TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary II

1. Milwaukee & The City Beautiful Tradition 1
   Introduction 1
   City Beautiful Civic Centers 3
   Criticism of the City Beautiful Movement 5

2. History and Context of MacArthur Square 7
   Kilbourntown Before MacArthur Square 7
   Three Historic Civic Center Proposals 8
   Civic Center Development 11
   Figure Ground Comparison: 1894 - Present 13

3. Site Analysis 17
   Piecemeal Improvements 17
   Circulation and Level Changes 17
   Views to and from the Civic Center 18
   Context of Development 18
   Context of Civic Institutions 20

4. Proposed Redevelopment of MacArthur Square 21
   Overview 21
   Plan goals 23

5. The University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee and the Milwaukee Design Community 27
   University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee 27
   The Milwaukee Design Community and the MacArthur Square Design Charette 27

6. Parking Utilization Study 43
   Field Study: Summary of Results 43
   Field Study: Detailed Information 44
   Potential Development Capacity 48
   Future Development Recommendations Related to the Parking Structure 48

7. Parking Renovation Concept Plan 49

8. Phasing and Financing Concepts 59
   Market Context 59
   Multiple Phasing Options 60
   Development Scenario 62

9. Next Steps 65
Today MacArthur Square consists of a group of civic buildings in downtown Milwaukee arranged around a multilevel parking structure. Historically, MacArthur Square represents the city’s legacy of the City Beautiful movement in architecture and planning. This plan proposes to re-envision MacArthur Square, by reinterpreting the principles of the City Beautiful movement and, at the same time, responding to a contemporary context of social, economic, and aesthetic issues. Redevelopment of MacArthur Square can, and should, become an engine to spur economic growth as well as nationally recognized public place linking Milwaukee’s past and future.

This historic legacy of MacArthur square has been tarnished over the years due to insensitive additions and modifications to the complex. While home to many important Milwaukee public institutions — including the County Courthouse, Museum, State and City offices, and the Milwaukee Area Technical College — the ensemble of civic buildings and public spaces has not realized its potential as a successful community gathering space or as a viable city district.

Due to the age and condition of the structure, the City of Milwaukee is faced with the need to make structural repairs to the MacArthur Square parking garage at a preliminary cost of more than $20 million. This redevelopment plan, commissioned by the City of Milwaukee, supported by the School of Architecture and Urban Planning at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and prepared by PDI/Graef, represents an effort to look beyond making just structural repairs to preserve the unsatisfactory status quo, but to examine how a broader vision might:

- Improve the functionality and capacity of the ramp
- Renovate the dismal open spaces into vibrant public places
- Provide mixed use redevelopment opportunities that create new value
- Generate new jobs
- Activate the district into a truly uplifting urban experience.

The history of MacArthur Square began in the early 20th Century as the City Beautiful movement swept across the country. Alfred C. Clas developed the first proposal for a civic center complex in 1909 which was supplanted by other schemes over several decades that built upon the original concept. Various buildings were constructed over the years including the courthouse in 1925. The Clas vision was only partly implemented and was heavily impacted by the addition of a multi-level parking structure and the construction of adjacent freeways during the 1960’s.

The redevelopment plan aims to correct fundamental planning problems principally that the Square is not integrated into the city fabric and its isolation and lack of connectivity both physically and perceptually divorce the complex from the rest of the surrounding urban fabric. Ironically, the district contains a variety of both daytime and nighttime activities, for both weekdays and weekends. Yet the system of public places and circulation actually fragment this pattern and prevent the realization of a lively “24/7” experience.

The urban design solution proposed in this plan involves the reworking of the parking structure and circulation system to allow for an extension of Kilbourn Boulevard westward from its current termination at 8th street all the way to the front steps of the Courthouse — its original destination. The largely unused and ill-defined open space on top of the parking deck would be replaced by a new Kilbourn Boulevard and a condensed and better designed civic plaza, one city block in size, located directly east of the courthouse. New development sites would be located along, and fronting, the boulevard and plaza for future public or private sector investment opportunities.

While the City Beautiful movement offers many lessons to be emulated, the architectural style of new structures must bridge between the past and the future. Consequently, as part of this planning effort an innovative design “charrette” workshop was held in which nine local Milwaukee area architecture firms provided architectural visions for various sites in the redevelopment plan. The charrette generated many innovative ideas and helped publicize the project within a broader community. Moreover, the results of the charrette provide evidence of how traditional principles of urban design can be combined with contemporary architecture into a re-envisioned public realm. The firms that participated include (in alphabetical order):

- Arquitectura, Inc.
- Engberg Anderson Design Partnership, Inc.
- Eppstein Uhen Architects, Inc
- Hammel, Green, and Abrahamson, Inc.
- Johnsen Schmaling Architects
- Kahler Slater Architects Inc.
- La Dallman Architects, Inc
- Studio 1032
- Zimmerman Architectural Studios, Inc.

Parking supply will be a key factor in determining the ultimate potential for development on the site. The redevelopment plan process included a study of the existing parking usage in the garage along with projections of the number of stalls that could be added in the reconfiguration and reconstruction of the MacArthur Square garage as illustrated in the redevelopment plan.

In summary, the study found that more efficient utilization of existing spaces along with the projected new totals would yield about 2500 additional parking spaces in the garage structure. Utilizing this parking amount, an ultimate development yield was computed in order to determine the overall amount of development square footage that might reasonably be expected. The study found that approximately 1.5 million total square feet of new mixed-use development can be expected on the site yielding a total development value of around $220 million dollars.
INTRODUCTION

MacArthur Square contains the surviving fragments of Milwaukee’s City Beautiful civic center overwritten by decades of changes. Never completed and much altered, the square is a disappointing shadow of its designers’ original intentions. However, within this disappointment lies the tremendous potential to reintegrate MacArthur Square with the surrounding downtown. An enlivened MacArthur Square, with bustling activity, can be the catalyst for redevelopment of the civic center district.

Origins Of The City Beautiful Movement

The City Beautiful movement is best remembered for its legacy of urban design due to the built environments left behind in numerous American cities. More accurately, City Beautiful was a political movement which in turn generated the parks, boulevards, and civic centers still in existence. According to William H. Wilson, the movement’s goal was to “influence the heart, mind, and purpose” of the citizen, with the assumption that positive physical changes to the built environment of cities would inspire “civic spirit” resulting in greater productivity and enhanced urban economies. Implementation of larger scale City Beautiful projects often required alterations to the existing political structure including passage of enabling legislation, creation of new public boards, and unprecedented grants of power to private entities.

The movement peaked between 1900 and 1910, with related projects trickling into the following decades. The movement’s primary concerns included the insertion of classically styled open spaces and monumental buildings inserted into the a industrial-based cities. This development process occurred in tandem with control and enhancement of the city’s economic and physical growth. Many turn-of-the-century American cities were visually unappealing and unsanitary, black with soot, with rivers polluted with sewage, and inadequate and under-developed park space. The movement relied heavily on the knowledge of experts, and believed strongly in providing space for working class recreational opportunities. The built legacy of the City Beautiful movement is typically represented by civic centers, campuses, parks, and boulevards featuring neoclassical architecture, often placed in contrast with broad landscape features. Neoclassical architecture was favored because it was evocative of American history, and it provided a simple aesthetic framework within which different architects could design complementary facades. At the same time, the movement has been criticized and ultimately discredited for its high costs, its superficial concern for aesthetics, overly monumental facades. At the same time, the movement has been criticized and ultimately discredited for its high costs, its superficial concern for aesthetics, overly monumental facades. At the same time, the movement has been criticized and ultimately discredited for its high costs, its superficial concern for aesthetics, overly monumental facades.

Wilson found the roots of City Beautiful in the career of landscape designer Frederick Law Olmsted (1822-1903). While Olmsted himself was often critical of City Beautiful projects, Wilson believed that Olmsted made three significant contributions to the movement’s formation. The first was the evolution of Olmsted’s career from the design of individual parks to citywide park and boulevard systems. The second was Olmsted’s belief that aesthetic enhancements such as parks and boulevards provided numerous benefits to adjacent land values, the local economy, and to the lives of citizens. Finally, Wilson notes Olmsted’s promotion of the hiring of outside consultants to engage urban problems. Wilson also recognizes Charles Mulford Robinson as an important influence on the City Beautiful movement through his 1901 book, The Improvement of Towns and Cities, or the Practical Basis for Civic Aesthetics.

Relation to the European Baroque Urban Design Tradition

The ‘City Beautiful’ movement in American urban design developed in the early 20th Century, but elements of the style are rooted in the European Baroque tradition through the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris (the educational source for many of the movement’s American practitioners). In his 1991 book, The City Shaped, Spiro Kostof discussed the elements of baroque design. These elements include utilizing topography to emphasize important buildings and create dramatic vistas. Manipulation of heights through the use of stairs, ramps, and platforms enhanced the topographical advantages of particular sites. The increased usage of wheeled carriages led in part to the implementation of wide straight avenues linking prominent buildings and districts, often in bold diagonal lines. These diagonal avenues often came together as radial spokes into a public square. The dismantling of defensive walls around European cities provided space for broad tree lined boulevards. The breadth and length of the new avenues led to an increased emphasis on architectural uniformity in color, scale, and style. Finally, the Baroque period saw an increased use of monumental buildings, sculptures, or columns to terminate vistas of long avenues.

In partial contrast to the design principles of the City Beautiful movement, came from an influential review of European urban design through the 19th Century provided by the Austrian architect and art historian, Camillo Sitte, in his 1889 book, City Planning According to Artistic Principles. Sitte traveled Europe studying the combinations of elements and characteristics that created the “aesthetic charm” of historic cities. Working at the end of the 19th Century, Sitte observed first hand...
the transformation of historic cities into larger, more industrial modern cities. Sitte recognized that changes in size, scale, technology, and economics made some modes of city building obsolete. Rather than creating a simple guidebook to historic sites, Sitte analyzed historic sites for lessons to apply to the modern city. Sitte saw public squares as part of two separate continuities.

Sitte determined that a sense of enclosure is a primary factor in the success of a plaza. In his terms, he said that enclosure is what transforms an open space into a plaza. He contrasts modern plazas, in which streets often intersect in right angles at the corners, to historic plazas in which typically only one street enters at any one point and streets are often angled to block views. The modern plazas struggle to provide an adequate sense of enclosure, while the historic plazas are more often successful because at any point in the plaza there is no more than one sightline out of the plaza. Other methods for enhancing enclosure are colonnades, trees, and arches or elevated loggias at corners. A plaza that is too small does not provide space to create optimal sightlines to the principle building, while a plaza that is too large makes even the most monumental buildings seem inferior.

1893 Chicago Columbian Exposition

The first major event to embrace the City Beautiful movement, was the development of the 1893 Chicago Columbian Exposition. Daniel H. Burnham was put in charge of an army of the nation’s leading architects, landscape designers, and sculptors to build an ideal city on the swampy lakeshore of Chicago’s south side. Frederick Law Olmsted designed the layout and landscape, while Burnham’s partner John Wellborn Root is credited with creating the concept of a water basin surrounded by major buildings. Burnham’s primary talent was organization. Described derisively by Frank Lloyd Wright as a man who would have been equally successful in the shoe or hat business, Burnham’s skill fended off the project’s impending collapse numerous times before he finally delivered a profitable and wildly popular exposition.

The result was an electrically bedazzled neoclassical wonderland that enraptured the tens of millions of visitors when the exposition opened in 1893. In large part, the charm of the ‘White City,’ as it came to be called, was its direct opposition to the real industrial cities of the era. The exposition site was planned, orderly, clean, bright, and spacious at a time when large American cities generally embodied none of those traits. The symmetry and stark white architecture were offset by Olmsted’s naturalistic lagoon and densely forested island. While some have seen the expo as the source of the City Beautiful movement, Wilson argues that instead the fair consolidated and popularized the previous several decades’ advances in aesthetics, sanitation, women’s rights, and “rationalization of urban function.” In the aftermath of the fair, many American civic leaders sought to introduce some of the White City’s magic into their own cities, in many cases by hiring the Fair’s designers directly. Daniel Burnham himself was involved in numerous urban planning projects until his death in 1912, notably the 1909 Plan for Chicago as well as work with the McMillan commission in Washington D.C.

Plan of the 1893 Columbian Exposition shows a mix of formal building arrangements with naturalistic landscape design and water elements.
In 1901 the McMillan Plan for Washington D.C., named after Senator James McMillan the Chair of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, sought to reclaim the legacy of L’Enfant’s work. While many major buildings were placed according to L’Enfant’s plan, the city had strayed away from the concept leading Charles Dickens to comment in the 1840’s that Washington was a city of “spacious avenues that begin in nothing and go nowhere.”

Washington at the turn of the century featured many deviations and desecrations of L’Enfant’s original plan; the most egregious of which were the Washington Monument’s placement off axis from the White House and the construction of a rambling train depot on the National Mall.

