

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: November 7, 2012

TITLE: 6002 Cottage Grove Road – Amended
PUD(GDP-SIP), Grandview Commons
Grocery Store. 3rd Ald. Dist. (17627)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: November 7, 2012

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Tom DeChant, Cliff Goodhart, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley and Marsha Rummel.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 7, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 6002 Cottage Grove Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Jeff Rosenberg, representing Veridian Homes; Brian Munson, Ald. Lauren Cnare, District 3; Jim Schaerer, Chris Winter, and Michael J. Schmitt, all representing Rollie Winter Associates; Max Dickman, Domenico Ferrante, representing Roundy’s; Dan Brinkman, representing Veridian Homes; Roger Guest and Kristina Fatke. Appearing in opposition were Tara White, Tiffany Taha, Barbara Davis, Dean Matuszak, Pamela Prestegard, Scott Blankman, Denise DeMarb, Carolyn A. Montgomery, Nicole Jenkel, Heather McFadden, Paul Reilly, Ted Szalkowski, Amy Szalkowski, Gigi Coleman, John Coleman and Michael Jawson. Munson focused on the comments they received during the initial approval process. Trees will be included along the central spine to help with symmetry. The southeast corner of central parking area has been shifted to reduce the stall count by one. The western edge of the central spine and Gemini Drive come together and add more formality with additional crosswalk points to the future retail building, the removal of one tree island and shifting of bike racks. This will help traffic flow to the southern edge out to Gemini Drive. The species list has been modified to include grasses and substituted appropriate species. In response to comments about the seating area, the northern seating area will be coupled with the one on the south with moveable furniture. They have identified areas for outdoor display as an amenity (pumpkins, flowers, seasonal in nature). The floor plans haven’t changed with the exception of the atrium moving to the south for a closer relationship with Cottage Grove Road and extension of the door out with an additional awning to signal the entrance. The southern façade incorporates sun shades projecting out 36”. The piers have been further built out with additional depth for more frequently scaled setbacks. The retaining wall has been switched to a smooth face block component more in keeping with the character of the building. On the southwest corner, the awning has changed to a sun shade with 36” projections that wrap the corner and give a sense of closure on the patio/plaza space. They are retaining the north side increased plaza space to allow for more outdoor eating areas and functional space and extending the awning element out on the corner and wrapped the corner with an additional sun screen element. The HVAC components will have a series of acoustic and visual screens that wrap around them and try to cluster them as close to the center of the building as possible. Their decibel range is 93 but as sound travels it drops decibel

level with the end result dropping to a level similar to the Interstate and Cottage Grove Road today; less than the levels present from residential air conditioning units in the neighborhood. The loading facilities have been intentionally oriented towards the north, which is the greatest distance to any existing homes. To the south is the outdoor storage area for the compactor (55 decibels) which is a self-sealed unit that is fed from the inside of the store; it's not a dumpster where you flip the top and throw a bag in. It's also picked up and taken away so opening it is not a daily occurrence. Within that enclosure you will not have any visual access from any direction; it does not have a roof but at 55 decibels, which is less than a typical conversation, that won't be a noise issue. Other elements wrapped into this are how the landscape contributes to the views of the loading dock, bringing it closer to the entrance points. Roundy's requires that when a truck backs up into the dock it has to turn off, regardless of the temperature outside. A screening wall on the east side of the loading dock will cover that truck. Views are also well screened from the north. One Maple will be removed because of disease. They are preserving the trees per the condition of the GDP approval, which stated that the trees west of the phone switch along Cottage Grove Road be considered for saving. The landscape plan does have roughly four times the point scale required and includes reforestation efforts. Water feature: In the GDP there was discussion of a feature in the parking lot. Proposed is a pergola shade structure as a vertical element that offers a shade element that a fountain can't in all seasons. It's an instant vertical element that adds more value as a structure inside this to help break down the space as you cross the walkway. Building materials were distributed which included a modular 4-inch utility brick will be used.

Pam Prestegard spoke with concern as a homeowner who faces the back of this project. She thinks the HVAC units are much louder than 93 decibels (perhaps that is only for one appliance?). She asked that they do whatever is technologically possible to contain that noise. The amount of traffic noise is going to continue to increase and the combination of all the sounds is going to be very intrusive to the neighbors. She asked the Commission to enforce their rules regarding noise mitigation. As many trees that can be saved as possible would be tremendously beneficial to the neighbors.

Michael Jawson spoke as a Richmond Hills resident. He is concerned for the neighbors south of the store site. He thinks the project looks really nice but the people who built their homes there will no longer be able to enjoy their backyards. Screening for these people will be critical. He thinks the applicants are working very hard to make this work but wishes screening would be considered more important. He reminded the applicants that there is more than one neighborhood to deal with in this situation.

Dean Matuzsak referenced a letter the neighborhood group submitted, specifically dumpster and outdoor storage issues. The fans for the HVAC will be on all the time. He would like to see the hours of operation shortened. The lighting, mature trees, rain garden management, traffic calming devices are also of concern. He reiterated that the loading dock/compactor area is not just about noise but also aesthetics. Roundy's claim to want to be a good neighbor and covering up this loading dock will make it more aesthetically pleasing.

