

## AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> February 15, 2012
TITLE: 857 Jupiter Drive – Amended PUD-GDP for Grandview Commons Town Center for 109,000 Square Feet of Future Retail/Office, a 24,000 Square Foot Library and 100 Multi-Family Units. 3 <sup>rd</sup> Ald. Dist. (24689)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: February 15, 2012	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Melissa Huggins, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Melissa Huggins and Henry Lufler.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of February 15, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of an Amended PUD-GDP for Grandview Commons Town Center located at 857 Jupiter Drive. Appearing in support of the project were Jeff Rosenberg and Brian Munson, representing Veridian Homes. Registered and speaking in support were Tonya Nye, Troy Nye, Craig Thompson, Dan Haider, Alisa Allen, Rick Fatke, Janice Munizza, Jeff Fuller, Mark Opitz, Dan Brinkman and Greg Miller. Registered in support but not wishing to speak were Linda Baldwin, Kristina Hauser, Donna Crane, Thomas Breister, Patricia Breister, Jean Bachhuber, Buckley Brinkman, Victoria L. Clark, Jasmine Rogness, Jeff Wunderlin, Donald Marcy, Sandra Marcy, Arlene Patt, Susan K. River, Charles R. Hilston, Sheldon S. Frank, Virginia A. Frank, Richard A. Deeving, Katie Lowe, Mark Proeschel, Jennifer Klug, Darren Klawtter, Jerry Benisch, Jesse Benisch, Norbert Rebholz, Jayne Paquette, Ann Matyas, Chris Winter, Lynn Lemberger, Kimberly Topel, Dale Royer, Fred H. Marshall, Ruby McFarlane, Charles Hicklin and Taya Dolsen. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Joe Massan, Tim Allen, Roger Guest, Mike Schmitt and Dan Day.

Registered and speaking in opposition were Paul Reilly, John Driscoll, Barbara Davis, Greg Cieslewicz, Alan Auby, Erin Thornley, Lucy Gibson, Dean Matuszak, Heather McFadden, Jill Schaefer and Karen TeRonde. Registered in opposition but not wishing to speak were Diane Flynn, Peter Anderson, Sarah Herwig, Denise DeMarb, Tony Peterangelo, Katie Peterangelo, Joe Wirag, Cindy Glaeden-Knott, Robert Hogan, Nick Schroeder, Nancy McVary, Tom McVary, Tammy Rozek, RoseMary Jackson, Michael Knott, Mike TeRonde, Jan Zadra, Georgette Horne, Carolyn A. Montgomery, Robert Montgomery, Tara White, Lisa Rajkovich, Nicole Jenkel, Basel Taha, Joel Chapiewsky and Geoff Hoffman. Registered in opposition and available to answer questions were Brenda Walkoush and Tiffany Taha.

Registered and speaking neither in support nor opposition was Ken Golden.

Rosenberg touched on what he felt were mistruths about this project. He does not feel there is overwhelming opposition to this project, just that perhaps the opposition is louder. A petition has been circulated with 125 signatures in favor of the grocery store. This parcel has already been approved for 150,000 square feet of retail and the arterials have been constructed for that, as well as 3-4 parking stalls per 1,000. It is also an option to build 197 units of apartments. The rumor that Roundy's has not been willing to negotiate on the design is untrue. They want to be a responsible member of the City of Madison. From the beginning of the proposal until now, Roundy's has done the following: removal of the street east of the store; removal of the drive-thru as a component of their pharmacy; the reduction of square footage from 70,000 to 62,000 to 58,000; they've reduced their parking to 3.2 per 1,000, which is less than the already approved parking count; shared parking for the neighborhood town center and the cooperative parking with the library; enhanced architecture; the idling restrictions have been decreased to five minutes, as well as a reduction in terms of hours of operation and delivery times; and they have eliminated all of their non-compete clauses because they grasp this town center concept. Rosenberg further stated that they spent many months going over the topography, going through 10 different cross sections to show the different heights; to show how much thought went into the topography. The streets can handle the increased traffic through a study done; the entire build out will be handled in 2032. They have spent years taking a look at different locations for this on the property and still believe this is the best location. Veridian has fought very hard for this project and its theme of new urbanism; they set the standard for this particular community. Rosenberg questioned what happens to the future mixed-use neighborhoods, without TIF money, if the Commission turns this proposal down tonight? Those are the undisputed facts. People are entitled to their own opinions but they are not entitled to their own facts.