A commission of Columbian Exposition veterans including Daniel Burnham, architect Charles McKim, and landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr. were selected to address a number of challenges including the establishment of a cultural vitality on par with European capitals and the revitalization of Washington’s monumental core. Their plan received widespread acclaim, and exerted great influence on subsequent City Beautiful schemes primarily for its unification of monumental public buildings with a park and boulevard system.

**City Beautiful Civic Centers**

The Columbian Exposition and the subsequent McMillan plan for Washington D.C. inspired numerous civic center projects in cities throughout the United States, including Milwaukee. These centers were intended to supplement the city’s existing commercial core. Designers respected the fact that land values in the core were too expensive to justify the large open spaces the civic centers demanded. Therefore, the centers were typically located adjacent to commercial centers, convenient to the existing center, but also in a position to influence future outward development.

The civic centers were intended to form an ensemble of buildings and spaces that would provide greater impact than any one building alone would be capable of offering. Building upon the precedents of the ‘White City’ and Washington D.C., not to mention European capitals, the center designers utilized uniform neoclassical architecture with matching cornice lines and materials. Grouping the buildings around a park or square served dual purposes. First the spacing enhanced the center’s beauty by allowing grander perspectives and greater contrasts. Second, the open spaces served the more utilitarian purposes of providing fire protection and noise buffers between structures, while the relative proximity of the civic buildings accommodated the use of a central heating plant.

**Cleveland Civic Center**

In 1902, Ohio Governor Nash appointed a commission to design a new civic center for Cleveland. The Cleveland Civic Center plan was centered on a vast lakefront railroad station at the northern head of the mall, with a post office and public library at the opposite end, near the center of the city. Furthermore, the plan featured a city hall on the east side of the mall, balanced by a courthouse on the west side. All of the above elements were intended to be connected by a vast formal esplanade of Parisian influence. Numerous elements of the plan were constructed, including the post office in 1916, the courthouse in 1912, and the public library in 1925. However, in the 1920’s the new owners of the railroad built the Cleveland terminal five blocks away from the location designated in the Civic Center plan. Today, the mall looks out directly over Lake Erie. It has been refurbished in a modern aesthetic.

While not all of the plan’s elements were implemented, the Cleveland Civic Center is more complete than most City Beautiful Civic Centers.
San Francisco Civic Center
In 1905, the Association for the Improvement and Adornment of San Francisco hired Daniel Burnham to devise a plan for the entire metropolitan area over the next half century. The private association put few restraints on Burnham, resulting in a visionary plan consisting of radial boulevards, civic buildings located around an inner circuit, a vast new park, and a system of parkways connecting hilltop parks. In spite of some initial widespread interest in the plan, its fate was sealed by the San Francisco earthquake of 1906. In the earthquake’s aftermath, the city’s business community insisted on the rapid reconstruction of the city along pre-disaster guidelines, and the elements of the plan went largely unbuilt.

In 1912, a commission including Edward Bennett advised that the new City Hall be built on the site of the old one, accompanied by a civic center housing an opera house and library. An auditorium associated with the 1915 San Francisco expo was eventually added to the scheme. The civic center was built largely as planned and remains a relatively complete example of a City Beautiful civic center scheme.

Denver Civic Center
Denver provides another example of a civic center that was largely completed, though it followed a complicated and tenuous path to its final result. Denver attempted a series of civic center plans from 1906 to 1916, by a number of designers. The focal point for these designs was a stretch of land west of the existing Colorado state capitol building, including the area around the existing public library. A series of plans advocated various alterations to merge the conflicting grids, to ease traffic, and to include monuments, plazas, fountains, and public buildings. Most of these plans were championed by Mayor Speer, who guided the civic center through a complex political climate to overcome a vigorous anti-civic center movement. At one point, Speer was removed from office only to be re-elected in 1916. When he regained office, Speer hired Edward H. Bennett to develop a new version of the civic center scheme.

Much of Bennett’s 1917 plan was eventually constructed. While Bennett’s Denver plan came closer to completion than most City Beautiful schemes, even this plan contained some elements that remained unbuilt. The central plaza was never completed as designed. The civic center continues to read as a coherent design to this day. In recent decades Denver has added to the Civic Center with a new Library, Museums, and currently a new courthouse and detention facility. These newer clearly represent both a continuation of, and a contrast to, the original design principles underlying the civic center. The latest revisions of the civic center also include a direct attempt to influence the character, vibrancy, and diversity of the surrounding neighborhoods.
CRITICISM OF THE CITY BEAUTIFUL MOVEMENT

In his book, The City Beautiful Movement, William H. Wilson acknowledges some of the movement’s shortcomings. He allows that the movement was often too ambitious, and that “fragmented politics” formed a barrier to the large scale physical reconfiguration of cities. Wilson also acknowledges the movement was too naive in its belief in physical determinism. A beautiful civic center did nothing to inspire better citizens or foster better government. Wilson, however, emphasizes the City Beautiful’s potential to work within, and improve, the existing urban fabric. He also sees the City Beautiful movement as primarily an “urban reform movement” which has left behind a legacy of civic activism. In many cases the City Beautiful remnants are valued elements of the urban fabric, available for reinterpretation and reintegration into the 21st century city.

According to Wilson, no less than 72 civic center projects were designed in the City Beautiful era, with less than one tenth ever beginning construction at the time and a handful more beginning construction in later decades. Very few were ever completed. Compared to other City Beautiful projects like parks or boulevards, civic centers were plagued by a unique set of difficulties. Necessity dictated that civic centers be placed somewhere in the vicinity of the existing commercial core. Therefore, the land required for their construction was inherently expensive. Furthermore, it was not practical to gradually acquire the needed land and build the centers in piecemeal fashion. Projects begun in this manner typically lost momentum and went unfinished. Finally, many came to see the civic centers as an impractical medium to foster improved civic organization and idealism.

By the City Beautiful movement’s end, it was subject to much criticism from contemporary architects and planners. The movement was caricatured as being concerned with frivolous civic adornments for the wealthy while being unconcerned with the plight of the poor, and the movement was further criticized as being obsessed with aesthetics and ignorant of practical necessity. Many critics focused on the high price tags and low completion rate of City Beautiful projects.

The backlash against the City Beautiful was in full effect as soon as 1909. At the American Institute of Architects (AIA) conference in that year, architect Cass Gilbert said, “Let us have the City Useful, the City Practical, the City Livable, the City Sensible, the City Anything but the City Beautiful. If it is to be a City Beautiful, it will be one naturally.” Architect and planner Arnold Brunner, himself a designer of the Cleveland Civic Center less than a decade earlier, added, “To the average citizen the City Beautiful suggests the City Impossible.”

Decades later, Jane Jacobs discussed the lasting impact of the City Beautiful movement on American cities in her 1961 book, The Death and Life of Great American Cities. In her opinion, the City Beautiful movement was essentially the “City Monumental” movement. Jacobs focused her attention primarily on the City Beautiful civic centers and their legacies within the urban fabric. Jacobs identified three civic center prototypes: those arranged on a boulevard or mall, such as Philadelphia or Cleveland; those bordered by a park, such as St. Louis; or those with parks incorporated into the civic center, such as San Francisco. In all of these prototypes, the most pertinent characteristic to Jacobs was the separation and arrangement of monuments to the “grandest affect possible” as a separate unit distinct from the rest of the city fabric. Jacobs felt that this separation of uses led to the failure of most City Beautiful civic centers. As she describes the civic centers, “people were proud of them, but the centers were not a success. For one thing, invariably the ordinary city around them ran down instead of being uplifted, and they always acquired an incongruous ring of ratty tattoo parlors and second hand clothing stores... Somehow, when the fair became part of the city, it did not work like the fair.”

Jane Jacobs (1916-2006)

Milwaukee’s City Beautiful Civic Center

Milwaukee made its own foray into the design of a City Beautiful civic center, at MacArthur Square in front of the Milwaukee County Courthouse. MacArthur Square has fallen victim to many of the same processes and circumstances that led other City Beautiful civic centers to failure. It also features many unique opportunities to once again become a vital and integrated portion of Milwaukee’s Downtown. Given its problems and potential, given its historical legacy within the City Beautiful movement, given its fragmented but clear pattern of development, what should Milwaukee do with MacArthur Square?

“Afurther criticism of the City Beautiful movement was the separation and arrangement of monuments to the “grandest affect possible” as a separate unit distinct from the rest of the city fabric. Jacobs felt that this separation of uses led to the failure of most City Beautiful civic centers. As she describes the civic centers, “people were proud of them, but the centers were not a success. For one thing, invariably the ordinary city around them ran down instead of being uplifted, and they always acquired an incongruous ring of ratty tattoo parlors and second hand clothing stores... Somehow, when the fair became part of the city, it did not work like the fair.”

Jane Jacobs (1916-2006)

Milwaukee’s City Beautiful Civic Center

Milwaukee made its own foray into the design of a City Beautiful civic center, at MacArthur Square in front of the Milwaukee County Courthouse. MacArthur Square has fallen victim to many of the same processes and circumstances that led other City Beautiful civic centers to failure. It also features many unique opportunities to once again become a vital and integrated portion of Milwaukee’s Downtown. Given its problems and potential, given its historical legacy within the City Beautiful movement, given its fragmented but clear pattern of development, what should Milwaukee do with MacArthur Square?

“Afurther criticism of the City Beautiful movement was the separation and arrangement of monuments to the “grandest affect possible” as a separate unit distinct from the rest of the city fabric. Jacobs felt that this separation of uses led to the failure of most City Beautiful civic centers. As she describes the civic centers, “people were proud of them, but the centers were not a success. For one thing, invariably the ordinary city around them ran down instead of being uplifted, and they always acquired an incongruous ring of ratty tattoo parlors and second hand clothing stores... Somehow, when the fair became part of the city, it did not work like the fair.”

Jane Jacobs (1916-2006)
2. HISTORY AND CONTEXT OF MACARTHUR SQUARE

KILBOURNTOWN BEFORE MACARTHUR SQUARE

The neighborhood surrounding MacArthur Square was originally named after Byron Kilbourn, the first European settler on the west side of the Milwaukee River. In a 1968 Milwaukee Magazine article, Kilbourn was described as a “vain intellectual” with an aim to build himself a local empire on the west side. Gifted with talents in engineering, mathematics, and history, Kilbourn was an experienced land surveyor by the time he arrived in Milwaukee. Kilbourn is responsible for Milwaukee’s systematic misalignment of the street grid on the east side of the river relative to west side grid (established by Solomon Juneau). This disconnection, intended to give Kilbourn an economic advantage, has ironically created some of the more interesting visual features and landmarks as one approaches the river from either the east or west. Eventually, the settlements of Kilbourn town, Juneau town, and Walkers Point (south of the river) merged into the City of Milwaukee. Nevertheless, the two sides of the river have always been seen as distinct districts.

The blocks in the immediate vicinity of the river formed the city’s commercial and business core. More than a block or two from the river, the urban fabric transitioned abruptly into a primarily residential landscape, though patterns of local land use tended to be highly complex with stables or blacksmith shops side by side with homes. The west side (the area that was to include MacArthur Square) was home to a number of ethnic neighborhoods including Greek, Slavic, Jewish, and African-American areas. A secondary “Gold Coast” neighborhood, occupied by wealthy Anglo-Saxons existed west of 9th Street between Highland and Wisconsin.

After 1900, the east and west sides became more balanced in terms of affluence and cultural influence. The east side had been home to most of the city’s public and cultural institutions including the City Hall, the Pabst Theatre, the original courthouse and its successor, and the cathedral. With the construction of the Milwaukee Public Library 1898 (just south of the future MacArthur Square) the west side began to take on some of those public functions. The current Beaux-Arts structure was the result of a national design competition won by the Milwaukee architectural firm of Ferry and Clas. The library was expanded numerous times, with projects completed in 1912, 1914, 1931, and 1956.

The west side received another major public amenity in 1909 with the completion of the Milwaukee Auditorium (just east of MacArthur Square). Its location (bounded by 5th, 6th, Kilbourn, and State) was originally dedicated for public use, including a public market. A large market hall occupied the site from 1867 until 1880, followed by an exposition hall. The original hall burned to the ground in 1905, prompting the construction of a new auditorium building. Public and private financing paid for a new auditorium after a lawsuit was won against Kilbourn’s heirs which determined the auditorium satisfied Kilbourn’s public use stipulation. Here too, the firm of Ferry and Clas are responsible for the Classical Revival design.

Undated photograph of the intersection of Cedar (now Kilbourn) and 9th, showing early conditions in Milwaukee away from the riverside commercial district. Source: Milwaukee County Historical Society.

Photograph of the intersection of Cedar (now Kilbourn) and 9th, showing early conditions. Source: Milwaukee County Historical Society.

Photograph of the intersection of 4th and Wells in the early 1900’s, showing the complexity of the urban fabric at the turn of the century. Source: Milwaukee County Historical Society.