Barbara Davis spoke about the trees. Many of the Maples range in age from 125-200 years of age; you can plant all the trees you want but we'll all be dead before they get to the size the existing ones are now. These are important to our neighborhood and selling points for these homes. They provide natural screening from the parking lot lighting and noise. The trees are important to their quality of life and sense of place.

Ald. Cnare, District 3 spoke to the memo from the McClellan Park Neighborhood Association. Noise is the issue and professionals (Commissions) need to deal with that. She looked to the Commission to make sure all these points within the memo as raised are addressed. She feels this plan is ready for the Plan Commission and the issues they are charged in dealing with.

Tim Parks of the Planning Division stated that the landscape plan is very strong (with question about some trees). The depth proposed on these plans does not meet all the requirements of the Big Box Ordinance but is moving in the right direction. The roofline variation is imperceptible; Planning Division staff encourages the development team to look both at the north and south elevations for ways to accentuate the height of those rooflines. There is room for this Commission to take action to better meet the intention and objective of the ordinance as it relates to the roof variation. Staff would encourage the developer to move the south wall of the atrium closer to Cottage Grove Road. This would better meet the Big Box Ordinance standards as well as making a bigger statement along Cottage Grove Road. The key is to strengthen the relationship between the entrance to the store to Cottage Grove Road where Planning staff feels the emphasis should be. They are definitely going in the right direction with what they've provided for the HVAC units. A potential way forward on the screening of rooftop mechanicals would be to identify the actual rooftop mechanical equipment, what their design noise generation would be (normal operations), identifying where those are on the rooftop, identifying where they will be screened and giving an idea of what happens to that noise as we move away from the source. The representation that screening of loading areas is mandatory by ordinance is false. Hours of operation and loading issues are addressed at the Plan Commission level.

Munson mentioned that they have been working with a group of neighborhood residents on the landscaping issues to address looking at the project holistically. They are under a commitment to install landscaping along the south corridor (across Cottage Grove Road). This is a separate agreement from this proposal.

The Commission made the following comments:

- I want to be sure there will be post-construction checks on the noise of the HVAC, if the truck driver doesn't turn his truck off, and the buffer across the street. Assuming those points have been dealt with, the only thing left is this community of plants. To me, a library that saves this tree could be incredible. Convince me that you can't save 3 and 4.
 - We take the trees seriously. Starting with 6, (the oldest and largest Oak) is being saved. #2 will be saved in place. Why the library there? The preceding neighborhood plan identified the need for a civic site within the site; it didn't say village green but we've always seen that site as a library site. #3 and #4 are a function of a couple of things. It's not just simply take out parking stalls as it relates to #3. There are other issues and other decisions made in layering this site and other sites together that have impacted that tree and the challenge with an 8-foot cut is having that tree up on a pedestal without understanding whether or not it's going to survive. The Hickory has lost the northern portion of its roots and the southern portion of its roots are being impacted by the grading and construction necessary to bring this through. Again, it's not as simple as pulling out some of the parking and moving that line, it actually ripples down through the parking lot. There are trade-offs; what we end up with in terms of the sustainability of the town center, integration of the buildings, sidewalk connections, pedestrian connections have value inherent in them as well, and instead are pursuing a goal of trying to put some Oaks in spaces where they can spread over time and be self-sustaining.
- It's not one tree, it's the grove that makes the effect. These take years and years to grow. People like these trees and they add value. It's not the building that is dictating what's happening to these trees, it's the design of the parking lot and the design of the walks. These trees are valuable and they're not going to be replaced. I'm going to have a hard time supporting this plan without you showing me that you cannot redesign the parking lot and those spaces. It may take a bit of effort but those trees are worth a lot. We have enough problems with nature-deficit disorder in our kids today. These trees need to be protected.
- I would like to see how you would design it to save the trees.

- We can give an overview of the efforts it would take. The biggest impact is these 16 stalls identified in the library agreement. You'd also have to look at whether you could keep the planting area within the parking lot or potentially removal of the sidewalk across the north side. There are competing interest in terms of screening across the parking lot, movement across the parking lot, and the tree. It's a choices component; it does have ripples throughout the site.
- If I have to trade the sidewalk for the grove of Burr Oaks, I'd trade the sidewalk. Talk to me about the parking and the library.
 - (Rosenberg) Veridian donated this land for the library, and they had certain conditions when we gave them that site. It had to be developed and had to have an SIP within a certain number of years and we're beyond that now. Part of the value for the library were the cross-easements they had for the parking. It's not necessarily the Capitol Budget that cause the library the biggest heartburn, it's the operating budget. Part of the value of what we were providing as a component of this is that they had these stalls that would have the ability to time restrict them. The land has already been deeded to them. That would be a whole different level of negotiation that would have to return to the Library Board.

If we take a tree away now, we don't get it back.