Munson continued the presentation, touching on why they are still pursuing this plan instead of building the 197 apartment units. The economic model does not support the original idea. If it can't be done in Grandview Commons that has an implication towards the balance of mixed-use pieces throughout the City. They looked at the original zoning and intent of the site and it was always intended to be the civic core of the neighborhood. It's giving people a way to walk and a place to walk to. They looked at all of the full service grocery stores in the City of Madison. They have reduced the square footage of retail, increased the square footage for the library, decreased the residential unit count, and decreased the parking count. This led to the proposal that is on the table today. The western side of the site, the heart of the town center, did not work for the site of the grocery store because of the establishment of the village green which changed the block shaping. Subsequent decisions have discounted this further because the parking would go to the east; they are proposing a public street in front of where the store would have been to the west. The final piece was the loading, which is often behind the front door. Copp's would not support that and that would put the loading dock across the street from the Great Dane. The second site was a central location to bring the store as close as they could to the town center. This would put the loading docks along Gemini Drive, flipping the relationship of the store and parking lot. It brings the building closer but the function farther away, facing the entry door towards the east. It also moves the parking field further east and eliminates the ability to supply shared parking to the library. The final determination was the location on the east creates a balancing point between several components: it has a functional relationship between the front of the store and the town center; it allows for the creation of a public street and the establishment of a 400-foot block spacing throughout the project to maximize shared parking and keep it walkable; and it separates the loading.

Munson then moved onto architecture, showing a Roundy's store in Mequon which is being used as the platform for this project. He highlighted some of the components in this model, including renderings showing the various views from different directions. There is glass, brick and stone all around the project and screening is being taken into consideration. This will be very different from other grocery stores in the Madison area. The site grading was looked at again; cross sections were shown from North Starr down to McClean. As you walk through the site, you see that the urban plaza is up from North Starr, which makes that plaza space interact with the street. There is a 5-foot grade change on the western end of the parking lot that continues to slope down at

about 4-feet to the front of the store. To the north of the store is another area they looked at very closely. The parking lot treatment is very important and has been refined with dividing the parking lot by replacing the drive aisle with a walking connection with Gemini Drive. A slight adjustment on the western end would accomplish moving vehicles that enter from Gemini Drive will be directed first to the north where parking is, but it also directs the pedestrian flow along to the south, making for movement that is complementary. This breaks up the parking lot into three components: parking lot of 86 stalls to the south, 138 stalls to the north and 69 stalls to the east, completely shared by everyone. They have worked hard to bring the parking counts down as low as they can, as well as making it as comfortable as possible for pedestrians. They recognize the separation from Cottage Grove Road and the need for screening. One concept shows a series of angular walls for architectural and landscape elements forming that screening buffer. Another example shows something like an "Edgewood Fence," creating a sense of enclosure along the street through a combination of brick walls, piers and fencing. There is ample room to create both of those elements along Cottage Grove Road. The transportation system was looked at very closely with a traffic impact analysis, as well as close work with Traffic Engineering. All the turning movements were looked at to enhance and welcome pedestrian activity. They talked about the potential for mapping bike routes that aren't currently established. They have had conversations with Madison Metro, which currently does not serve this larger area of the Sprecher neighborhood. The design accommodates bus service, even though budget restrictions have not facilitated that service; the creation of the town center could spur transit to this location. Regional truck routing was looked at very closely; they designed it so as the trucks would come in off Cottage Grove Road and north out the parking lot back to Cottage Grove Road, so the trucks do not have to go through the residential neighborhoods.

Comments from registrants were as follows:

Ken Golden spoke neither in support nor opposition, as someone who was deeply involved in creating this neighborhood, which was very innovative and new. He was also the lead sponsor of the big box ordinance. He listened very intently to Jeff Rosenberg and Brian Munson and stated that he did not know if some of the information in his handout was incorrect (he did parking counts without including shared parking). He acknowledged how hard this process can be and feels perhaps a middle ground can be reached. Rummel inquired about Golden's thoughts on being successful at building new urbanist neighborhoods, but how does the City add the commercial piece and make that successful. Golden responded by saying new urbanism does not anticipate commercial models very well. We have a nation that does big boxes and neighborhoods that don't want big boxes. Having an anchor use is very important. Having a grocery store is absolutely critical to the town center and the concept, it will spawn other commercial ventures. He doesn't know enough about the grocery business to know what their economic model is. He mentioned that Trader Joe's is 12,000 square feet and that many students walk over from the Regent Street Apartments, something he didn't anticipate; Trader Joe's gets a lot of walk in traffic. He hopes this neighborhood would have that level of walk in use.