Photograph of the intersection of 2nd and Wells in 1900. Note the variety of building types and scales. Source: Milwaukee County Historical Society.
While major civic buildings were located west of the river, the formal origins of MacArthur square as a civic center began with the 1905 decision to include a new Courthouse in a City Beautiful style civic center. Milwaukee was fully aware of the movement that began to south in Chicago. Civic leaders now saw the opportunity to connect the existing Public Library, Auditorium, and City Hall into a coherent master plan featuring a new Milwaukee County Courthouse. A series of three schemes were developed by local and national practitioners, each building on the efforts of the prior scheme. All three plans located the new courthouse building on a prominent hill on the west end of Kilbourn Avenue on axis with the City Hall east of the river. Furthermore, each scheme sought to redevelop the six to eight blocks to the east of the courthouse building into a public plaza ostensibly unifying the civic buildings. The site was formerly occupied by a finely grained neighborhood which transitioned from downtown to residential. The monumental nature of the new plans represented a radical departure from the existing urban fabric.

Three Historic Civic Center Proposals

The first proposal was developed in 1909 by Alfred C. Clas, a prominent architect who served on both the City and County Park Boards. Clas and his various firms designed a number of landmark Milwaukee structures, including the Pabst Mansion, the Milwaukee Public Library, the Milwaukee Auditorium, the Lake Park Pavilion and Staircase, the Old Coast Guard Station, the layout for Lincoln Memorial Drive, and the original layout for Red Arrow Park. Clas embodied the principles of the City Beautiful movement in his introductory text to his design:

“This municipal art, which has so firmly taken root, is the germ that is to regenerate the American city. It foreshadows a broadening public mind; it appeals to the finer and truer sensibilities of man, and it makes possible an object lesson to the masses, which cannot be over-estimated. Many of our people have no appreciation of the desirability of beauty in a city; with them the highest consideration is the convenience of city life. In the erection of our buildings today, we find that utility is not alone to be considered, but that beauty is fully as necessary and important. If our cities are to be made attractive, and made to appeal to the pleasure and comfort of their citizens, the beautiful must be considered. With
all the resources of art and science now at hand, there is no reason why we should allow ugliness, meanness, and squalor to exist and to deaden the external aspects of our cities to the extent we do. Civic art has beautified, stimulated, and inspired the world for three thousand years or more.... A good picture is admired by a few, but a magnificent edifice, a grand boulevard, or a beautiful park is the pride of thousands."

Clas re-envisioned (and realigned) what is now Kilbourn Avenue as a grand boulevard linking the existing City Hall to the new Milwaukee County Courthouse. Clas organized a trio of civic buildings to join the Auditorium around a large fountain in a round plaza on Kilbourn. West of the fountain, Kilbourn opened into a broad boulevard running through a grand square. The square wrapped around both sides of the courthouse to the north and south linking the open space to the existing Milwaukee Public Library.

While the plan’s open spaces are vast, they are subdivided into smaller formal areas. Unlike later schemes, this plan keeps the existing street grid intact with the exception of the courthouse blocking Kilbourn. The existing library does not face the main square in this plan, instead facing a small auxiliary square south of the courthouse.

Olmsted and Nolen Proposal

The City then hired nationally known landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted Jr. and planner John Nolen to analyze the Clas plan and recommend any alterations to the plan as they saw fit. Olmsted Jr. officially joined his father’s firm as a partner in 1895. He is best known for his involvement with the MacMillan Plan for Washington D.C., and for his advocacy for the national park system. John Nolen (1869-1937) was an early pioneer in city planning in the United States. Nolen is remembered in Wisconsin for his 1908 Plan for Madison (which provided recommendations for the city, the state, and the University of Wisconsin), and for his work in developing the state park system. Olmsted and Nolen agreed with many of the underlying assumptions of the Clas plan, as stated in their report:

“So far as concerns the practical question of comparison with any alternative sites such disadvantages as are peculiar to the site proposed are emphatically outweighed, in our opinion, by its manifest advantages, notably its proximity to the business center combined with the economy of purchase, a visual relationship with City Hall, and an arrangement of grades favorable to a fine, artistic composition.”

Olmsted and Nolen’s primary criticism of Clas’s proposal involved the precise placement of the courthouse. Clas placed the courthouse between 8th and 9th Streets. Olmsted and Nolen objected to that placement because the site failed to “suggest the full possibilities of the situation.” Olmsted and Nolen recommended shifting the courthouse west to the crest of the hill, centered on the 9th Street right of way. They justified the disruption of 9th Street with the explanation that passengers from the street car stops to the north and south can travel directly to the building.
Olmsted and Nolen used a series of stairs and terraces in front of the courthouse to accommodate the topography and enhance the building’s monumentality. Relocating the courthouse to the top of the hill suggested equal access from the west side as well as the east. Olmsted and Nolen acknowledged this by enhancing the approach from the west. While the western approach is handled with some sensitivity, there was still a rather abrupt transition from the courthouse to the existing residential fabric.

The shifting of the courthouse placed it off-axis with the existing public library. In this scheme, the library was neither completely on the main square nor completely aligned to an auxiliary plaza. Olmsted and Nolen attempted to mask this alignment by proposing new buildings to form a continuous enclosure around the entire perimeter of the open space.

Olmsted and Nolen also handled the main open space differently. Perhaps due to the enhanced monumentality of the courthouse, they chose not to subdivide the open space into smaller components to the same degree as Clas. Olmsted and Nolen also recommended the closing of 7th Street between Wells and State. This created an open space with adequate depth in the east/west direction to accommodate the enhanced monumentality of the courthouse. However, the scale of the open space was such that the new perimeter buildings still lacked the mass to adequately enclose the space.

Revised Metropolitan Park Board Proposal

Founded in 1907, Milwaukee’s Metropolitan Park Board became the City Planning Commission in 1911, a change which reflected its more comprehensive scope. The park board prepared a final report in which they investigated other civic center sites (north of City Hall and east of Auditorium), in addition to a revised plan for the Kilbourn Avenue site investigated first by Clas, and then by Olmsted Jr. and Nolen.

The Metropolitan Park Board saw their city at a crossroads in the early 20th Century. They envisioned rapid and uninterrupted growth well into the next century, and their proposal was meant to ensure that Milwaukee’s beauty would be preserved:

“Milwaukee County has been richly blessed with natural beauties which a far-seeing and courageous Park Board is now striving to conserve for the benefit of future generations. Would that an equally courageous and far-seeing board with city
“Experience in other cities makes it a foregone conclusion that the grouping of our public buildings should be somewhere on a main thoroughfare where it passes through or very near the future business area... It should be placed where it will be most accessible to all the people of the city... It should be placed where it will be seen by the greatest number of people per day, and it should be large enough in area so as to afford an ample and dignified setting for what we hope will be our best architectural effort.”

At the same time, the board also argued for a reduction in traffic:

“If there is to be a large open space at the center of this group of buildings to serve as a concourse for public gatherings, it must be admitted by all that it is most desirable to have it located in such a place that the least number of principal traffic streets will have to be carried through it.”

The board augmented this preservation of open space at the center by introducing diagonal streets which veer to the northwest and southwest from Kilbourn at 6th, diverting traffic out of the central space to Wisconsin Avenue to the south and Highland Avenue to the north. Thus a ‘T’ shaped open space was reserved, with a level change occurring at approximately 7th Street.

This plan also introduced buildings within the open space between Wells and State. This subdivided the space into portions of a more reasonable scale, while also providing a greater sense of enclosure. The area between 6th and 4th Streets is also radically altered from previous plans; larger proposed buildings on these blocks created a well defined street edge on Kilbourn.

Finally, the revised plan shifted the courthouse yet again to the west, placing it between 9th and 10th Streets. This location showed some increased sensitivity to the transition between the monumental courthouse building and the residential neighborhood to the west by extending Kilbourn as a boulevard for one block flanked by new low buildings.

**CIVIC CENTER DEVELOPMENT**

**Initial Civic Center Implementation**

In 1920, Milwaukee voters passed a referendum which designated the Kilbourn Avenue site as the future home of the Milwaukee Civic Center, and designated the land between 9th and 11th Streets as the location for the new Milwaukee County Courthouse. Controversy plagued the project and voters rescinded approval for the civic center in 1925. A court order pushed the project ahead, and land acquisition began later in 1925.

In spite of objections that the civic center was not a proper setting for the housing of inmates, the first public building constructed in the Milwaukee Civic Center was the City/County Public Safety Building. The building was designed to house the City police department, the county sheriff’s office, a combined jail, and administrative functions.

The Milwaukee Area Technical College (MATC), founded in 1912, moved to its current location abutting the civic center area in 1923. They added to their facilities in 1929. The now-empty block to the south of MATC, at the southwest corner of 6th and State, was known as the Civic Center Campus.

**Milwaukee County Courthouse**

After three decades of contentious debate, the new Milwaukee County Courthouse project moved forward
with land acquisition in 1925. Dozens of buildings needed to be razed between 7th, 10th, Wells, and State Streets to make room for the courthouse. Noted Milwaukee architect and original civic center designer Alfred C. Clas judged a national design competition, and awarded the job to Albert Rudolph Rossof New York. The facade and the building’s massive scale, combined with its hilltop location created a truly monumental presence at the western end of the civic center. The building’s design was not without its critics. Frank Lloyd Wright once described the courthouse as “a manifest cultural curse.”

Later Additions In The Urban Renewal Era
As in most American cities, the Great Depression and World War II suspended most building activity in Milwaukee during the 1930’s and 1940's. Thus, few changes occurred to the civic center until the 1950’s. On September 17, 1945 the central plaza was rechristened as WWII General Douglas MacArthur, a Milwaukee native.

The next major civic project to be constructed as part of the civic center was the Milwaukee Arena, completed in 1950. Built adjacent to the Auditorium to the east, the arena was the City’s primary venue for concerts, conventions, and comparable events. Discussions regarding the project began in 1945, but site acquisition was a slow process as numerous immigrant families (mostly Chinese) were relocated as part of the renewal.

View looking west on Kilbourn during demolition of existing residential structures to allow for the construction and regrading of Kilbourn Avenue.

Kilbourn in 1894
1. Hilltop site of future Milwaukee County Courthouse: buildings on the site in 1894 include: 10 single family homes, 30 rowhouses, and the B’nai Jeshurun Synagogue at the SE corner of Kilbourn and 10th.
2. Site of the future Milwaukee Public Library: buildings on the site include Trinity Hospital, the Calumet Club, and several homes.
3. Milwaukee Industrial Exposition Association building; built in 1880 (destroyed by fire in 1905), replaced by the current Milwaukee Auditorium building in 1909.
4. Site of the future MacArthur Square; among the buildings on the site in 1894: the B. Hoffman Manufacturing Co. foundry, the Northwestern Tile Co., the August Pagenkopf Co., - manufacturer of fine shoes and slippers, the Roth Manufacturing vinegar works, the Milwaukee Art & Architectural Metal Works, the Dolger and Kirsten Co. machine shops, livery stables, and dozens of single family homes and rowhouses.
5. City Hall under construction, completed in 1898.

Clas Proposal
1. Proposed Milwaukee County Courthouse, located near the top of an existing hill between 8th and 9th Streets, terminating Kilbourn Avenue opposite the City Hall tower.
2. Existing Milwaukee Public Library facing auxiliary plaza instead of main open space.
3. Existing Milwaukee Auditorium to be integrated into new civic center complex.
4. Three new buildings join the existing auditorium to frame a new round plaza with a fountain.
5. Kilbourn Avenue expanded into a formal boulevard in front of the new courthouse, flanked by four formal squares. Each of the four squares is sized appropriately to the building facing it, while the four squares combined into one large open space are scaled for the monumentality of the courthouse building.
6. New infill buildings designed to a scale and style appropriate for enclosing adjacent plaza and streets.
7. Existing City Hall, terminating Kilbourn Avenue.
8. No transition between western courthouse approach and adjacent residential area.
9. Kilbourn Avenue bridge straightened to provide direct axis from Courthouse to City Hall.

Olmsted and Nolen Proposal

1. Proposed Milwaukee County Courthouse, located at the crest of an existing hill in the 9th Street right-of-way (and therefore visible from Wisconsin Avenue), terminating Kilbourn Avenue opposite the City Hall tower.
2. Existing Milwaukee Public Library off-axis to courthouse, not directly facing main plaza.
3. Existing Milwaukee Auditorium to be integrated into new civic center complex.
4. Three new buildings join the existing auditorium to frame a new round plaza with a fountain.
5. Kilbourn Avenue expanded into a formal boulevard in front of the new courthouse, flanked by large formal squares. The plaza is scaled for the enhanced monumentality of the courthouse building.
6. Enhanced western approach, still an abrupt transition to existing residential area.
7. Existing City Hall, terminating Kilbourn Avenue.
8. New infill buildings designed to enclose adjacent plaza and streets.
9. Kilbourn Avenue bridge straightened to provide direct axis from Courthouse to City Hall.