- The parking stalls dedicated to the library should not be constructed at this time. Allow the flexibility for that entire north side to be reviewed when the time comes.
- (Chair) We can suggest that unless the agreement with the library requires that it be done at this time. We cannot void the contractual agreement with the library solely with our actions. The Council may have that ability.
- That north walk really doesn't serve a direct pedestrian connection. The connectivity should come down through the center of the site so I would suggest that that full length of the north walk be eliminated.
- How much distance to you have between your planters? My concern is the Carpinus are very low branching and will spread out, but the branches don't prune very well.
 - The walkway is 12-feet and they're centered in those planters. I want to say it's 6-feet. You might want to go with something that has a more upright form. Salt would be an issue too. Magnolias all along through there would be pretty cool too.
- We still have at least two elements of the Big Box Ordinance to deal with.
 - There's a break every 75-feet and if you go from break to break there is a gap in the middle of about 50, not a significant distance. When we started to look at the strong horizontal across the top we felt that that was a form that worked better. We took the approach of having more smaller breaks, more frequently with material ins and outs to help break the overall building.

I think we would need to make that finding as a Commission.

- You could look at creating a similar roof element over the corner that would be the café to strengthen it. A variation in the roof at that volume would strengthen the corner and give it a bit more identity as its own potential place. In terms of the Big Box Ordinance you're creating an entire street and creating these experiences along the way.
- I still think the secondary signage needs to be lowered below that top band.
- What are you doing to address staff's concern about somehow enhancing that experience closer to Cottage Grove Road, umbrellas?
 - A combination of approaches in the landscape up to the building. A plaza space with an activity node, benches along this face so we feel that the combination of the planters, the trees and the benching as you come in create a nice entry point to the activity area.

How would bringing that canopy element out towards us prohibit that?

- I think it's just a different approach.

I'm looking for ways to see how you're going to address the comments being raised, doing something in addition to what's being show now. We already talked about the roof element and I think we're looking at that being satisfied.

- I think similar to the roof element what we try to do is attack it from a bunch of different angles in context to the overall plan.
- We did bring the canopy element out. The reason we don't want to go too far with it is we don't want to limit what they're going to be doing because obviously the seasonal thing is going to change. The overall composition is what we're trying to achieve. There's a visibility aspect to it also.
- What if this larger canopy at least came out to this edge of the stone so we now have a larger canopy here and you can bring the sun shade cut back to this side of the stone. Something to keep pushing out closer to Cottage Grove Road.
- The brick is pretty monotone on a large expanse so you're not going to have a lot of richness or depth in that. Study other bricks before you finalize it. Generally speaking it's a nice palette I would just suggest differentiating it a bit on the Cottage Grove Road corner, at a minimum.
- In terms of provisions for the trucks, we have to keep in mind that a truck could come in that isn't a Roundy's truck and not be able to turn off their engine due to their load (i.e. frozen items, etc.).
- (Ald. Cnare) If we keep an active relationship open with the Library Board and we provide a good discussion that meets many interests, I'm confident that they're not going to stonewall us in any particular way.
- My sense of process and proportion is that that kind of a trade-off is better weighed by the Council than it is by a Commission. We give our best recommendation on saving the trees and the Council can decide. How that works itself out I don't know but if we say that's what we want then we're letting the City "fathers and mothers" make those decisions as they are elected to do.
 - It seemed to me that the ability to be able to remove a sidewalk along that particular portion of the parking lot is something you could formulate in the motion. It would be an undoing to have to go back and try to renegotiate that library contract.

I think we would suggest that we remove the sidewalk, we make a recommendation to the Plan Commission as part of the approvals and that those parking stalls not be built at this time that would be used by the library until the library would actually be there and the issues can be negotiated with the library. In the meantime, whatever landscaping is done encourages the preservation of that Burr Oak grove.

- I'm saying that in absence of not completing the parking lot what would you like us to be able to do on that sidewalk?

I want you to do something that keeps those trees now for future discussion of that but without those section of stalls which are going to be for the library.

- We need to complete the parking lot component as part of the Copp's build-out because they're going to be the ones installing them. Part of the cost savings down the line for the library is they get to use this but it's already be installed by somebody else.

We can refer this whole matter until you come back with a preservation plan for the trees. We can refer it until you work with staff.

- We dedicate a site to the library, we provide them \$250,000...

I understand that but you've gone beyond what is reasonable.

- And what we're saying is we'll do our best to preserve that tree but we need to build out that parking lot, that's a component of our obligation to our client. I can't not build it and leave the parking lot in an incomplete fashion. That's part of what we're doing; I don't quite understand it. And if you want us to withhold the building of the sidewalk as a part of a way to preserve that tree then we'll make an attempt to do that. You're putting the bologna in the sandwich here.

The City Council adopted the motion that talks about the preservation of the trees. The City Council did that, not this Commission. So what we're trying to do in approving an SIP is figure out a way to meet that City Council requirement and still approve an SIP.

- West of the telephone switch.