Paul Reilly spoke of great disappointment after three UDC meetings that the design has not changed, it's still a big box. This was about more than pretty pictures, it's about rezoning to accommodate a land sale that might ultimately come in for a grocery store. Yes it has been reduced from 70,000 to 58,000 square feet, it's still a big box and just because you start off with something very unreasonable, that's not necessarily movement. The neighborhood has no assurance that there ever will be a town center; the developer could not give us a timeline for that development. The traffic study was not completed; it says Cottage Grove Road can handle the traffic but it doesn't say how it will get there. People will cut through existing neighborhoods, and just 10% of that neighborhood cutting through is 1,000 vehicles per day. What is a parking lot going to add to the tax base?

Tonya Nye spoke as a Grandview Commons resident and Veridian employee. She helped create the farmer's market in Grandview Commons, and stated that many neighbors walk home with several bags of groceries. She stated that 46 lots have been sold and the majority of those were sold because of the grocery store possibility.

Having Roundy's come into their neighborhood is very beneficial. She chose this neighborhood because of the location and the vision of the town center.

John Driscoll spoke in opposition as a current board member of the McClellan Neighborhood Association. They looked far and wide when shopping for their new home and chose Grandview Commons for the town center. However, this presentation tonight, and what has been presented for the last two years, is not what they were told was going to happen. This is big box sprawl and if they had been told initially they would not have purchased this home. What he heard from Plan Commission members were three primary things: It's too big, it's in the wrong place, and this massive concrete parking lot is too large. Two years later it's still too big, still in the wrong place, and the massive asphalt parking lot is still there. It wasn't acceptable two years ago and it's not acceptable tonight. The surrounding neighborhoods have been battered by this for two years and it's time to put this to rest. He asked the Commission to deny this project; if they choose referral he asked that they include the following conditions: the size must not exceed current Madison big box standards, the location must be moved back to the commercial area as it's shown in the current neighborhood plan, and decrease the massive parking lot.

Troy Nye spoke as a Grandview resident. The ability to walk to a neighborhood store is something he is very excited about. He is disappointed that the only side the Commission seems to be paying attention to is the opposition. He finds misleading information out there to misdirect neighbors. Even the alders go out of their way to discourage their constituents from approving this. Copp's would be an anchor that would help this town center succeed. Just because the opposition has been the loudest does not make them the majority.

Barbara Davis spoke in opposition and began by stating that the Nye family has indeed owned two homes in the Grandview neighborhood, the first one near the town center, but the second one on the other side of the neighborhood, away from the proposed grocery store. Very little in this proposal has changed. Rather than decrease the size of the parking lot as has been requested, they have added a fountain in the middle of the lot. Veridian isn't listening to the Commission or the people who bought their homes. She reiterated that the neighborhood is not opposed to a grocery store, but it is their place to say when something is not appropriate. She suggested that Veridian is using employees and residents of other Veridian developments to sway the people in Grandview Commons. The starting point has to be the original town center across from the Great Dane with 25,000 square feet of grocery store development. It is irresponsible development to allow a 58,000 square foot grocery store at this location. She distributed a copy of a flyer given to residents of assisted living.

Craig Thompson spoke as a resident of Richmond Hill in support of the development. He hasn't voiced his support until now out of respect for some of his neighbors, and he wanted the opposition to gain as many concessions as possible from the developer. However, at some point he has grown tired of some of the rhetoric heard and he finds those tactics unfortunate. He feels the last UDC meeting was skewed in terms of opposition; he thinks the opposition is just more vocal. He was impressed with the Commission's discussion and getting to the heart of the conversation. At some point in time the economics are the economics.