Revised Metropolitan Park Board Proposal

1. Proposed Milwaukee County Courthouse, located at the top of an existing hill between 9th & 20th Streets, terminating Kilbourn Avenue opposite the City Hall tower.
2. Existing Milwaukee Public Library facing main open space.
3. Existing Milwaukee Auditorium to be integrated into new civic center complex.
4. Three new buildings join the existing auditorium to frame to define the Kilbourn Avenue approach to square.
5. Kilbourn Avenue interrupted with level change and fountain. Buildings introduced to open space to provide greater sense of enclosure to space. Remaining open space is shaped to enhance monumentality of courthouse building.
6. New infill buildings designed to a scale and style appropriate for enclosing adjacent plaza and streets.
7. Existing City Hall, terminating Kilbourn Avenue.
8. Greater sensitivity applied to western approach to Courthouse, greater effort to transition from monumental character of square to residential neighborhood.
9. Kilbourn Avenue Bridge straightened to provide direct axis from Courthouse to City Hall.
10. New diagonal streets introduced to divert traffic from the central open space.

FIGURE GROUND COMPARISON: 1894 - PRESENT

Six figure-ground drawings are shown to illustrate civic center proposals and changes that have occurred to the built environment in the last 115 years. All of the drawings are presented at the same scale, aiding direct comparison between them.

Kilbourn town in 1894 and the Clas, Omstead and Nolan, and the Park Board proposals for a civic center are shown on page 12 and 13. The Urban Renewal Plan and the Current Conditions are shown on page 14.

In each of these drawings, the area of the current civic center (the area bound by 6th, 10th, State and Wells Streets) which included MacArthur Square, is shown in a dashed red line.
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process. The arena was designed by the Milwaukee firm Eschweiler and Eschweiler.

The Civic Center Campus at 6th and State expanded in 1952, with the construction of the South Building, replacing quonset huts that had accommodated educational services on the site since WWII. The campus became the forerunner of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (UWM), and functioned as a downtown outpost of UWM for several decades.

The next major civic center building was the Milwaukee Public Museum, completed in 1963. The museum had lived under the same roof as the Library from the 1890’s until the new building’s construction. The building was designed by Eschweiler, Eschweiler, and Sielaff. The building’s main entry lies on Wells, and in spite of its location the Museum has little physical interaction with the civic center’s open space.

The State of Wisconsin put its stamp on the Civic Center with the construction of its State Office Building, located at the northwest corner of Wells and 6th, in 1963.
By the 1960’s the Public Safety Building was no longer adequate to function as the Milwaukee Police Department’s administrative headquarters. The new Police Administration Building, located immediately to the east of the Public Safety Building, was completed in 1969.

The final public building constructed as part of the civic center is the Milwaukee Expo Center and Civic Arena (MECCA), completed in 1974. MECCA was intended to supplement the Auditorium and Arena and the buildings were connected by skywalks, further separating the civic center from any surrounding public places.

The Plan Commission asked the rhetorical question, “Why a Civic Center?” and proposed the following answer:

• To promote efficiency of government through the grouping of public buildings
• To provide convenience to the public in transacting business requiring visits to more than one public agency
• To provide a central location for cultural, civic, and recreational activities
• To achieve architectural beauty through the establishment of prominent, well-designed buildings within an harmonious composition
• To create open space and green areas for relaxation, enjoyment, and public gatherings
• To improve vehicular and pedestrian circulation within downtown
• To provide off-street parking to serve public buildings and commercial activities
• To establish orderly and stable land use replacing a deteriorated area
• To enhance taxable values adjoining the center

According to the Plan Commission’s map, the civic center was considered to extend along Kilbourn from 12th Street to Juneau Park on the lakeshore in the east, thus including not only the vicinity of the Courthouse, but also City Hall, the new Performing Arts Center, the Municipal Office Building, and Cathedral Square.

Soon after this initiative, proposals for the freeway system began and included Kilbourn as a primary access point to and from the freeway at both the west and east ends. The entire system was never completed but Kilbourn was modified to access I-43 via two underground tunnels beneath the civic center. Apparently this was freeway connection was viewed as consistent (or no more then a minor detriment) to the vision for the civic center.

Contemporaneously to the freeway system, the development of the large parking garage was completed in the late 1960’s. The three story garage contains nearly 1,500 spaces, and features a landscaped plaza on the roof. While the garage seemed to meet some civic center goals and, at the same time, provide parking for surrounding uses. By this time, however, it was almost too late to return to the initial vision of the civic center.

The current predicament of MacArthur Square seems to be the result of numerous decisions, any one of which might be compatible with an effective system of public places, but which collectively ensure the impossibility of a civic center. Consequently, the plan proposed herein attempts to accept but reinterpret these decisions in a way that reflects the original traditions and principles, builds on the decisions that have been made, and envisions a new set of options that can create an effective civic center for Milwaukee.
3. SITE ANALYSIS

PIECEMEAL IMPROVEMENTS

MacArthur Square and the Milwaukee Civic Center have a long and complicated history. Various components—buildings, landscape elements, and circulation changes (including the two freeway ramps)—have been added and removed for almost a century. Rarely have these changes improved the civic center as a whole. Instead, Milwaukee has inherited a series of piecemeal efforts which, collectively, have overwritten the initial visions.

CIRCULATION AND LEVEL CHANGES

The complex layering of spaces within MacArthur Square is an obvious legacy of past building efforts. The area has always had a sloping topography. The hilltop location for the courthouse was a driving force behind the placement of the civic center. As stated previously, the Metropolitan Park Board viewed the civic center site as highly visible, and accessible to a great number of people.

While the site is still adjacent to Milwaukee’s commercial core, alterations to the plaza and the street grid have hindered access and visibility. The 1967 parking garage eliminated much of the slope, replacing it with abrupt elevational transitions. Kilbourn no longer flows uphill toward the Courthouse, but rather links vehicular traffic underground with the freeway ramps. At the same time the parking structure was inserted very carefully around the underground freeway access tunnels, connections to surrounding buildings, and a complex set of internal linkages. Ninth Street, placed underground, and no longer enters the square but merely passes beneath it, further obscuring pedestrian and visual access to the plaza above.

Pedestrians encounter blank walls and uninviting circulation paths. Pedestrian circulation into MacArthur Square has been fatally compromised by level changes and the disruptions to the surrounding street grid brought. This is a major reason for the underutilization of the open space. Furthermore, there is a lack of visual connection from the surrounding neighborhood into the square. Buildings block views into the civic center from State and Wells, and pedestrian access points are neither clearly designated, nor readily apparent.

Vehicular circulation has been all but eliminated from the surface of MacArthur Square. The Courthouse still provides a monumental termination to Kilbourn, but the plaza is not visible and access to the space is unclear. The contrast between the monumentality of the civic center and the lack of human activity make the place seem even more desolate and disappointing.
The Kilbourn Avenue civic center site was selected, in part, because the elevated topography provided the opportunity for the civic center, and the Courthouse in particular, to create a strong visual landmark. The Milwaukee County Courthouse was intended to “bookend” the existing Milwaukee City Hall, each providing a strong terminus to Kilbourn Avenue. Various alterations over the intervening decades have compromised this original vision. The Kilbourn Avenue bridge was not built in alignment with the street grid west of the Milwaukee River. Consequently, City Hall terminates Kilbourn from a distance, but not as it passes over the river. While this creates an interesting vista it diminishes the symbolic link between the two major civic buildings and the impact of City Hall as a terminal feature.

The removal of buildings from the MacArthur Square area has exaggerated the monumentality of the Courthouse to a point at which it seems removed from civic life, rather than serving as a center of activity. Moreover, Kilbourn runs underground to the freeway as it approaches the Courthouse, further emphasizing the lack of connection of the Courthouse to the district. This disruption of Kilbourn removes the Courthouse from any street activity and hides open space from both pedestrians and drivers.

Throughout the history of the Civic Center, proposals have endeavored to link the center to the lakefront via Kilbourn Avenue. Alfred Clas prepared the sketch below in 1909 showing the relationship between the Civic Center and Lake Michigan. In documents from the 1950’s, the Milwaukee Plan Commission describes the Civic Center as extending from the Courthouse all the way to Juneau Park, including all of the public buildings and open spaces along the way.

The City of Milwaukee continues to recognize the importance of Kilbourn Avenue. The City’s Downtown Plan includes ‘West Kilbourn Avenue Streetscape Improvements’ as a catalytic project, with the goal of enhancing the linkage between the Courthouse and City Hall that has been disrupted over the years.

The removal of buildings from the MacArthur Square area has exaggerated the monumentality of the Courthouse to a point at which it seems removed from civic life, rather than serving as a center of activity. Moreover, Kilbourn runs underground to the freeway as it approaches the Courthouse, further emphasizing the lack of connection of the Courthouse to the district. This disruption of Kilbourn removes the Courthouse from any street activity and hides open space from both pedestrians and drivers.

VIEW TO AND FROM THE CIVIC CENTER

Top Left: View looking west on Kilbourn toward the Milwaukee County Courthouse in the 1930’s, prior to the clearance of buildings to create the civic center’s open space.

Middle Left: View from corner of 6th and Kilbourn looking west toward courthouse. The severe level change beyond creates a visual barrier to the square beyond.

Bottom Left: View looking east on Kilbourn from MacArthur Square. While still visible, City Hall is no longer the dominant terminal feature at the east end of Kilbourn.

View of entry to the underground portion of 9th Street as it passes in front of the Milwaukee County Courthouse. This layering of the street network and the plaza hinders both pedestrian and vehicular access.

An overview of recent redevelopment in the MacArthur Square vicinity follows, numbers are keyed to the adjacent Land Use and Development Map:

Top Left: View looking west on Kilbourn toward the Milwaukee County Courthouse in the 1930’s, prior to the clearance of buildings to create the civic center’s open space.

Middle Left: View from corner of 6th and Kilbourn looking west toward courthouse. The severe level change beyond creates a visual barrier to the square beyond.

Bottom Left: View looking east on Kilbourn from MacArthur Square. While still visible, City Hall is no longer the dominant terminal feature at the east end of Kilbourn.

View of entry to the underground portion of 9th Street as it passes in front of the Milwaukee County Courthouse. This layering of the street network and the plaza hinders both pedestrian and vehicular access.

CONTEXT OF DEVELOPMENT

MacArthur Square still commands a prime location amidst a large number of recent and ongoing redevelopment projects. A re-envisioned MacArthur Square could provide a crucial link to many surrounding activities that energize the downtown include the Milwaukee Area Technical College, the Milwaukee Public Museum, the State Office Building, the surrounding concentration and entertainment venues, and even Marquette University, and the new redevelopments of the Park East and Pabst Brewery sites. Furthermore, MacArthur Square abuts 6th Street, which is the primary north-south connection to the countless redevelopment projects in the Menomonee Valley, located six blocks to the south.

An overview of recent redevelopment in the MacArthur Square vicinity follows, numbers are keyed to the adjacent Land Use and Development Map:

Top Left: View looking west on Kilbourn toward the Milwaukee County Courthouse in the 1930’s, prior to the clearance of buildings to create the civic center’s open space.

Middle Left: View from corner of 6th and Kilbourn looking west toward courthouse. The severe level change beyond creates a visual barrier to the square beyond.

Bottom Left: View looking east on Kilbourn from MacArthur Square. While still visible, City Hall is no longer the dominant terminal feature at the east end of Kilbourn.

View of entry to the underground portion of 9th Street as it passes in front of the Milwaukee County Courthouse. This layering of the street network and the plaza hinders both pedestrian and vehicular access.
**Development Legend**

1. MacArthur Square: outlined in dashed yellow line
2. ‘The Brewery’ redevelopment: one block north of MacArthur Square, on the former Pabst Brewery site. Pabst operated the brewery from 1844 until 1996. Many of the historic brewery buildings are being renovated for new uses. Redevelopment includes residential, office, and retail in 1.3 million square feet of space on 20 acres of land. Phase One construction, remediation, and renovation are currently in progress. ‘The Brewery’ is a LEED for Neighborhood Development pilot project.
3. Park East redevelopment: the Park East Freeway was a one mile stretch of elevated freeway which was stopped when local opposition halted the completion of the Milwaukee freeway system in the 1970’s. Approval to remove the freeway spur was granted in 1999, with demolition beginning in 2002. Demolition of the Park East Freeway has opened 24 acres for redevelopment, two blocks north of MacArthur Square. Numerous projects have been completed, or have been approved for the site. Other parcels await future redevelopment.
5. Milwaukee Intermodal Station: home to Milwaukee’s Amtrak and intercity bus service. A $16 million renovation, completed in 2007, turned the existing 1960’s era eyesore into a modern structure.
6. Midwest Airlines Convention Center: completed in 1998 and home to over 188,000 square feet of exhibition space, plus a 37,000 square foot ballroom.
7. Marquette University: portions of campus located across I-43 from MacArthur Square, extending to the west. Recent or ongoing projects include the new Eckstein Hall for the law school, the $16 million 2040 Lofts dorm expansion, and an addition to the Ambassador Hotel. New engineering facilities are also currently under development.
8. Menomonee Valley redevelopment: the Harley-Davidson Museum, located six blocks south of MacArthur Square at Sixth and Canal, was completed in 2008. A two-year expansion project was completed at the Casino in 2008. The Sixth Street Viaduct, was rebuilt in 2002 providing and effective gateway to the Menomonee Valley. The 1,200 acre Menomonee Valley is undergoing numerous sustainable and job-producing redevelopment projects.
10. Martin Luther King Drive redevelopment: 1990’s redevelopment of the former Schlitz Brewery into an office park is among the factors that spurred the revitalization of King Drive. King Drive has seen 25 new businesses and over $100 million in redevelopment over the past 3 years.
11. Bradley Center: the home of the NBA Bucks and Marquette basketball teams and other events, was completed in 1988. Although the facility lacks some of the features needed to remain a viable NBA venue, it has brought a many valuable entertainment activities into the downtown.
12. Milwaukee Riverwalk: initiative launched in 1988, the Riverwalk now encompasses three miles of pedestrian walkways along the river, downtown and in the Third Ward. Since the Riverwalk’s inception, the Milwaukee River has become a focus for numerous redevelopment efforts.