- I made that west of the telephone switch to be very precise, that is true. But I also all through this whole process talked about tree preservation, so I don't want to say "oh I only meant here" and literally I agree that amendment was about that junction box, which in their design shows no trees, I didn't say that. But we want to save as many trees as possible. This amendment is not all powerful.
- So if you were designing a sentence or two to the City Council...
 - I would say that the Urban Design Commission gets final approval with the following stipulations, the ones that Dawn suggested on the canopy front and other things like that. And that the developer is required to come up with a plan to preserve the Burr Oaks in this grove (#3 and 4) and that that plan should include a way to have discussions with the City and the plans about the library potential on that site that could encompass that preservation, and that until such a plan is approved that neither the sidewalk nor those parking stalls in that strip can be constructed until subsequent action by this Commission, Plan Commission or the Council approves those reserved parking spaces.
- If you're going to keep #3 you should keep #4 (trees).
- I feel stronger about 1, 2 and 3 (trees).
 - If you'll allow us to be able to not build that sidewalk, we believe, even though we know there will be some engineering involved, we can save that Oak tree #3. We did have Bruce Alison look at it, he doesn't care about that Hickory tree. He's more concerned about the Oaks. If you would craft an approval for the language that would allow us to remove that sidewalk and preserve that tree while still building the parking lot, then I think appeasing everyone, including the library, including Roundy's, including Marsha, we can handle that.
- I'd like to see a preservation plan in that approval that either comes back to all of us or to Richard or myself. It has to be OK'd first before those stalls are constructed.

ACTION:

On a motion by O'Kroley, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0). The motion provided for the following:

- There shall be continuing jurisdiction relative to noise impacts as part of the Plan Commission's jurisdiction with detailed plans and maps relative to acoustics provided for review.
- The developer shall develop a preservation plan for the trees within the grove, particularly #1, 2 and 3, 4 if possible, to be approved by staff in consultation with Commissioners Slayton and Harrington, in addition to coordinating a discussion between the City, the Library Board and the applicant on the tree preservation issues, on-site parking for the future library development with a recommendation to take out the sidewalk with the project as currently proposed until the Urban Design Commission, Plan Commission and Common Council have approved the contingencies.
- Address of all architectural issues relative to the extension of the canopy element or alternative design features on the northwestern corner off the front elevation such as a tower element and the extension of the canopy elements at the southwest corner and central entry feature below the "PHARMACY" graphic to create a colonnade effect from the main entry to Cottage Grove Road, in addition to more variation in the roofline per Tim Parks' comments, the lowering of signage on the top band, and the reexamination of the monotone brick for more variation on the Cottage Grove Road corner.
- In reviewing the standards the design meets the Big Box Ordinance standards with the modifications proposed.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall ratings for this project are 6 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 6002 Cottage Grove Road

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	7	6	-	-	5	7	7
	5	6	6	-	-	6	-	6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: October 17, 2012

TITLE: 6002 Cottage Grove Road – Amended
PUD(GDP-SIP), Grandview Commons
Grocery Store. 3rd Ald. Dist. (17627)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: October 17, 2012

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley, John Harrington, Henry Lufler, Cliff Goodhart and Tom DeChant.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 17, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of an Amended PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 6002 Cottage Grove Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Jeff Rosenberg, representing Veridian Homes; Brian Munson, representing Rollie Winter Associates; Alisa Allen, and Ald. Lauren Cnare, representing District 3. Appearing in support and available to answer questions were Domenico Ferrante, Chris Winter, Michael Schmitt, Dan Day, all representing Rollie Winter Associates; Dan Brinkman, representing Veridian Homes; Max Dietman and Nathan Zywicki. Registered and speaking in opposition were Barbara Davis and Paul Reilly. Registered in opposition but not wishing to speak were John Driscoll, Dean Matuszak, Nicole Jenkel, Heather McFadden, and Carolyn Montgomery. Munson presented the updated plans for the grocery store component of Grandview Commons. There is an outdoor plaza space, a refined central walking spine, a pergola and landscaping that ties the grocery store front back to Gemini Drive and the town center. An additional island has been added to the northern portion of the site to break the parking lot up. On the east side of the store they worked on the grades to reduce the heights of walls to the east and the length of walls, and they enhanced the landscaping. They have gone from a 3-bay wide loading to two loading bays facing north with the compactor moved into a fully enclosed area. Four of the mature trees near the phone switch location have been saved. The landscape plan is four times the point requirements to provide buffers in meaningful and real ways, with additional vertical elements to provide a sense of enclosure and permanence to the site. A slide show presented still shots of the architecture, including the main entrance, the tower element, windows, different building materials, awnings and canopies and the pergola. A plaza space with outdoor seating and landscaping is proposed at the entrance that ties with the tower and Cottage Grove Road in a meaningful way. The roof plan shows the HVAC clustered internally to the store with two screening lines around the center of the store that is a vertical visual screen that is separate from the units to serve as functional purpose for visual as well as acoustics.

Paul Reilly spoke to the importance of the design issues to the neighborhood. He believes that, in part, approval of the rezoning and General Development Plan was based on Veridian’s credibility and good reputation. The neighborhood has expressed concern that Veridian will sell this property and it will be out of their control. The

fountain represented along the pedestrian walkway is not there, and the neighbors on the south still have to face a very large blank wall. Some of the neighbors visited the Roundy's site in Middleton Hills and are disappointed to see that many of their amenities are not included in this proposal, such as the exterior mechanicals, the loading dock camouflaged with a wall but is not enclosed, failure to put things such as compacting, food waste, etc. inside the building. Something has to be done to the southern elevation to soften the wall. He is concerned that once initial approval is granted, the neighborhood's concerns will be pushed aside and not receive adequate discussion.

