

City of Fond du Lac
Frequently Asked Questions
Lakeside Park Master Plan Pavilion
Jordan Skiff, Director of Public Works
jskiff@fdl.wi.gov, 920-322-3472
November 23, 2016

Is a new pavilion facility a high priority in the Lakeside Park (LSP) Master Plan?

1. A second pavilion (“Hub”) could bring together many of the recommendations of the Lakeside Park Exploratory Committee (LPEC). This summary was presented to the City Council at its June 8, 2016, meeting: “This new facility is at the heart of the master plan because it brings into one structure so many goals identified in the LPEC process—a destination that becomes the dazzling centerpiece of Fond du Lac’s crown jewel; a modern facility to accommodate the many gatherings that the current pavilion hosts (and sometimes turns away); an appealing public space for displays of art, history, and nature; a large patio space and pier that lure visitors to the border where the park and water meet; and the potential for a partnering restaurant that would draw even more people to the park.”
2. The vision of what a Hub may bring to the Park varies for all of us, but some priorities could include the following:
 - a. *Providing more space like we have, but newer and larger.* The layout and features of the existing pavilion (Pav) are not ideal. The kitchen is dated, and must be shared by both parties if each half is rented. The west meeting space can be disrupted by the public or those in the east meeting space walking to the bathrooms. There is no air conditioning, and the heating is temperamental.
 - b. *Replacing a building that’s past its useful life.*
 - c. *Creating a visual or architectural “statement” along the water.* The display areas and open patio—as well as the beauty of the building itself—could be an important part of public amenities in the Park.
 - d. *Providing great quality space at a below-market price to would-be renters.* The Pav is heavily used. Over the two-year span between July 2014 and July 2016, the Pav was rented 412 times. Of course, most of these reservations are over the busy summer months, leading to weekends when the Pav is rented multiple times (and some customers are simply turned away). A second facility would allow us to accommodate more events.
 - e. *Creating space to house activities or services that either don’t exist or have no home, but would only if there was space for them.* Many people who would like to have a larger or fancier event at LSP do not have the right space to accommodate them.
3. The appearance of the Pav is dated. If there is no new facility in the coming years, we will likely recommend a major renovation of the existing Pav.

4. There has been a lot of interest in having a restaurant in LSP. The most feasible way to attract a restaurant is to make it a part of a Hub.

What elements should the Hub contain? It is intended to include meeting spaces, restrooms, an open common space that could be used for historical exhibits, art, and nature exhibits, and a small area for equipment rental, storage or retail sales. A large patio—with sections exclusive to the rented meeting spaces and other areas completely open to the public—would provide a link to the lake, to Promen Dr., and provide space for outdoor seating, food trucks, etc.

The Advisory Park Board (APB) recommended that the Hub be tentatively scheduled for 2019 (instead of 2018), and to move a splash pad into 2018 in its place. Has that recommendation been followed? Yes. That schedule has been reflected in the 2017 Capital Improvement Plan.

What are the pros and cons of the two primary options for the Hub's location?

1. The first option is the brainchild of Excel Engineering, and situates the Hub due north of where Main St. meets Promen Dr. This would offer a breathtaking view of a beautiful new building as people enter the Park's main entrance. The parking lot would be constructed on the opposite side of Promen, southwest of the Hub. A pier would extend into the lake due north of the Hub, and the new bike Loop would wrap around the west and north ends of the facility. This location would offer the following advantages:
 - a. Wow Factor: A gorgeous new facility will be a visitor's "welcome" to the park.
 - b. Central View: The N. Main site would be in a more visible and accessible location.
 - c. Second Pier: Although adding a second pier near the Hub would increase expense and maintenance, it would complement the current Fishermen's Pier to provide two places for boaters, fishers and sunset-watchers to enjoy Lake Winnebago. Boat docks would also be safer and more convenient than on Fishermen's Pier. And having two piers would minimize the conflict between boaters and fishers.
 - d. Pier Plan Feasible: A local contractor estimates that a removable pier—extending 160' into the lake—could be constructed for under \$100,000, and could be hauled in for the winter and returned to the lake in the spring for \$6,000/year.
 - e. Use Pav: The current Pav is still structurally sound, functional, and popular. It could be a "value" option for smaller groups, or if the Hub is booked. The current concessionaire is making great use of this space, and might have more options if a new Hub frees up the current Pav for indoor seating for him. Retaining the current building doesn't require the demolition costs of the second option.
 - f. Ample Space: The Hub could contain meeting space (and parking spaces) for 200 or 300 people. It may be challenging to fit a facility, parking lot and patio on the current Pav site without feeling crowded.
 - g. Amphitheater Option: While the current plan does not include the construction of an amphitheater (due to the staffing it would take to operate such a facility), if one was pursued in the future, it might be best to site it next to the Hub. This likely could not happen at the current Pav site.