Two proposed developments at the Park East site; at left is the Palomar, which includes 63 condos and a 175 room hotel; at right is the Moderne, which includes high end residential units and retail. Source: Milwaukee Dept. of City Development

Harley-Davidson Museum, located six blocks south of MacArthur Square on 6th Street in the Menomonee Valley. Source: About.com

Rendering of ‘The Brewery,’ the proposed development at the former Pabst Brewery site. Source: Zilber Development
CONTEXT OF CIVIC INSTITUTIONS
City Beautiful era civic centers typically gathered together a group of public buildings. These agglomerations were seen to have a number of benefits, not the least of which was efficiencies in shared infrastructure such as heating plants. Today the shared infrastructure includes parking and access to transit. Finally, the groupings were intended to offer convenience to citizens while also inspiring them view their community with greater pride and appreciation for civic life.

Due to its City Beautiful heritage, it is not surprising that MacArthur Square is occupied and surrounded by several public and quasi-public institutions. These institutions include Milwaukee County, the City of Milwaukee, the State of Wisconsin, the Wisconsin Center Convention facilities, the Bradley Center, the Milwaukee Area Technical College (MATC), and Marquette University.

MacArthur Square itself is shared by the City and County of Milwaukee, and the State of Wisconsin. County buildings on the site include the Milwaukee County Courthouse, the Public Safety Building, the Milwaukee County Jail, and the Milwaukee Public Museum. The City of Milwaukee contributes the Police Headquarters building, while the State of Wisconsin has placed an office building on the site. The City of Milwaukee also operates and maintains the three-level underground parking garage below the square and the associated rooftop open space.

Each of the institutions will have a stake in the future redevelopment of MacArthur Square. However, one of the contributing factors in the failure of the square is the failure to treat the collective institutional activities as more than just the sum of the parts. The Library’s front facade is on Wisconsin Avenue and the rear facade facing the square seems less appealing. The front of the Museum, by necessity, has long been oriented to Wells Street. Access to the City, County, and State buildings is limited to typical office hours in most cases, leaving the garage and the open spaces above relatively desolate at other hours of the day and night. Nothing encourages multiple use of the activities. There are no significant outdoor activities to build linkages and create memorable associations among places and cultural experiences. Future redevelopment of the square should engender a mix of uses that attracts users with more frequency and at a variety of times during the day.

Stakeholder Map
1. Milwaukee County
   1A: Milwaukee County Courthouse
   1B: Milwaukee County Jail
   1C: Public Safety Building
   1D: Parking Lot
   1E: Milwaukee Public Museum
   1F: Open Space
2. City of Milwaukee
   2A: Police Headquarters
   2B: Open Space with underground parking below
   2C: Milwaukee Public Library
3. State of Wisconsin Office Building
4. Wisconsin Center
   4A: Midwest Airlines Center
   4B: Milwaukee Auditorium
   4C: Milwaukee Arena
5. Bradley Center
6. Milwaukee Area Technical College (MATC)
7. Marquette University
OVERVIEW

This plan proposed is to bring MacArthur Square back into the life of the city through improvements in access, changes in the character and configuration of open space and through fostering a more diverse mix of uses both in MacArthur Square itself and within the district as a whole. The square in its current state is a kind of “black hole” of urban dysfunction set in the midst of several adjacent redeveloping city districts. In addition, the historic role of the square as a proud embodiment of the community needs reassertion. To that end, several major concepts underlie the plan:

- Restore Kilbourn as a Grand Boulevard
- Reconnect the street grid
- Bring new activities to the civic center
- Expand and use the parking structure as an economic asset
- Reconfigure and activate public places
- Provide enhanced development opportunities
- Improve functionality and access to existing uses

The functional foundation of the plan is the complete renovation of the parking structure to both allow for more parking and provide for future development activities on top of the structure. The parking structure would also be reconfigured and expanded one block east to 6th Street.

In addition a series of improvements to the circulation infrastructure provide the armature for new public places. The creation of street ramps, bringing Kilbourn Avenue up to the Courthouse, represents the primary street improvement that will restore activity to the civic
MacArthur Square Improvement Summary

1. Reconfigured MacArthur Square
2. Four formal gardens (parterres) surround square
3. New ramps access Upper Kilbourn from Lower Kilbourn and 6th Street
4. I-43 access tunnels at Kilbourn and 6th Street remain
5. 8th Street extended to the square
6. 9th Street raised to grade of the square
7. New parking structure ramps on James Lovell Street
8. Angle parking added to Upper Kilbourn for Ground-level retail
9. Courthouse terminates Kilbourn Avenue and anchors the square

Building Development
A. New building developed over parking structure
B. New building developed on perimeter of parking structure
C. Renovation/redevelopment of existing building
D. Courtyard to be designed by adjacent building's architect
center. Kilbourn Boulevard would thus extend westward across the top of the parking structure to terminate in a newly-configured public square just east of the courthouse building. The structure would be designed to accommodate future buildings sites as shown in a red/brown color on the plan. Internally the parking structure would be renovated to provide for service access at the second level with a series of entrances and exits dispersed throughout the structure interior. The freeway access ramps would continue to extend through the structure, although in slightly different trajectories as they pass through the various levels.

**PLAN GOALS**

**Restore Kilbourn as a Grand Boulevard**

While Wisconsin Avenue has been seen as the commercial “Main Street” of Milwaukee, Kilbourn has an equally important and symbolic role as the “Civic” street, linking several municipal buildings, parks and civic plazas to the lakefront. MacArthur Square was envisioned as the western terminus of this civic axis, with the termination point occurring symmetrically on the courthouse east colonnade.

With the addition of the parking structure, freeway access ramps, level changes and other modifications, Kilbourn was severed from the square. A key component of the redevelopment plan is to restore Kilbourn as a grand boulevard by physically extending the street, including vehicular and pedestrian access, westward from the 6th Street intersection up to the Courthouse beginning with paired street ramps bridging over 6th Street. This extended boulevard can create an activated street, bringing vehicles and pedestrians around the new square and up to the front of the Courthouse. These ramps are envisioned as major landmarks designed to visually link the square to the district. Access to the freeway entrance/exit lanes would be provided underneath the ramps, in locations almost identical to their current configuration.

As Kilbourn extends westward from 6th, it would continue as a surface street on top of the parking garage, with ample street parking and wide sidewalks to accommodate sidewalk cafes and other pedestrian-friendly activities. This new street — Upper Kilbourn — would intersect extensions of 7th Street and 8th Street, before bordering the new square and intersecting 9th Street as it parallels the Courthouse steps.

The existing Kilbourn Boulevard, between 6th Street and the Milwaukee River is a wide thoroughfare with a small central median and three lanes of traffic moving in each direction with additional parking lanes to the sides of the street. The redevelopment plan calls for reconfiguring this segment of Kilbourn to integrate with the new access ramps to MacArthur Square. The central median would be replaced by two lanes of traffic moving in each direction. Smaller medians would then buffer two “access frontage lanes” consisting of a one way service and parking lanes directly along the curb. These frontage lanes would provide immediate access to the Auditorium, Arena, future Midwest Center expansion, and other businesses along Kilbourn. Service lanes can be closed for staging areas if necessary. Other communities have used this type of boulevard in urban areas. A coordinated streetscape palette should be established for new and existing segments of Kilbourn that visually integrates entire corridor, similar to the original civic center intent.

**Precedent: Grand Central Station**

Grand Central Station Utilizes a similar ramping system to move traffic on Park Avenue up to the Station’s grade. Traffic flows around the terminal in a one-way loop that provides local access; Park Avenue reconnects on the far side of the station. In MacArthur Square’s concept, an active outdoor space replaces the station’s grand indoor space.
The redevelopment plan proposes to add a series of uses to the existing cultural and institutional activities currently found within the district. The plan outlines a series of development parcels along the newly-extended Kilbourn Boulevard (and in other locations) which include opportunities for both (a) expansion of existing institutions and (b) private sector development for residential and commercial use. Incremental infill development would increase density and create a synergy of uses to activate the Square and its environs. Existing facilities such as the Public Museum would be able to open up a new “front door” onto Kilbourn.
**Improve Functionality and Access to Existing Uses**

While it creates many problems, the existing parking structure does provide a valuable resource that cannot easily be removed or replaced. In fact, the renovation of the MacArthur Square parking structure offers an opportunity to improve service and drop-off access for existing and proposed buildings. The redevelopment plan calls for a service and transit access within the structure (“lower” Kilbourn), directly below the new “upper” Kilbourn Boulevard. New buildings may have service docks under the street in a manner similar to portions of downtown Chicago that have service access from a lower level network of streets, parking, and access drives. For the Museum, this same zone could allow for a bus drop off area to help alleviate bus congestion that can occur along Wells Street. The ceiling height in this zone is expected to allow for higher access from alower level network of streets, parking, and development of new buildings as art of a long term redevelopment concept.

**Provide Enhanced Development Opportunities**

The introduction of private sector development to the MacArthur Square district offers the opportunity to diversify uses and activities while generate tax revenues to help offset the costs of public investments. There could also be opportunities for some of the current institutional users to partner with developers for projects. The plan includes scenarios for phasing and development of new buildings as art of a long term redevelopment concept.

**City Beautiful Civic Centers:**

**Present Day Critiques**

Many cities today contain either complete or remnant examples of City Beautiful urban compositions. While many still ennable their communities and serve as effective settings for institutional administration, the degree to which these civic centers have kept pace with the needs and aspirations of present day urban communities has been subject to speculation and discussion.

**Disconnected From the Public Space Network**

Most City Beautiful civic centers were conceived as part a larger-scale series of public places including waterfronts, boulevards, other neighborhood centers and parklands. The civic center was to serve as the culmination of this network, reinforcing the center as the premier public gathering place in the city. However, in many instances, cities did not construct the interconnected system and the result has been that the civic center has become isolated from vital activities and day-to-day street life.

**Serve as Destinations Yet Lack Day-to-day Use**

Many City Beautiful centers are seen as gathering places for large civic gatherings such as political rallies, demonstrations, large festivals or assemblies, and other symbolic events. What is often missing is a vital everyday street life consisting of shopping, strolling, and pedestrian gathering. The sense of isolation and disconnection, discussed previously, only exacerbates the situation.

**Comprised of a Single Use (Institutional)**

When they were originally planned, City Beautiful centers were most often seen as representing the power and good of government or other institutions. Uses were and in many cases still are, primarily institutional meaning that the public sidewalks and public places are largely devoid of activity after 5:00 p.m.

**Sized Too Large and Overly-monumental**

In many cases public buildings and plazas were sized and scaled to represent the grandeur of the ideals behind the City Beautiful movement resulting in gigantic open spaces that seem empty unless accommodating an event that draws large crowds. While some City Beautiful spaces were broken down into smaller sub-spaces that allowed more intimate settings, many more retain an overly-monumental character.

**Developed Without Supporting “Fabric” of Background Buildings**

When originally designed civic centers in the City Beautiful tradition were seen as “object” buildings or spaces set within a consistent background of “fabric” buildings. In this sense the centers had a “supporting cast” of carefully designed in a harmonious manner, with controlled heights and architectural styles that were the same or complementary to the architecture of the civic center itself. This harmony would help integrate the center into the city as a whole. However, in most instances the uniform background buildings did not materialize causing most centers to stand out as anomalies within the city fabric.

**Require a High Level of Maintenance/repair**

City Beautiful civic center architectural styles consisted of a variety of classical motifs and often featured a profusion of ornament. While buildings were usually constructed with high quality compared to today’s standards for public buildings this kind of architectural detail can be expensive to maintain and repair. Deferred maintenance or poorly-done renovations can not only mar the architectural integrity of the building or public space but also stain municipal budgets.
Reconfigure and Activate Public Places

As they exist currently, the open spaces of MacArthur Square are fragmented, unattractive, and desolate. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that pedestrian access is limited and difficult from adjoining neighborhoods. Most of the uses surrounding the open space turn their backs or do not have direct entries onto the plaza. The open space is quite large but not well defined as recognizable “outdoor rooms” which feel comfortable to the user.