Alisa Allen spoke with excitement about what the plan looks like. She does not think this looks like a grocery store and sees the changes as developing a real asset to the community.

Barbara Davis spoke in opposition, citing that many concerns are missing from the newest design. The loading dock remains open and back up to homes of residents who did not purchase because of the promise of a grocery store. Mature trees are being razed with condos that back up to some of these trees. Those trees serve as screening to the original condo owners in the community. She asked that they hold the developer accountable to the amendment proposed by Ald. Rummel at City Council that these trees be preserved. She asked that Tim Parks comment on the revision from his first recommendation to the UDC and the second recommendation letter, particularly in reference to "additional design work is needed before the proposed building can be found to meet the large retail establishment ordinance." She asked the UDC to go beyond looking at the "spirit of an ordinance" and to look at the ordinance to the letter and protect the people who invested in the Grandview vision.

Ald. Cnare spoke in support of the project. She praised that this development looks very different from any other grocery store in the area. This design offers more than they have seen in previous iterations. She asked the Commission to look at this project while thinking about what the large format retail ordinance means. If there is a piece of this that does not fit perfectly with a line of the ordinance, does the meet it in another way? There may be better ways than our original intent with the ordinance to prescribe what buildings like this should look like.

Ald. Jill Johnson spoke with concern regarding the screening and mature trees. She feels an injustice was done to the owners who purchased in this neighborhood with a certain understanding of what the zoning was going to be. Furthermore she felt that this particular version of the zoning was one of the marketing aspects used by the developer to develop the area. Saying you're not going to comply with the big box ordinance is like adding insult to injury; the ordinance was there long before this dispute. She asked the Commission to refer this item pending another neighborhood meeting.

Tim Parks spoke to the Commission regarding his Planning Division memo. As far as staff is concerned the site plan and landscape plan are more than sufficient.

The Chair read from the big box ordinance Large Retail Development provisions in MGO, Section 33.24(4)(f), specifically regarding the loading area, and noted that it does not require enclosure of the area, but there is reference to the acoustic impact of these functions being fully contained. Parks listed several big box developments in Madison that do not have fully enclosed loading areas. He noted that it does fall to the Urban Design Commission to apply the requirements and make a determination on how they feel the project should go forward. Staff supports what the Urban Design Commission will come up with and do not anticipate rehashing these at the Plan Commission. Staff want these elements to come out more, more needs to be done on the rooflines to provide the variation that is required, including more information and details on mechanical screening and acoustic noise mitigation. Need more roofline variation and the center of Cottage Grove Road elevation and more relief of façade with vertical elements. The front right side elevation needs to relate more to

Cottage Grove Road with the elongation of the entry element (arcade) closer to the outdoor seating/activity area. He did note that the outdoor plaza area that is proposed for neighborhood use is the farthest spot away from where you would purchase that type of food inside the grocery store; this issue could be addressed by moving the foyer and perhaps an arcade of the entry element that brings the south facing entrance to the foyer closer to Cottage Grove Road.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- I think we can place this in its site a little bit more. For example, the south face with the clear glass is going to bake. My opinion is that in the intent of staff to add some depth and variation in this area, what if a horizontal sun shade were added to cut some light and get some depth and perspective on that face.
 - This exhibit will help explain what's going on. First off we have awnings and canopies projecting out from the façade. The pier offers horizontal and vertical breaks along the façade. The idea of an awning is definitely something we can think about. We're focused on the functionality of the store insides and outsides.
- Regarding the outdoor café area, Cottage Grove Road is going to be a bear to cross. You've made an incredible effort to make a pedestrian effort on this side of the building. Is it possible to investigate having the outdoor dining in the area where that food is sold inside the store?
 - The decision from Roundy's in terms of how the interior operates led to a left-hand store. We wanted to have it be unbalanced a bit because that breaks it up in a way. There could be some tables there certainly, but we felt we had a better opportunity here in this space because of how it functions inside. You come in, you buy something in the deli and then circle around to the tellers. The distance from where you pay to either location is about the same distance and we wanted to keep that activity closer to Cottage Grove Road. We also struggled with this basically being a highway. We focused on how we could create this plaza space with amenities to help serve that function and bridge out to Cottage Grove Road, but we also thought maybe there wouldn't be a lot of traffic from that direction.

That's why I'm suggesting a better pedestrian connection. There's a way to make it a space and confine it. There's no real synergy here.

- I'm reminded of the Sentry at Hilldale, they built a little indoor café area. It might be a more pleasant space to sit through the remainder of the year.
 - The square footage component has been a concern all along; this would bring additional building mass and square footage.

So maybe a covered element with columns to bring some more shelter. Staff noted that the need to address this concern with an increase in interior square footage could be considered with the PUD approval.

- I would like to know what size the trees are that are being removed. What really bothers me is that there's a lot of potential but it's not there yet. Is there a way we can move these trees so there is equal distance, creating a much stronger movement in here. You need to carry these trees across. Spread out trees at Gemini on both sides of the drive.
- Question the use of large trees on one side with small on the other, use equal size trees and carry alley across drive and provide tree islands at a twelve stall interval.
 - In terms of the design intent of the landscape, we were trying to layer it a bit both as you look through and travel down. The view to the north and to the south is now layered across the central spine. We have the challenge of sequencing with pedestrians, bicycles and vehicles.