2. The APB unanimously recommended to site the Hub on the footprint of the current Pav site. This location would offer the following advantages:
 - a. Floodplain: The N. Main site is in the flood fringe. While this wouldn't prevent placing a building there, the elevation would have to be raised, adding expense.
 - b. Fishermen's Pier: the current pier is permanent and "free." To construct a new Hub and potential restaurant right by it could be a great fit. Docks and stairs for transient boaters could be placed on the east side of the pier, where the water is relatively deep and is already dredged periodically.
 - c. Less Impact to Park Aesthetics: Using the footprint of the current facility and parking lot would have less impact on the amount of green space in the park, and the N. Main site would remain untouched. The size and quality of the trees lost to construction at the current Pav site would be less than at the N. Main site.
 - d. Maintenance: Obviously, the current Pav will continue to age and require more maintenance in future years, if it remains.

The APB also recommended that the Hub have seating for 300 people (in rooms of 200, 50 and 50 that could be combined), rather than the 200 people that were originally planned. What are the advantages and disadvantages of a 300-person facility?

Advantages:

1. Economy of Scale: If we're going to invest in a new facility, it makes sense to make it large enough to meet the needs of as many groups as possible.
2. Additional Events: Some weddings or other large events simply wouldn't fit in the Pav or a 200-person Hub.
3. Catering options for a potential restaurant would be heightened if the facility could hold more people.

Disadvantages

1. Expense: A project of this scope is already a budgeting challenge; a smaller building would cost an estimated \$1.3 million less.
2. Footprint: For a facility that can hold 200 people, an estimated area of 11,760 sf would be needed. (This includes the spaces for restrooms, retail/rental space, and an open exhibit area.) The parking lot to serve such a facility would require an estimated 20,000 sf (serving 70 vehicles). These numbers jump to 20,020 sf and 30,000 sf, respectively, for a 300-person facility. It should be noted that other parking options can be considered for the current Pav site, such as having as much parking as the site can comfortably fit without sizing it for full capacity of a Hub, or constructing overflow parking on the opposite side of the Promen St. Bridge.
3. Competition: Although this facility will "compete" with other meeting spaces in town regardless of its size, a space that accommodates 300 people will compete with other large spaces like the Holiday Inn.
4. Municipal Ownership: The current Pav serves many family events and church functions. Do we want to keep that focus by keeping a new facility smaller?
5. Maintenance: A larger space will take more resources to clean and maintain.

What's the deal with a restaurant? Many people have voiced support for a restaurant in LSP, one that would both draw more people to the park and bring transient boaters to the community. Others want to minimize the impact on the park, and to keep the City out of the restaurant business. *If* a restaurant is pursued, here's the current game plan:

1. The FCEDC is open to doing a market analysis to see if there is the demand for a restaurant in this location, and if so, what niche it could fill.
2. If the demand is there, the City plans to solicit proposals from reputable restaurateurs to get their ideas for size, theme, and services. We expect that they would want a liquor license, outdoor seating, and maybe a small stage for outdoor music.
3. If a lease can be worked out, it would be long enough—with a fee high enough—to cover the City's construction of the restaurant space, as part of the new Hub. This lease should cover all of the City's costs so the taxpayer isn't paying for this private venture.
4. It is anticipated that the restaurant would be the designated caterer for events held at the Hub, should the event organizers need a caterer. For this reason, the restaurant should be on the same level as the meeting spaces, and not on a second floor. (Incidentally, Excel estimates that a two-story facility is approximately the same cost as a single story. While a two-story footprint may be smaller, the stairs/elevator and code requirements add a lot of expense.)
5. The restaurant space would be designed so that if no restaurateur fills the space after the initial lease runs out, the dining area could be used as an additional public meeting space.