As noted previously, critiques of the City Beautiful movement emphasize the monumentality of the open spaces and lack of connectivity to surrounding areas. Many planners and designers have offered solutions to these dilemmas. Camillo Sitte’s work represents a particularly salient approach to this set of problems. Sitte’s writings and urban design work, contemporaneous to the City Beautiful movement, form the basis for some of the concepts embodied in this plan. Specifically, this plan proposes reducing the size of the square substantially, creating a sequence of public places, and using Kilbourn as a primary visual axis creating places for more intimate day-to-day activities for pedestrians. The proposed plaza space is concentrated directly in front of the courthouse building and is about the size of a typical Milwaukee city block (roughly the size of Cathedral Square Park.) Infill development around the Square will help define the space as an outdoor room. New buildings or additions around the Square will be encouraged to have entrances directly onto the plaza when possible and retail uses along the ground floor perimeter of the Square.

The design of the Square itself reflects a twofold objective of accommodating both major social events in a large central plaza while four smaller garden spaces (akin to formal “parterres”) along the perimeter offer more intimate places for pedestrian seating, cafes, vendor carts or kiosks, or smaller gathering spaces that can be customized to reflect their immediate surroundings. The plan also calls for the reinstallation of the grand flight of exterior stairs extending out from the front of the courthouse, a feature that was removed when the parking structure was built. These stairs, if generously proportioned, could become another pedestrian gathering area, in a manner similar to the steps in front of the Art Institute in Chicago or the Metropolitan Museum in New York City.

The redesigned square is not the only public space proposed in the redevelopment plan. The extension of Kilbourn Boulevard from 6th Street westward to the MacArthur Square Plaza is envisioned not just as a traffic corridor but as an activated street, with wide terraces along the sides to accommodate landscape, seating areas, and access stairways into the parking structure below. Buildings fronting the new street would have retail spaces along the street edge to encourage pedestrian use. Kilbourn would thus become an active public place, connecting the MacArthur Square plaza to the entertainment facilities (Auditorium, Arena, Bradley Center, Midwest Center) just to the east of the district.

Rewrite the Civic Center

When taken together these redevelopment concepts work to transform MacArthur Square into a full-fledged lively urban district that not only is a destination attraction but also fosters day-to-day use and enjoyment for those that live and work within the MacArthur Square district and surrounding city neighborhoods. The beneficial effects of the MacArthur Square redevelopment will reinforce other development efforts occurring in the immediate vicinity including The Brewery development, Marquette University, Park East, the sports/entertainment/convention venues, and Westown as a whole. By integrating MacArthur Square into the fabric of the downtown, a City Beautiful artifact can become a more vital urban place while maintaining its historic role as an important civic icon.
5. THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - MILWAUKEE AND THE MILWAUKEE DESIGN COMMUNITY

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - MILWAUKEE

Students, faculty, and alumni of the School of Architecture and Urban Planning at the University of Wisconsin Milwaukee (UWM) have played a leadership role in many of the community’s major planning, urban design, and architectural projects. This project is no exception. Over the last decades major downtown development projects have been the focus of student projects as well as award-winning work by practitioners who are faculty and alumni of UWM. In this project, all three groups have played a role.

Franz Heizer, a graduate student in UWM’s joint Architecture and Urban Planning Masters Degree Program undertook several studies and projects related to MacArthur Square. Specifically he worked with faculty member Larry Witzling in an independent studies course and later in his thesis project to examine the current and historical conditions of the site, past precedents and theories that might offer solutions, and a detailed look at the City Beautiful movement. Several of his drawings and diagrams are included in this document (as noted) as well as some of his thesis drawings are included at the end of this chapter.

THE MILWAUKEE DESIGN COMMUNITY AND THE MACARTHUR SQUARE DESIGN CHARETTE

Another key aspect of the overall community design process was the organization and implementation of a design charette under the guidance of UWM and Planning and Design Institute (now PDI/Graef). This design charette was limited to local designers, affiliated with UWM, who had shown both insight and interest in downtown redevelopment.

The intent of the charette was to examine the relationship between an overall plan concept that followed some of the traditional urban design principles of the City Beautiful movement, and the opportunities to create civic architecture with contemporaneous and diverse styles representing different architectural attitudes. The nine firms are listed in alphabetical order on the facing page. One page is devoted to each entry.

Planning and Design Institute prepared the redevelopment plan, prior to the charette, as a basis for collective action. Each firm was given a specific site within the redevelopment plan and was asked to prepare an architectural and programmatic vision for the site. Firms received their sites previous to the charette event and were able to spend several weeks working on an individual concepts.

On the day of the charette, each firm displayed and presented their initial schemes and spent the rest of the day in workshop format with other firms to discuss and revise the concepts. Following the charette each firm had several weeks to refine their designs based upon the input received in the charette. The final designs were gathered together and displayed at several exhibitions and events in order to help publicize the project.

As part of the submittal requirements the participants were required to submit a three-dimensional computer model of their proposal. PDI/Graef integrated these individual models into one master drawing that incorporated all schemes to created an overall animated vision for the project. From this model a series of illustrations were created highlighting key views of the revamped MacArthur Square. These illustrations are included at the end of this chapter.
Renewing the City Beautiful: MacArthur Square

Franz Heizer’s thesis explored several key design issues integrating principles of the City Beautiful movement and other urban design theories regarding public places, circulation, and planning policies. These illustrations are excerpted from that thesis and show a unified architectural vision for all of the new buildings.
Development Options by the Following Architectural Firms

The following redevelopment plan, as prepared by Planning and Design Institute (PDI/Graef), formed the basis for assigning each architect with a program and site. It was assumed that each block (or component of a block) would be developed by a different client with a different designer, each with a varied view of the architectural issues and their unique style, talent, and aesthetic sensibilities. This process was intended to simulate the diversity that might occur with a long term development process. The numbers corresponding to each architectural firm assigned to the specific block:

1. Arquitectura, Inc.
2. Zimmerman Architectural Studios, Inc.
3. LaDallman Architects, Inc.
4. Engberg Anderson Design Partnership, Inc.
5. Eppstein Uhen Architects (EUA)
6. Studio 1032
7. Hammel, Green, and Abrahamson, Inc. (HGA)
8. Kahler Slater
9. Johnsen Schmaling Architects
ARQUITECTURA, INC.

“Student Lawn” Dormitory
Hammel, Green, and Abrahamson, Inc. (HGA)
Flexible-Use Tower
Zimmerman Architectural Studios, Inc.

Mixed-use Building
Eppstein Uhen Architects (EUA)

Milwaukee Community Justice and Resource Facility
Engberg Anderson Design Partnership, Inc.
Milwaukee Public Museum Expansion
La Dallman Architects, Inc.

“MacArthur Square: Terrascape”

Theater/Recreation and Residential Building
KAHLER SLATER
“Urban Cultivation”
Residential Agricultural Market Building
Planning and Design Institute (PDI/Graef) developed an animation with each of the solutions prepared by the architects in the charrette. The illustration on this page, and the following two pages, were derived from that animation.
6. PARKING UTILIZATION STUDY

The MacArthur Square parking facility contains 1445 parking stalls on three levels, serving the Milwaukee County Courthouse, Milwaukee Public Museum, Milwaukee Police Department, Milwaukee Area Technical College and other downtown destinations. The parking utilization study estimates the number of parking stalls needed for current users and the potential supply of parking for new users.

The study, conducted between July and October 2008, utilized a field count of occupied parking stalls at different times of the day to determine garage occupancy levels. The study also sought to determine when peak parking demand was occurring and evaluate different parking needs occurring at different times.

Like most parking facilities, MacArthur Square offers hourly and monthly rates, as well as monthly reserve spaces. This study, however, did not address restricted use/reservation of stalls. That is, this study assumed a stall was either occupied or vacant. Any vacant stall, regardless of payment procedures, represents an opportunity for shared parking by different users. For example, a residential building and its high demand for night parking can share a block of parking reserved for an office during the day.

FIELD STUDY: SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The field study indicated the garage as a whole was significantly below capacity at all times surveyed. The busiest surveyed time was weekday mornings with the garage at a 59% occupancy rate or almost 600 available stalls. By the afternoon on weekdays, the garage occupancy dropped to 49% with over 700 stalls available. Weekend days the garage was largely vacant with occupancy levels of 12% and 14% respectively.

Sub-area Demand Analysis

In addition to the overall occupancy levels of the garage, sub-areas were analyzed to determine where the highest and lowest usage is and when it occurs. Parking was available in every sub-area on every visit. Average sub-area occupancy rates did not exceed 85% at any given time slot (that is, more than 15% of stalls where available). There was only one instance where a sub-area had an occupancy rate higher than 90%.

Demands did, however, vary substantially between the sub-areas within MacArthur Square. The varied demand seems due to the diversity of adjacent users and times in which those users are active.

Level 1

The next high demand subarea was Level 1. Level 1 is on the west end of the parking structure and is adjacent to and can directly access the courthouse. This sub-area's weekday morning and afternoon observed occupancy rates (79% and 65% nearly equal those of Level 2 east, however weekday evening and weekend day rates are dramatically lower at 5% and 7%. The Courthouse may be the only significant user of parking for this area and when the courthouse is not in session, parking demand disappears.

Level 2 East

The area with the highest and most consistent demand for parking was the east side of the second level. This area was highly used by the Milwaukee Police Department staff as well as Milwaukee Public Museum patrons. Both of these uses are accessed directly from this area. This sub-area also captures a substantial amount of the hourly parking users, since the garage's primary entry and exit are in this location. Observed occupancy rates for Level 2 East were 82% for weekday morning, 68% for weekday afternoon, 35% for weekday evening and 46% for weekend day.

Level 2 West

Level 2 West has reasonable demand during weekday mornings and afternoons. The observed occupancy rates of 54% and 48% are probably due to additional Courthouse demand but could also be due to overflow from the Museum and Police Department. Night and weekend rates are dramatically lower at 5% and 3%.

Level 3 East

Level 3 east is also consistently used during business days with morning and afternoon occupancy rates at 48%. This sub-area also has the second highest evening and weekend rates (behind Level 2 east) at 9% and 18%, which are probably due to the Police Department’s and its staff utilization of the garage.

Level 3 West

Level 3 west is the least utilized area of the garage. Even at peak times, its utilization rate only reaches 31% and drops as low as 2% on weekends. This could be because no users are directly accessed from this location and its perceived distance from the main entrance is high.

Diagram showing the location of parking sub-areas within the MacArthur Square Garage.
### Field Study: Detailed Information

PDI's parking field study counted vehicles present in the garage at various times on weekdays and weekends. Cars were counted by row, indicate both the degree and location of utilization. Counts were taken on weekday mornings (9:00-10:30 am), weekday afternoons (3:00-3:30 PM), weekday evenings (7:00-7:30 PM) and weekend days (Saturday 1:30-2:00). Week-day counts were taken three times and the weekend counts were taken twice. The accompanying charts represent the average utilization for each of the times. All weekday counts were taken between Tuesday and Thursdays at the suggestion of the City of Milwaukee.

The charts on the accompanying pages display utilization by aisle, sub-areas of the garage, and total garage. The bar charts show utilized stalls (green) and available stalls (red) for aisles, levels and the whole garage.

Weekday morning counts were taken on the following dates:
- June 26 - 9:00 AM
- August 28 - 9:00 AM
- September 25 - 10:30 AM

#### Weekday Morning Parking Utilization Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking sub-area</th>
<th>Occupied Stalls</th>
<th>Vacant Stalls</th>
<th>Utilization Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 West</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 East</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 West</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 East</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Total</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MacArthur Square - Existing Parking Analysis: Average Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking sub-area</th>
<th>Utilized Capacity</th>
<th>Available Capacity</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Garage Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking sub-area</th>
<th>Utilized Capacity</th>
<th>Available Capacity</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Side</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Side</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Weekday afternoon counts were taken on the following dates:
- June 24 - 3:00 PM
- August 28 - 3:00 PM
- September 25 - 3:30 PM
Weekday evening counts were taken on the following dates:

- June 25 - 7:00 PM
- August 28 - 7:00 PM
- October 7 - 7:30 PM

### MacArthur Square - Existing Parking Analysis: Average Utilization

#### Weekday Evening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking sub-area</th>
<th>Occupied Stalls</th>
<th>Vacant Stalls</th>
<th>Utilization Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 West</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 East</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 West</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 East</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Level 1
- Utilized: 14
- Available: 365

#### Level 2 East
- Utilized: 47
- Available: 468

#### Level 2 West
- Utilized: 16
- Available: 317

#### Level 3 East
- Utilized: 13
- Available: 312

#### Level 3 West
- Utilized: 16
- Available: 333

#### Level 3 Total
- Utilized: 13
- Available: 325

#### Level 1 Total
- Utilized: 119
- Available: 503

#### Garage Total
- Utilized: 180
- Available: 1265

#### Average Utilization - WEEKDAY EVENING

- Level 1 Total: 5%
- Level 2 Total: 35%
- Level 3 Total: 4%

#### Garage Total
- Utilized: 157
- Available: 509

#### North of Drive Axle
- Utilized: 119
- Available: 503
- Ratio: 21%

#### South of Drive Axle
- Utilized: 157
- Available: 509
Weekend day counts were taken on the following dates:
- June 28 - 2:00 PM
- October 4 - 1:30 PM
POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY
Following the parking utilization study, an estimate was prepared that detailed the quantity and type of development that could occur based on the existing utilization of the MacArthur Square parking facility. The model looked at vacancy during business days as an opportunity for additional office space and night/weekend as an opportunity for additional residential units to be developed.