I don't mind the driveway but with a little creativity you could tweak this to carry these trees so they carry across there. Right now it seems very unbalanced.

- Perhaps the “dominant” and “minor” trees need a different relationship on this walkway so they are more centered to get more space and the smaller ones become subservient. That may help out with the closer alignment.
- This pergola perhaps needs a greater presence; more of a node feel to it so it starts to become an event rather than part of the passage. And may need to lose parking stalls to accomplish.
- To go and sit in this area, it’s going to be lost. People are coming from the parking and the neighborhood. Maybe this is an opportunity for an occasional farmer’s market kind of thing, seasonal things. That animates a space visible from the highway and doesn’t create a place where I don’t want to sit. Look at placing activity at the northwest corner with an outdoor display/activity on the southwest corner.
- On elevations CMU is not a fancy detail for walls; look at a different material, more upscale.
- The “Feesey Ribbon Grass” type of grass that is invasive, it can’t be in there.
- The scale of the building is good in that you’re breaking it down without making it false. But if you look at your west parking lot elevation, I’d look at a little bit more at the articulation of the volume that people enter, versus the other volume at Cottage Grove Road. They’re looking too similar right now.
- Look for some richness in your building materials. Think about your mortar color.
- Question directed at Ald. Johnson: Has your neighborhood asked for a meeting?
 - It’s something I think is appropriate for a project of this scale.

My question is has your neighborhood asked for a meeting.

My neighborhood has asked for more discussion of this, not specifically for a meeting. My point is this is significantly different than what we were talking about this past summer. In addition for those who are not visual, I think there is enough change that would warrant another meeting.

Ald. Cnare: I’m going to disagree with that. I think the essential elements of this project that most people were paying attention to have already been addressed. There are some very fine details that you are looking at now; the opportunity for the public comment takes place now. Everyone was informed that this meeting is occurring tonight and everyone will know when the Plan Commission and Common Council meetings are. It is at the point now that this belongs to the public, to all people. I would ask that you continue to treat this as any other project you would go through. I think it’s time to move on with this.

- Look at placing your secondary signage on top of the canopies; simple letters on top rather than up high. It’ll be more at pedestrian scale.

ACTION:

On a motion by Lufler, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion provided for address of the following, in addition to the comments made:

- Examine the entry location as it relates to the south elevation outdoor seating area.
- Reexamine the south side of the building, the articulation of the façade, upper parapet, including screening and acoustic noise mitigation details.
- Look at the alley/tree issues.
- Reexamine enclosure element and monitor the acoustic impacts.
- Phalaris arundinacea “Feesey” invasive species to be removed and substituted.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall ratings for this project are 6, 7 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 6002 Cottage Grove Road

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	6	6	-	-	5	7	6
	8	8	8	7	6	7	9	8
	7	6	7	-	-	-	6	7

General Comments:

- Strengthen alley.
- Consider covered canopy south of main entry at plaza and horizontal sun shades at south elevation.
- Pretty good for a big box.

CITY OF MADISON
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL
CORRESPONDENCE

DATE: October 12, 2012

TO: Urban Design Commission

FROM: Timothy M. Parks, Planner, Planning Division

SUBJECT: **UPDATED Staff Comments re: ID# 17627 – PUD-SIP for Copps grocery store at Grandview Commons on the October 17, 2012 UDC agenda**

This memo is an updated version of the memo that was provided at the October 3, 2012 Urban Design Commission hearing regarding the Copps grocery store in the Grandview Commons Town Center.

On March 20, 2012 meeting, the Common Council conditionally approved a request to rezone properties generally addressed as 6002 Cottage Grove Road, 5901-5939 Sharpsburg Drive and 857 Jupiter Drive from Temp. A (Agriculture District), PUD-GDP and PUD-SIP to Amended PUD-GDP and R2T and the preliminary plat of Town Center Addition to Grandview Commons. The Amended General Development Plan called for the future development of 109,000 square feet of retail/office space including a maximum 58,000 square-foot grocery store, a 24,000 square-foot library, and 110 multi-family residential units.

An application was filed on September 19, 2012 by Brian Munson, Vandewalle & Associates to rezone approximately 5.9 acres generally addressed as 6002 Cottage Grove Road from PUD-GDP to PUD-SIP to allow construction of a 58,000 square-foot Copps grocery store on behalf of the store's developer, Rollie Winter Associates of Appleton. This request, a second rezoning to PUD-SIP for a 3,800 square-foot multi-tenant retail building at the northeastern corner of future Gemini Drive and Cottage Grove Road (ID#27835), and the final plat of Town Center Addition to Grandview Commons are scheduled to be considered by the Plan Commission on November 19, 2012 and the Common Council on November 27, 2012.

As the proposed grocery store will contain 58,000 square feet of gross floor area, it is required to be reviewed against the applicable standards for large retail establishments found in Section 33.24(4)(f) of the Urban Design Commission Ordinance, which was adopted in 2005 to provide standards for retail developments of 40,000 square feet or more of gross floor area either as one building or in multiple buildings on a single zoning lot. The standards are intended to "[promote] the efficient use of land and [preserve] and [enhance] the urban fabric through a more urban site and building design," and include specifications for the treatment of exterior walls and facades, roofs, entrance locations, parking lots, outdoor storage and loading areas, pedestrian circulation and central features. Any single retail establishment with a gross floor area of 40,000 square feet or more shall be subject to Section 33.24(4)(f)3-14.