LAKESIDE PARK MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Fond du Lac City Council Committee of the Whole
November 30, 2016

The goals of tonight's meeting include providing updates and hearing Council feedback regarding Excel Engineering's draft of a Lakeside Park Master Plan, to reach consensus where possible, and to identify—and vote on, if ready—those areas where consensus has not been reached. Ideally, then Excel can be given the direction needed to produce the final draft of the Plan for the Council to approve at a future meeting.

LAKESIDE PARK MASTER PLAN UPDATE
Fond du Lac City Council COTW
November 30, 2016

Non-Pavilion Major Draft Master Plan Components

- Shelter Improvements
 - Excel studied each shelter
 - \$35k for proposed post repairs in '17 CIP
- Ice rink south of park storage bldg; no designated budget
- Splash Pad
 - Sited south of playground restrooms
 - \$200k proposed in '18 CIP
- Bridge between Lakeside Park & LSP-W
 - 16' height for boats = long approaches
 - \$1.3M proposed in '21 CIP
- Supple Marsh boardwalk, viewing platforms
 - \$350k proposed in '22 CIP

REVIEWED @
9/28/16 COUNCIL.
ONLY PROVIDE
DETAILS/
DISCUSSION
IF REQUESTED.

LAKESIDE PARK MASTER PLAN UPDATE
Fond du Lac City Council COTW
November 30, 2016

“Settled” Issues

- If a beach is pursued, it would likely be at the former site north of Oven Is., clearing zebra mussels and doing periodic cleaning.
- An amphitheater will only proceed with the “right” partner.
- A bridge to LSP-W is in the CIP, for now.
- The splash pad was moved to ‘18, and the potential Hub to ‘19
- Skating rink south of park shop or other location; not combined with splash pad

REVIEWED @
9/28/16 COUNCIL.
WONT GO INTO
DETAIL
UNLESS
REQUESTED

LAKESIDE PARK MASTER PLAN UPDATE
Fond du Lac City Council COTW
November 30, 2016

Excel & Planning Committee’s Hub Vision

- New “Hub” due north of Main St. (“Hub = new, larger pavilion, “Pav” = current pavilion)
 - Seating for 200
 - Kitchen/prep areas for each
 - Parking lot south of Frazier Dr.
 - 160’ removable pier due north
 - Large patio area; public & rental seating
 - Central, open exhibit area (may include some public seating, art/historic/nature exhibits)
 - Year-round restrooms
 - Retail/rentals/storage area
 - “Optional” restaurant to the west
 - Up to \$3.6M, depending on size & style

LAKESIDE PARK MASTER PLAN UPDATE
 Fond du Lac City Council COTW
 November 30, 2016

Advisory Park Board Recommendations

- **8/22/16: "show of hands"**
 - Use current Pavilion location
 - 300-person capacity, possibly split into 3 spaces (50, 50, 200)
 - Smaller parking lot, if possible
 - Don't pursue a restaurant
 - Include balcony or 2nd floor views
- **9/26/16: unanimous recommendation**
 - Use current Pavilion location
 - Parking "minimal but ample"
 - No full-service restaurant, but consider enhanced concession stand or pub
 - Don't pursue a TID that would include the Park

LAKESIDE PARK MASTER PLAN UPDATE
 Fond du Lac City Council COTW
 November 30, 2016

Changes/Conversations Since 6/8/16

- **Public Information Meeting**
- **Talks at four service organizations**
- **Pier details and costs**
- **FCEDC preliminary market analysis**
- **More information on bridge design**
- **Parking requirements clarified** (*There is quite a bit of flexibility regarding how much parking should be provided for an "accessory use" in a park. Requirements would be based on the size and character of the Hub*)
- **Public interest in partnering for exhibits in Hub**
- **Possible sponsor interest in funding bike/ped bridge @ Promen?**

DISCUSSED ON
 9/28/16,
 MOSTLY SHOWN
 TO DEMONSTRATE
 SIGNIFICANT
 PUBLIC FEEDBACK
 REC'D FOR THE
 PLAN

LAKESIDE PARK MASTER PLAN UPDATE
Fond du Lac City Council COTW
November 30, 2016

Remaining Issues

- **Overall Direction: Do you agree that a Hub should be a main focus of the Master Plan?**
- **Location: north of Main St., or current Pav site?**
- **Meeting Space Capacity: 200 or 300 total?**
- **Restaurant: continue FCEDC market analysis? Large & full service? Smaller pub or enhanced concession area? Future addition?**