After calculating excess stalls, an optimum occupancy ratio of 95% was applied to the garage. This reduction in programmed parking is intended to provide “flex” capacity between office and residential users as well as ensure parking is generally available at the structure. A garage that is full of residential and office users ceases to be of value to patrons of the Museum and other users.

Next, conservative parking requirement ratios were utilized to calculate additional office square footage and residential units. Office space utilized a 3.5 stalls per 1,000 sf and residential stalls utilized a 1.5 stalls per unit at night and .75 stalls per unit on the weekends. The existing residential capacity utilizes the lesser number of units calculated by using the above ratios. This step ensures existing weekend capacity, primarily utilized by the museum, would not be limited by future residential development. These calculations indicate the existing underutilized capacity in MacArthur Square could support an additional 150,000 sf of office and 800 residential units.

Potential taxable value was calculated from these numbers. At value rates of $150/sf for office and $200,000 per residential unit, the existing underutilized capacity in MacArthur Square could support and additional $180 million of new taxable value.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO THE PARKING STRUCTURE
The following recommendations were generated from the evaluation of current parking patterns within the MacArthur Square parking facility.

1. Require a Mixture of Uses
Mixed uses will help maximize parking utilization by providing users with different peak demand times. Residential development will increase evening and weekend demand while minimally impacting business day parking demands.

2. Distribute Future Building Locations
Existing parking demands where, not surprisingly, concentrated around access points to adjacent buildings and uses. Areas next to the Courthouse, Police Department, and the Museum experienced the highest and most consistent demands. Future buildings and their access points from the garage should be evenly distributed around the parking structure to spread demand throughout the facility.

3. Distribute Activities
In addition to distributing buildings, activities should be distributed to balance use of the garage during the day. If, for example, all the residential was located in the east and all office would be located in the west, there would be a perceived parking shortage as a result of all buildings having their peak demands at the same time.

4. Increase Access Points to the Garage
Parking areas furthest from the primary entrance and exits where often the least utilized. Increasing the number of vehicular access points will increase the ease of use of the garage, including speed of exiting, while also providing more balanced usage of the structure.

Increasing the number pedestrian surface access points might also help spur parking structure utilization by uses not immediately adjacent to the facility, such as the Public Library and State of Wisconsin office building.

MacArthur Square Parking Value Analysis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Condition</th>
<th>Existing MacArthur Square Capacity</th>
<th>Date From Field Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office Space Parking Ratio (SF/1000 sf)</td>
<td>Residential Space Ratio: Weekday (stalls/unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Excess Weekday stalls</td>
<td>Current Excess Weekday stalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optimum Occupancy Ratio</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential Space Ratio: (stalls/unit)</td>
<td>Residential Space Capacity: (sf)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>147,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office Space Parking Ratio (SF/1000 sf)</td>
<td>Office Space Value ($/sf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Office Space Capacity: (sf)**</td>
<td>147,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Residential Value Capacity</td>
<td>$22,157,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Total Value Capacity</td>
<td>$181,223,810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
* Office capacity is calculated by applying the office space parking ratio to excess weekday stalls
** Residential capacity is calculated by selecting the lesser of residential ratio calculations (weekend and night)

Potential Development Capacity
Following the parking utilization study, an estimate was prepared that detailed the quantity and type of development that could occur based on the existing utilization of the MacArthur Square parking facility. The model looked at vacancy during business days as an opportunity for additional office space and night/weekend as an opportunity for additional residential units to be developed.

After calculating excess stalls, an optimum occupancy ratio of 95% was applied to the garage. This reduction in programmed parking is intended to provide “flex” capacity between office and residential users as well as ensure parking is generally available at the structure. A garage that is full of residential and office users ceases to be of value to patrons of the Museum and other users.

Next, conservative parking requirement ratios were utilized to calculate additional office square footage and residential units. Office space utilized a 3.5 stalls per 1,000 sf and residential stalls utilized a 1.5 stalls per unit at night and .75 stalls per unit on the weekends. The existing residential capacity utilizes the lesser number of units calculated by using the above ratios. This step ensures existing weekend capacity, primarily utilized by the museum, would not be limited by future residential development. These calculations indicate the existing underutilized capacity in MacArthur Square could support an additional 150,000 sf of office and 800 residential units.

Potential taxable value was calculated from these numbers. At value rates of $150/sf for office and $200,000 per residential unit, the existing underutilized capacity in MacArthur Square could support and additional $180 million of new taxable value.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO THE PARKING STRUCTURE
The following recommendations were generated from the evaluation of current parking patterns within the MacArthur Square parking facility.

1. Require a Mixture of Uses
   Mixed uses will help maximize parking utilization by providing users with different peak demand times. Residential development will increase evening and weekend demand while minimally impacting business day parking demands.

2. Distribute Future Building Locations
   Existing parking demands where, not surprisingly, concentrated around access points to adjacent buildings and uses. Areas next to the Courthouse, Police Department, and the Museum experienced the highest and most consistent demands. Future buildings and their access points from the garage should be evenly distributed around the parking structure to spread demand throughout the facility.

3. Distribute Activities
   In addition to distributing buildings, activities should be distributed to balance use of the garage during the day. If, for example, all the residential was located in the east and all office would be located in the west, there would be a perceived parking shortage as a result of all buildings having their peak demands at the same time.

4. Increase Access Points to the Garage
   Parking areas furthest from the primary entrance and exits where often the least utilized. Increasing the number of vehicular access points will increase the ease of use of the garage, including speed of exiting, while also providing more balanced usage of the structure.

Increasing the number pedestrian surface access points might also help spur parking structure utilization by uses not immediately adjacent to the facility, such as the Public Library and State of Wisconsin office building.
The existing MacArthur Square parking structure, constructed in the late 1960’s, consists of three levels and contains approximately 1500 parking stalls. Major entrance points are located along 7th Street, with additional entrances from 9th Street as well as an exit and entrance from the I-43 access ramps that extend through the structure. An internal ramp connects the three levels vertically.

The following pages present a conceptual revised and expanded layout of the MacArthur Square garage based upon the redevelopment plan. The left side image is that of the existing structure. The right hand image is the proposed plan. Each level of the structure is presented separately. The proposed garage plan includes an optional fourth level of parking, which would involve adding a level of parking below that of the lowest level of the current structure. The parking totals are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level one</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level two</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>1255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level three</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>1305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level four (optional)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1445</td>
<td>4242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed plans are conceptual and must undergo a thorough process of design study and technical analysis in order to determine functional adequacy, cost, and the ultimate parking yield.
**Existing Level One**

**Entrances**
On 9th Street (south end)

**Exits**
On 9th street (north end)

**Notes**
- Connections to level 2 and 3 by ramp, located on the east side of the parking structure.
Proposed Level One

**Entrances**
On 9th Street (North and South end)

**Exits**
On 9th Street (north and south end)

**Notes**
- Connections to level 2 and 3 by ramp, located on the center of the parking structure.
- Level 2 service corridor atrium is viewed on the east side.
Existing Level Two

Entrance
On 7th Street (North end)

Exit
On 7th Street (south end)

Notes
- Connections to level 2 and 3 by ramp, located in the center of the parking structure.
- Police parking is separate from public parking structure.
Proposed Level Two

**Entrances**
- On 7th Street (North end)
- On 6th street (ramp)

**Exits**
- On 7th street (south end)
- On 6th street (ramp)

**Notes**
- Connections to level 2 and 3 by ramp, located on the west side of the parking structure.
- Service corridor in the center of the structure allows for buses, semi-trailers, and trucks easy access for deliveries.
- Police parking remains separate from public parking structure.
- Interstate tunnels extended to 6th street.
**Existing Level Three**

**Entrances**
On 7th Street (North end)

**Exits**
on 7th street (south end)

**Notes**
- Connections to level 2 and 3 by ramp, located in the center of the parking structure.
- Police parking is separate from public parking structure.
- Interstate tunnels appear on 7th street and are accessible on 6th street.
Proposed Level Three

Entrances
On 6th Street
From interstate tunnel

Exits
on 6th street (north and south ends)
Inner-structure ramp to level 2

Notes
• Connections to level 2 and 3 by ramp, located on the west side of the parking structure.
• Police parking remains separate from public parking structure.
• Interstate tunnels extended to 6th street.
Proposed Level Four (Optional)

Entrances
Inner-structure ramp on level 3

Exits
inner-structure ramp to level 3

Notes
- This level is proposed below level 3 and does not currently exist.
- Connections to level 2 and 3 by ramp, located on the west side of the parking structure.
- Police parking includes another level and remains separate from public parking structure.
Interstate Tunnel Slope Calculations

Notes
• The interstate tunnels have the same slope of the existing tunnels (a-d).
• The tunnels were extended (d-f) in order to allow more structured parking between 6th and 7th streets.
• At d, the tunnels have no slope gradient in order to allow circulation on level 3. Then the tunnels return to 6th street level.
Proposed East - West Section

Notes:

Proposed North - south section

Notes:
8. PHASING AND FINANCING CONCEPTS

Successful plan implementation will require detailed phasing and financing strategies. Given the recent decline in the economy, initiation of this project may seem questionable. However, public investment in this type of infrastructure — linked directly to sustainable urban growth — may be considered a prime candidate for implementation. Several questions need to be resolved in order to view this project as a primary candidate for current investment.

MARKET CONTEXT

The City of Milwaukee hired SB Friedman to conduct a market study of the downtown area. The market study, completed in June of 2007, investigated the feasibility of residential (rental and condominium), retail and office uses. Much has changed in terms of the economy and market since this report was released, however it does provide a look at development trends in the downtown.

Residential: Condominium

The study indicated for-sale residential units will likely be the major development type in the downtown in the near future. According to the study, condominium development is the most valuable property type on a per square foot basis and has generally been feasible without City financial assistance. The prices of units have also shown to be high enough to allow developers to construct structured parking without financial difficulty. The report indicated that the current absorption for condominiums in the downtown area was approximately 360 units per year, with a current supply of 220 units on the market (seven month supply). This last finding is especially critical — even if the economic parameters of condominium projects are changing, the underlying demand represents a market opportunity that should unfold in the next few years.

Residential: Rental

Downtown market-rate rental apartments have shown high occupancy rates, averaging 97% occupancy among the properties surveyed. This high occupancy rate would suggest strong demand for new rental space, however, current rents are likely cost prohibitive. The current rents produce a building value of approximately $154 per square foot. This is well below the condominium average sales value per square foot, which ranges between $250 and $350.

Successful development of rental properties has been achieved through various federal tax credit programs. Low income tax credits have provided the necessary subsidies to make projects feasible. The project are typically a mix of subsidized units and market rate units for the duration of the tax credit program life. Here too, changes in economic parameters may not diminish the underlying demand which should resurface as economic conditions stabilize.

Commercial: Office

In conjunction with recent office development, the downtown market has absorbed some of the new space, but the vacancy rate has increased due to the unabsorbed new space. The development of new office space has generally occurred only when a major office tenant has been attracted from outside downtown or from another downtown building. The report did indicate one of the factors limiting downtown development was the cost of parking, something which could be addressed through the MacArthur Square redevelopment.

In addition, there may be market forces impacting MacArthur Square that are not present in other parts of the downtown. For example, office buildings catering to law offices and legal services may be easier to develop and a standard office building, given the proximity to the courthouse.

Commercial: Retail

The study indicated that ground floor retail, as a component of a larger development, was generally feasible. It indicated spaces between 10,000 square feet and 25,000 square feet would cater toward neighborhood oriented retail and not compete with other retail found within the downtown. Spaces and tenants larger than 25,000 square feet often prove to not be financially feasible as a result of the high costs of structured parking.

Entertainment and Hospitality

Although not discussed in the SB Friedman report, there may be a market for a hotel in the area around MacArthur Square. Three projects in the downtown area have been recently competed or are currently under development which have at least a hotel component. However, none of the projects are located to capture substantial amounts of business associated with the convention center, the Bradley Center and the U.S. Cellular arena events. These venues also create a large demand for restaurants in the area, which could be accommodated in a hotel. The large amount of available, weather-protected, nighttime parking also supports the creation of hospitality and entertainment uses.

Institutional

MacArthur Square is a opportunity for expansion of nearby institutions. These educational institutions face challenges when expanding in an urbanized area. The scarcity of large tracts of land adjacent to the institutions is a common problem. MacArthur Square can provide land for institutional growth in a attractive location for the Milwaukee Area Technical College (MATC) and perhaps Marquette University. In particular, student housing across a range of economic categories might be viable for both institutions. Some student housing includes privately-owned apartments or affordable
condominiums that are marketed towards students. The MATC downtown campus, just off the square, currently does not offer any student housing or athletic facilities. Such facilities could be accommodated as well as additional class space or staff offices.

Additional possibilities exist for expansion space for the University of Wisconsin Milwaukee. While UWM’s facilities are generally located on its Eastside campus, it has begun to expand outside its main campus. The University’s new School of Public Health is currently proposed as part of the former Pabst Brewery site redevelopment. This proximity could also create additional residential demand in the area.