To ensure that large retail buildings are well designed and incorporate four-sided design, the design standards include a series of provisions for facades visible from a public street, adjacent properties or rights of way, which staff believes will apply to all four sides of the proposed

grocery store, which will be visible from future residences to the north and east of the store as well as Cottage Grove Road.

Any building having 40,000 square feet or more of gross floor area is required to incorporate wall plane projections or recesses having a depth of at least three percent 3% of the total length of the facade and extending at least 20% of the length of the facade, with no uninterrupted facade length exceeding 75 feet. Rooflines of large retail buildings are required to change in height every 75 linear feet in the building length, and rooftop mechanical equipment is required to be screened from view by integrated architectural elements, such as parapets. Staff believes that the proposed western, front and eastern, rear facades provide an acceptable degree of wall plane variation. However, the northern and southern side elevations do not appear to provide the 3% depth required, which would be approximately 5.88 feet for the 196-foot long facades. Additional roofline variation should also be provided along the northern and southern elevations to provide the required height variation every 75 feet, while additional information regarding the location, size and screening of any proposed rooftop mechanical equipment is needed to determine if that standard is met.

Retail buildings over 40,000 square feet are required to have ground floor facades that face or abut public streets with pedestrian and vehicular access shall incorporate arcades, windows for vision, display, or daylighting, customer entrances, awnings, canopies, or porticos, and outdoor patios, or community features along no less than 60% of their horizontal length in a manner determined sufficient by the Plan Commission. Staff believes that the Cottage Grove Road (Right) elevation as currently designed only meets this requirement and encourages the developer to look for opportunities to further open and articulate the building along the southern elevation.

There is also a requirement that all sides of a building that directly abuts a public right of way providing vehicular and pedestrian access to the site provide at least one customer entrance (33.24(4)(f)7b). The entry may utilize a pedestrian plaza, portico or a community feature to help satisfy this requirement. The developer proposes an outdoor café space along the southern end of the western, front wall to satisfy this provision. Staff recognizes that this outdoor area is far removed from the south-facing side of the proposed entry foyer to satisfy this requirement. The potential addition of a second entrance along the southern third of the western wall or the reduction of the distance between the south-facing doors and Cottage Grove Road are other options.

The large retail establishment provisions require that a development containing a large retail building have at least one element of one building with a maximum setback of 20 feet adjacent to a street frontage that abuts a right of way that is projected to have the most pedestrian activity associated with the building. While Cottage Grove Road is not expected to have the highest level of pedestrian activity in this area initially, the proposed grocery store will be setback 20.2 feet from the southern property line, which staff believes satisfies this requirement. Overall, staff feels that the proposed location of two future retail buildings and a City library along the Gemini Drive side of the block on which the grocery will be located as well as the site and parking lot landscaping and community features proposed on the block satisfy the various site design requirements for sites containing a large retail establishment.

Service and mechanical functions are required to be incorporated into the overall building design and use screening and/or landscaping so that the visual and acoustic impacts of these functions are fully contained and out of view from adjacent properties and public streets. The service functions proposed along the eastern wall of the proposed grocery appear to be

designed to meet these requirements. Acoustical screening of the grocery store's mechanical equipment will also be required.

Areas for outdoor storage, truck parking, trash collection or compaction and loading are required to not be visible from public or private abutting rights of way and are not to be located within 20 feet of any public or private street, public sidewalk, or internal pedestrian way. Additionally, the standards require that large retail establishments have a high degree of onsite pedestrian circulation and connectivity to public sidewalks, and that at least one central feature and community space occupying a minimum of 400 square feet in area be provided for each 40,000 square feet of building. The ordinance allows for patio seating areas, pedestrian plazas, planter walls and other similar amenities to be incorporated into the site design to meet this requirement, which Planning staff feels can adequately be met for the proposed grocery store by the pedestrian plaza that will extend through the parking area, and by the plaza space that will be located at the southwestern corner of the store.

Lastly, non-enclosed areas for the storage and sale of seasonal inventory are required to be defined and permanently screened with walls and/or fences. The applicant needs to identify any such areas and how those areas will be screened.

The Plan Commission may waive one or more of the requirements in Section 33.24(4)(f)4-14 if it determines "that unique or unusual circumstances warrant special consideration to achieve a superior design solution." The Plan Commission will give serious consideration to the recommendations of the Urban Design Commission in determining whether design waivers are warranted for the proposed 58,000 square-foot Copps store. While the Planning Division believes that the proposed store is substantially in conformance with the concept plan for the same included in the approved Amended General Development Plan for Grandview Commons Town Center, staff recognizes that this project does not totally meet every requirement of the large retail establishment ordinance. However, the Urban Design Commission may recommend approval if it finds that the project meets the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

cc: Brian Munson, Vandewalle & Associates
Steven Cover, Director, Dept. of Planning and Community and Economic Development
Brad Murphy, Director, Planning Division
Rebecca Cnare, Planner, Planning Division



Date: November 5, 2012

To: UDC Commission Members

CC: Plan Commission Members, Mayor Soglin, Michael Waidelich, Brad Murphy, Tim Parks

Re: Grandview Commons SIP Plan

Dear Commission Members,

In the McClellan Neighborhood Association by-laws, our mission is, in part, to promote community safety and to protect and enhance the residential character of the area. This is the purpose of the following letter.