Greg Cieslewicz spoke as a resident of Richmond Hill. He stated that at the Commission's previous meeting Mr. Rosenberg was asked if he would be willing to come with something completely different, to think outside the (big) box. What you got tonight were new pictures and fancy drawings. Nothing substantive has changed from the development you were ready to reject. He did say he would come back with a new design, which is a different answer than the residents have received. The biggest change seen from Veridian is a PR campaign, no changes to the store and parking lot. Proponents have made a variety of suggestions, all of which have been ignored. They are capable of building stores that fit their surroundings. He encouraged the Commission to ask Veridian to start over.

Dan Hider spoke in very strong support of this proposal. He wants this proposal. He wants the town center and a large grocery store, so he can do his full shopping there and stop on the way home from work. He wants to be able to walk there whenever he wants. Moving the store nearer the Interstate won't work, leaving this lot empty another decade because we think we'll get a smaller grocery store doesn't cut it. When he started looking to buy a house, he found this neighborhood was very well planned. The major arterials of Cottage Grove Road and Sprecher Road can handle the increased traffic. Grandview Commons is a great mixture of the old and the new; City planners and Veridian had the concept right. The only thing he ever thought was wrong with the plan was the small grocery store.

Alan Auby spoke in opposition, surprised that Veridian came back with a proposal revision that virtually didn't change anything. This proposal is so much different from what they expected when they purchased their property and they are very concerned. They did an informal survey in their neighborhood and he read an excerpt of a letter from one of the residents, Alan Sweet to Al Martin, Secretary of the Urban Design Commission. Mr. Sweet stated that of 76 units in their Birchwood Ridge condominium. The bottom line of the results is that 73% of the owners did not want a large retail store at all, and/or the projected size was clearly in excess of what they deemed reasonable. The Roundy's proposal does not fit in with the new urbanism look and feel of Grandview Commons.

Alisa Allen spoke as a member of a group of residents that first met last fall in support of the project. Now that all voices have been heard, this group of residents represents over 25 years of combined neighborhood services (neighborhood associations, park groups, etc.), and do not represent the developers, Roundy's or the City of Madison. They took away a commitment of sharing the information that is accessible to everyone and be a safe place for everyone to state their opinion. During that time they met with the developers and asked for information. She stated that they are the team who put out flyers, not Veridian or the developers, and they created the website. The biggest trigger for that was the feedback they heard regarding virtually no support for the project. Their site did include a petition form to help people feel more comfortable with speaking out. Unfortunately experience has shown that if you voice your support for the project, you best be ready for unsolicited emails and letters. They have over 125 petitioners signed to date, they did their due diligence and checked with the Assessor's Office to verify these petitioners; 122 of those petitions were from the Madison area including one from Verona, one from Monona and two from Sun Prairie; they do not know how they received two from out of state. 102 are from the 3 neighborhood association areas closest to the site.

Erin Thornley spoke in opposition. She was surprised at the anger shown by some people in the community. She's very fond of living in the Grandview neighborhood and has concern that this process has created a lack of trust because it seems that people have not been listened to in the community. As it moves forward there has been an arrogance and a feeling that this is moving forward no matter what, and that the developer doesn't really care what the neighborhood has to say. She does not want the neighborhood compromised in this way. She asked the Commission to look at the motivation behind trying to shut people down and building a store that is oversized for the community.

Rick Fatkey spoke as a Grandview resident since 2005 because he and his wife loved the new urbanism concept. They were expecting the same kind of walkable neighborhood with retail nodes as promised and have yet to see any of that. He thinks the Copp's store is a great idea and better than a smaller sized store. A boutique grocery store is of no interest to him. This is a much better idea and the concept is much better now than when it was originally proposed. The developer has gone a long way to address the concerns of many of the people in the neighborhood and the town center will be a great addition to the neighborhood. Having walkable retail is only going to increase the value of these homes.

Janice Munizza spoke in support. She moved from downtown in 2007 and did a lot of looking around and found Grandview Commons. She moved there because it was a new urban development. That is why she bought her home there. In order for that new urbanism to happen, she is firmly grounded in reality that they have to have something as an anchor to the town center that will be economically sustainable, and she sees Copp's as fitting that bill. She marvels at the way this plan has evolved. We just need to stick with the facts.