**Catalysts**

It is difficult to make recommendations on the best opportunities for initial development. Clearly the initiation of the parking structure itself will serve as a major catalyst. At the same time, projects which take advantage of low-cost evening parking, the need for institutional growth, and the proximity to other uses should all be considered higher priorities. Various forms of incentives might be considered such as sale/leaseback programs for public buildings with private developers. The incorporation of student housing into projects might also help spur development.

**MULTIPLE PHASING OPTIONS**

With market and economic factors in mind the development model was established with three relatively independent phases. While these phases are arranged in a potential chronological order they can, however, be rearranged as opportunities occur.

Peripheral Phase: this consists of development on parcels on the periphery of the civic center that do not directly impact the garage.

West Phase: this consists of the west part of the parking structure followed by development adjacent to the improved garage areas.

East Phase: this includes the east half of the garage, including its expansion to 6th street, the ramps from Kilbourn Avenue, and redevelopment of structures currently abutting this part of the garage.

A development scenario will be discussed on the following pages. The table below summarizes the development by phase.

### Phase Summary

| Phase       | Peripheral Phase | West Phase     | East Phase
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>80,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>38,400</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>479,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>144,000</td>
<td>69,600</td>
<td>59,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IV</td>
<td>62,400</td>
<td>62,400</td>
<td>77,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase V</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77,700</td>
<td>1,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>324,000</td>
<td>176,000</td>
<td>972,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Parking Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Night</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>543</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Value</td>
<td>$48,600,000</td>
<td>$26,400,000</td>
<td>$145,867,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peripheral Phase**

As mentioned previously, this phase of the MacArthur Square redevelopment is targeted to parcels that do not directly impact the garage reconstruction. Peripheral development could occur over an extended period, depending on development in other areas of the downtown, especially in the largely vacant Park East corridor. While these parcels are not currently connected to the garage, there is potential for them to be connected to the redeveloped garage, and they should be designed accordingly. There are three development areas in this phase:

- Block 1 (between 10th Street and I-43)
- Block 2 (south of the courthouse between 9th and 10th Streets)
- Northern half of Block 6 (South side of State Street between 6th and James Lovell Streets)

Additionally, block 3 and the southern half of Block 7 (Renovation/Redevelopment of the State Office Building) could be included in this phase. This could allow future direct access to the garage. Block 8, the future expansion of the convention center, is also shown in this phase.
**West Phase**

This Phase includes reconstruction of the west half of the existing garage structure. This work would include adding entries and exists off 9th Street, which will increase the ease of use of the garage, and serve as the entry and exit during the construction of the east side. Re-orienting the circulation spine within the garage will also begin to take place in this phase.

Development during this phase should include block 3 (North side of Wells Street between the Museum and 9th Street if it has not already occurred. If block 3 is developed during this phase, any parking needed for the project could be located in a private underground area and accessed through a secured access point.

**East Phase**

This phase is the most active and complex. It meshes public construction of the garage, roadways and bridges with private construction of buildings above. This is the phase when the square will come together in its proposed form, being connected to the surrounding City and preparing for activity within. While most complex, it is also the most visible and might make the best catalyst.

Development would occur on the following areas:
- Block 4 (area immediately north of the Museum between James Lovell and 8th Street)
- Block 5 (area immediately south of the Police Administration Building between James Lovell and 8th Street)
- Southern half of Block 6 (North side of Kilbourn Avenue between 6th and James Lovell Streets)
- Northern half of Block 7 (South side of Kilbourn Avenue between 6th and James Lovell Streets)

The buildings on blocks 4 and 5 will be physically integrated with the garage, sharing a common structural system below the plaza. This may or may not be the condition for blocks 6 and 7 as well.
DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO

The following is a development scenario intended to illustrate a possible build-out of the square. It was generated based on the following assumptions and ideas:

- Respond to market demands and trends
- Create a development framework that attempts to utilize existing unused capacity in the garage as well as newly created capacity
- Employ a mixture of uses to create activity both day and night
- Mix primary uses throughout the garage to evenly distribute parking demand
- Scale development appropriately to utilize parking efficiently without a great surplus or shortage
- Create an active and inviting public space that contributes to the quality of life in Milwaukee

Block Descriptions

The map and brief descriptions on the following page detail the uses, scale and location of the proposed buildings. A more detailed chart with square footage, parking demands and potential values follow the descriptions.

Block 1
Block 1 contains two separate buildings, which together created a framed view of the Courthouse from the west. Building 1-N is a small, four-story office building intended to house law firms with a need for space abutting the Courthouse. Building 1-S is envisioned as student housing for Marquette University. The small size of the units is well suited to this especially narrow site. Neither building will have direct access to the garage but will be easily accessible by pedestrian routes.

Block 2
Block 2 contains two identical buildings along 9th and 10th Streets. These buildings house residential units with a retail area fronting Wells Street. Like block 1, these buildings are not directly connected to the garage, and because of this they are likely to be developed as rental units.

Block 3
Block 3 contains an eight story residential building with retail space fronting Wells Street. This building can be connected directly to the garage. These residential units are envisioned as owner occupied condominiums.

Block 4
Block four has two buildings: one overlooks the plaza from the corner of 8th and Kilbourn while the other fronts Kilbourn Avenue and extends south on James Lovell Street. Building 4-W might contain retail and/or restaurant uses on the ground floor, with 8 floors of condominiums above. Building 4-E is comprised of ground floor retail fronting Kilbourn with condominiums above. In the section fronting James Lovell, this building houses three levels of office space with rental residential units above.

Block 5
Block 5, much like block 4 has two buildings: one fronting the plaza and one along Kilbourn. The nine-story Building 5-W has ground floor retail with three levels of office before its five floors of condominiums. Building 5-E contains retail fronting Kilbourn with a mix of rental and condominium residential above.

Block 6
Block 6 is envisioned with three buildings, one on each of the southern corners and one fronting State Street. Building 6-N is intended to house office and educational space as well as student housing for MATC. Building 6-W has ground floor retail fronting Kilbourn with office on the remainder of the first two floors. Rental residential is located on the upper floors. Building 6-E is one of the two gateway towers at the corner of Kilbourn and 6th Streets. Its houses hotel space and condominiums in its twelve stories.

Block 7
Building 7-W is a mix of ground floor retail, office and rental residential on its upper floors. Building 7-E, one of the gateway towers, houses street level retail fronting Kilbourn with offices and condominiums in the remainder of its 12 stories.

Block 8
Block 8 will contain expansion space for the Midwest Center. This is envisioned as a long-term project and is not included in any development estimates.
Detailed Development Information

The chart below shows detailed information for future development within and surrounding MacArthur Square. Each building details its footprint, height, square footage, uses, and estimated value.

Parking needs were estimated by using a day/night parking demand analysis. Residential Condominium units, for example, need parking primarily at night and have an estimated demand of 1.5 parking stalls per unit. The demand will substantially be reduced during business days but not eliminated. This is due to residents who will leave their car in the garage during the day and use means of circulation such as transit, walking, biking, or carpooling. The day parking demand was estimated based on the current data in downtown Milwaukee\(^1\).

Retail parking needs was estimated in a similar fashion. It was assumed during business days, retail patrons would either utilize on-street parking, walk to the shops, or have already parked in the garage for other uses (such as office employees).

Development in this scenario includes nearly 1.5 million square feet in 13 different projects. Nearly one million square feet is to be developed as residential units, representing approximately 740 units. The remaining 500,000 square feet is split fairly evenly between street-level retail, office, and institutional uses.

Development value is estimated conservatively at $220 million and as a result of this future development, both day and night parking occupancy ratios have increased to over 80%.

\(^1\) Based on data from 2007 American Community Survey. Data indicated approximately 20% of residents living in the Downtown/East side area used means other than a single occupancy vehicle to travel to work. This ratio was increased to 25% for the analysis to extra margin of error.

---

### MacArthur Square Development Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Building Footprint</th>
<th>Building Height</th>
<th>Total SF</th>
<th>Street Level Retail</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Residential Condominium 1600 SF Units</th>
<th>Residential Rental 1000 SF Units</th>
<th>Institutional: Dormitory 120 SF Units</th>
<th>Institutional: Educational/Office</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>New Parking Demand</th>
<th>New Building Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 N</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>4 38,400</td>
<td>0 38,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$5,760,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 S</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>6 21,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$3,240,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>8 85,600</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>144,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$133,340,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21,600</td>
<td>8 176,000</td>
<td>21,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>$26,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 E</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>7 129,500</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>23,100</td>
<td>76,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>$19,425,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 W</td>
<td>10,950</td>
<td>9 87,750</td>
<td>10,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$13,162,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 E</td>
<td>26,400</td>
<td>7 177,600</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115,200</td>
<td>43,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>$26,640,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 W</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>9 75,600</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>37,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>$11,340,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 SE</td>
<td>16800</td>
<td>12 172,200</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>86,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77,700</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$25,830,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 SW</td>
<td>17,700</td>
<td>6 106,200</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>29,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77,700</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$15,930,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 NW</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>6 78,000</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>$11,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 NE</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>14 145,600</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>99,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>$21,840,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>41,722</td>
<td>117,950</td>
<td>176,600</td>
<td>350,800</td>
<td>69,600</td>
<td>62,400</td>
<td>77,700</td>
<td>1,473</td>
<td>$220,867,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Building Information</th>
<th>Street Level Retail</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Residential Condominium 1600 SF Units</th>
<th>Residential Rental 1000 SF Units</th>
<th>Institutional: Dormitory 120 SF Units</th>
<th>Institutional: Educational/Office</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>New Parking Demand</th>
<th>New Building Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block ID</td>
<td>Footprint</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Total SF</td>
<td>Street Level Retail</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Residential Condominium 1600 SF Units</td>
<td>Residential Rental 1000 SF Units</td>
<td>Institutional: Dormitory 120 SF Units</td>
<td>Institutional: Educational/Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 N</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>4 38,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$5,760,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 S</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>6 21,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$3,240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>8 85,600</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>144,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$133,340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>8 176,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>$26,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 E</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>7 129,500</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>23,100</td>
<td>76,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>$19,425,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 W</td>
<td>10,950</td>
<td>9 87,750</td>
<td>10,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$13,162,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 E</td>
<td>26,400</td>
<td>7 177,600</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115,200</td>
<td>43,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>$26,640,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 W</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>9 75,600</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>37,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>$11,340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 SE</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>12 172,200</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>86,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77,700</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$25,830,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 SW</td>
<td>17,700</td>
<td>6 106,200</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>29,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77,700</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$15,930,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 NW</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>6 78,000</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>$11,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 NE</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>14 145,600</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>99,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>$21,840,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>41,722</td>
<td>117,950</td>
<td>176,600</td>
<td>350,800</td>
<td>69,600</td>
<td>62,400</td>
<td>77,700</td>
<td>1,473</td>
<td>$220,867,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Res. Condo (per unit)</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Rental (per unit)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Dorm (per unit)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Future Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Future Usage</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Weekday Parking Usage (From Field Study)</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Weekday Occupancy Rate (From Field Study)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Weeknight Additional Capacity (Special Event)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Estimated Usage</td>
<td>2329</td>
<td>2456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Garage Capacity (Three Levels)</td>
<td>2873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Occupancy Rate</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Based on data from 2007 American Community Survey. Data indicated approximately 20% of residents living in the Downtown/East side area used means other than a single occupancy vehicle to travel to work. This ratio was increased to 25% for the analysis to extra margin of error.
9. NEXT STEPS

Downtown Milwaukee has enacted several catalytic redevelopment efforts during the past decade. These projects have improved the quality of life in the downtown, increased the tax base, added jobs, created a more vital public realm, and added to the economic health of the City of Milwaukee. MacArthur Square has the potential to become a major chapter in this progression.

In the vicinity of MacArthur Square, several redevelopment projects are currently underway including the Park East Corridor and The Brewery. As these projects are completed over the next several years MacArthur Square will be poised to become the next focus of development – but only if the process begins now.

The redevelopment of MacArthur Square requires a sequenced combination of public and private sector investments. This plan offers a strategy that allows multiple options for phasing and investment in response to market needs, financing, and other contingencies. At the same time, however, the compactness and intricate structural linkages within the site require detailed coordination throughout the process.

Early implementation of investment in this plan can create a catalytic effect that establishes momentum for the project as a whole. This plan offers a multifaceted rationale to begin the process of implementation. Following below is a list of potential action steps to continue plan implementation, not necessarily in order:

1. Preliminary Engineering Analysis/Cost Estimates
   - Verify technical parameters, phasing options, and compute preliminary costs
   - Investigate of Funding Sources
   - Establish options for project financing including TIFs, PILOTs, and infrastructure subsidies.

2. Preparation of MacArthur Square Civic Center Guidelines
   - Write a code to influence the form and function of the ultimate build out of development.
   - Establish programs and guidelines for integrated design of public places

3. Architectural and Engineering Design

4. Begin schematic design of first investment in parking structure and access ramps