Following the initial approval of the zoning change and Comprehensive Plan change to accommodate this project, a letter was submitted to City Planning staff outlining resident concerns associated with this development. To date, most of these concerns have gone unaddressed. Listed below are the most pressing factors that if unaddressed will adversely affect the value and enjoyment of many homeowner's properties in Grandview Commons. We respectfully ask that you review these concerns and consider how the developer could address them prior to granting final approval.

In reference to section 33.24(4) c the following shall be fully contained, which includes a roof in addition to the already indicated walls.

- Loading Dock
- Trash Compaction equipment
- Dumpsters
- Trash collection equipment
- Outdoor Storage
- HVAC units

Hours of Operation:

- Store hours of operation shall be limited from 7 am to 10 pm
- Truck deliveries shall be limited from 7 am to 9 pm.

Lighting:

- Shall be of a design that is dark sky compliant, with additional consideration given to lower lighting levels along the north and east parking lot borders that are adjacent to residential properties.

Mature Tree Preservation:

- In accordance with the amendment proposed by Alder Rummel and approved by City Council in conjunction with this re-zoning and Plan change, all mature trees West of the switch box are to be preserved. Special consideration should be given to the mature trees behind the condo properties on Kilpatrick Dr. which provide natural screening from parking lot and lights.

Rain Garden Management:

- The developer shall provide a detailed plan for upkeep and maintenance of rain gardens indefinitely. Cost of this upkeep (maintenance, dredging and re-planting) shall be the sole responsibility of the developer and not fall to homeowner's association.
- There shall be a plan to control chemical applications to the parking lot which may result in loss or damage to rain garden plantings.

Traffic Calming Devices:

- A detailed plan shall be provided by Veridian to mitigate the effects of increased car trips along residential streets.
- Veridian shall provide funding to the city to accommodate necessary traffic calming measures along Sharpsburg, and Mclean Drives.

Water Feature:

- Fountain water feature shown at earlier UDC, Plan Commission and City Council as a distinguishing factor from other stores has disappeared. The water feature enhances the public space and creates a "sense of place" for people who wish to eat on a bench outdoors. The pergola feature is less of a focal point than the previously depicted water feature.

Respectfully Submitted,
Dean Matuszak, MPNA President
MPNA Board of Directors

Parks, Timothy

Subject: RE: Grandview Commons Mature Trees, circumference and approx ages

From: Neighbors for Responsible Development Grandview Commons [<mailto:gvcnrd@gmail.com>]

Sent: Monday, October 22, 2012 12:51 PM

To: Martin, Al; Rummel, Marsha; dokroley@dorschnerassociates.com; cliffg@eua.com; rslayton@erdman.com; mhuggins@charter.net; luflier@education.wisc.edu; tdmadtown@charter.net; Murphy, Brad; Waidelich, Michael; jaharrin@tds.net

Subject: Grandview Commons Mature Trees, circumference and approx ages

Dear UDC members,

Attached please find a powerpoint that depicts the actual mature trees on the Grandview Commons site that are to be razed. We have an official copy of the SIP provided by Veridian and have ascertained with them during previous summer meetings that they intend to keep only one mature oak on the condo side of the site and it is unclear as to what will be preserved apart from the Spruce trees on the part of the property that abuts the Doric Lodge.

These trees range in age from 115-249 years. They provide valuable screening to condo owners on Kilpatrick, and some backyard screening for several owners in Richmond Hill who face out to Cottage Grove Rd. Aesthetically they contribute great beauty to our neighborhood, provide homes to Red Tailed Hawk and other birds and are historic. They warrant protection and preservation. When City Council approved this proposal last Spring after great debate, Marsha Rummel had insightfully proposed an amendment to protect "all mature trees West of the switch box". It was the addition of this amendment that helped to encourage Council members on the fence to support this project. Consequently, it is now very disappointing to see the developer's blatant disregard for this thoughtful amendment in the plans that Vandewalle and Associates and Rolle Winter Group presented to you last week for initial approval.

The residents of Grandview Commons need you to advocate for the preservation of our quality of life. We purchased our homes here with a very different vision than what is being served to us today. Development on this site needs to occur in a way that does not destroy our community, or expose some of our residents to unnecessary nuisance factors. Razing these trees invites bright parking lot lights and car headlights into the bedrooms and living rooms of our residents.

We hope that you find this powerpoint useful, and are happy to answer any further questions in advance of upcoming meetings if you should have any. Thank you for helping to ensure that this project moves forward in a considerate and responsible manner to the original investors who believed in the Veridian vision.

Sincerely,

Barbara Davis

Grandview Commons Neighbors for Responsible Development Spokesperson

Cell: 314-704-1668

Great Neighborhoods are no accident. They come from those who are willing to protect them.