LAKESIDE PARK MASTER PLAN UPDATE
Fond du Lac City Council COTW
November 30, 2016

Public Comment

LAKESIDE PARK MASTER PLAN UPDATE
Fond du Lac City Council COTW
November 30, 2016

City Council Discussion

- Is the Council comfortable voting on these questions tonight, if consensus cannot be reached?
- If so, would the Council like to review the questions one at a time, or to discuss all aspects as a whole?
- Remaining Questions:
 - Overall Direction: Do you agree that a Hub should be a main focus of the Master Plan?
 - Location: north of Main St., or current Pav site?
 - Meeting Space Capacity: 200 or 300 total?
 - Restaurant: continue FCEDC market analysis? Large & full service? Smaller pub or enhanced concession area? Future addition?

↓
ONLY SHOW
NEXT THREE
SLIDES IF
COUNCIL WOULD
LIKE TO
REVIEW THESE
PRO'S/CONS
WITH STAFF.

LAKESIDE PARK MASTER PLAN UPDATE
Fond du Lac City Council COTW
November 30, 2016

Location

Would you prefer to see the Hub located due north of Main St., or on the current Pav site?

- **Main St. Advantages**
 - Allows use of current Pav for smaller, less formal events
 - More visible, central location, "wow" factor as enter Park
 - More room for parking, patio, restaurant, future amphitheater
 - Dock to the north offers second pier into lake
 - Nearer playground, splash pad, etc.
- **Pav Site Advantages**
 - Use current Fishermen's Pier (more permanent, less cost)
 - Less impact of view of lake or current "green" space
 - Avoids maintaining/upgrading current Pav
 - No flood fringe issues (as on Main St. site)
 - Although lose more trees than Main St. site, lower quality trees.
 - Fewer odors than Main St. site?
 - Nearer gazebos, Oven Island, etc.

LAKESIDE PARK MASTER PLAN UPDATE
Fond du Lac City Council COTW
November 30, 2016

Capacity

What is the ideal overall seating capacity for the Hub's meeting spaces?

- **300-person Advantages**
 - Opens potential of attracting additional level of events (large weddings, etc.)
 - "Economy of scale" with construction; not much more expense to add extra capacity.
 - Allows for up to three rental spaces, not two
- **200-person Advantages**
 - Avoids competition with larger venues in town
 - Smaller footprint, at either location
 - Doesn't generate as much new demand for parking
 - Retains family "feel" of facility, consistent w/ park setting

LAKESIDE PARK MASTER PLAN UPDATE
Fond du Lac City Council COTW
November 30, 2016

Restaurant

Does a variation of one of these statements best capture your opinion concerning a restaurant in LSP? Note: some of these options may not be feasible depending on the location selected.

- **Some ideas. . .**
 - I think that a full-service restaurant would be a great addition to the Park, and I would like to see one incorporated in the Hub.
 - I support asking FCEDC to continue a market analysis regarding the viability, size and style of a restaurant, and to include it in the eventual building design if shown to be feasible.
 - I'm not interested in a restaurant at this time, but believe that space should be retained adjacent to the Hub for one to be added in the future.
 - A restaurant should not be included in the Master Plan. I prefer to see the Hub include space for a concessionaire or small brew pub (with some associated interior and patio seating, ability to cater, etc.).
 - A concessionaire the scope of our current one is sufficient.

Note that a restaurant, if built, would have to meet full zoning code requirements for off-street parking.

LAKESIDE PARK MASTER PLAN UPDATE
Fond du Lac City Council COTW
November 30, 2016

Next Steps

- **Follow up on questions and/or ideas brought up by Council, either tonight or in the future**
- **Set date and goals of follow-up Council discussion, if necessary**
- **Provide direction to Excel Engineering to finalize plan, when decided**
- **Bring final draft of Plan to Council for approval**
- **Incorporate Plan goals into future CIPs, for deliberation and approval by the Council at that time**

Thank you!