Lucy Gibson spoke in opposition as a resident of the Elvejem neighborhood. It has been her experience over the years that developers make promises that are not contracts. She wonders why people who moved into this neighborhood were promised a 25,000 square foot grocery store and are now fighting against a 58,000 square foot store. The idea of a two-story store and underground parking would help a lot. She would very much like a walkable grocery store but her biggest concern is the viability of the mall at the corner of Acewood Boulevard and Cottage Grove Road, which is currently struggling. The Sentry people claim that their store would likely go under if this Copp's goes through. She quoted Jeff Rosenberg as saying "If they come in with a store that doesn't look like this you have every right to remind them." If the plan is approved, what will actually be built?

Jeff Fuller spoke as a supporter of the project. People do walk with their grocery bags. He doesn't go to small stores to do big shopping and would much rather shop at Copp's in his neighborhood rather than the one in Monona. A small store isn't going to make it. There are a lot of people in the area that are in support and a lot in opposition. It's better to have the store and library instead of empty land. It needs an anchor that is economically viable.

Dean Matussek spoke as a board member of the MPA neighborhood association. He commended the Commission for seeing the same drawings over and over. He brought up the Commission's request of Mr. Rosenberg to bring back something that is different and that he agreed to, but did not produce. He sees this as a regional grocery store rather than a neighborhood one because of the traffic it will generate and it will come into his subdivision (approximately 8,000 per day). In Veridian's plans it talks about comprehensive review and redesign of the town center to move the mixed-use forward as a walkable town center from idea to reality and that hasn't happened. He researched new urbanism and found "it promotes the creation of construction of diverse, walkable, compact, viable mixed-use communities composed of the same components as conventional but are assembled in a more integrated fashion." This grocery store is not integrated. There is no mixed-use and they have not presented that.

Mark Opitz spoke as a resident of Middleton adjacent to the Copp's in Middleton Hills and also disclosed that he is a planner for the City of Middleton and served 12 years on the County Board. He shared the debate they had in Middleton in 2003-2004. For 8 years the Middleton Hills development was vacant and was zoned to have small shopfront development. The retail component was supposed to have 35,000 square feet including grocery, 30-39 housing units, office space and parking (288). What ended up being built was quite a bit more retail, more than double, including the grocery store, no office space, slightly less housing, apartments above the shops and 40 additional parking spaces. The original proposal presented to the City was problematic; the original vision, however, did not contemplate a vacant town center. Several opponents filed lawsuits. Ultimately after a year of working with the developers and Roundy's to revise the site plan and address important design issues, the City approved the project. Why did the City approve it? City policies state that grocery stores belong in residential areas. If this hadn't been located in Middleton Hills, Copp's would have been along the Beltline or the periphery. Now it's commonplace to see residents walking with grocery bags. The results: no traffic problems with traffic, property values have appreciated greater than the city average. The biggest problems are the bright lights in the parking lot and the shopping carts you sometimes see along the street. He has seen every single one of the leaders of the opposition shopping in that store. He believes the anchor store is necessary to make the town center come alive, the building is optimally located and the square footage compromise is reasonable, the shared parking, bicycle accommodation and the grocery store will be buffered from existing residences by new

development, in contrast to Middleton Hills where there was a 50-unit condo building 50-feet away from where the loading dock was built. It sounds like Madison has already received more concessions than Middleton did. Not only is structured parking not viable but it would lift up the building and that would be a design issue. Rummel asked how long after the grocery store was built did the retail follow. Opitz replied that it was a condition of approval that all the buildings be developed but it took the anchor to bring the other stores there. The services all originally envisioned are there, it's just that how it was designed was the key. Ald. Cnare mentioned the concept of liner buildings; essentially the Copp's building is there and other buildings are butted up against it, with a fire wall in between and asked Opitz to elaborate on that. He responded that that took awhile to develop and may actually still have a vacancy. There are no rear entrances to the shops, which is the main complaint from tenants. The entire town center has developed. The original neighborhood commercial node was limited to the Prairie Café; there was no demand for such a small sized store. Ald. Cnare further inquired Mr. Opitz's take on the parking lot issue in terms of number of stalls. He replied that Middleton Hills has about 330 stalls and the parking is rather congested.

Heather McFadden spoke, thanking everyone for listening and applauded both sides for speaking. She is a proud member of Grandview Commons Neighbors for Responsible Development. They aren't against development, but are for responsible development. This to her is not a grocery, it's a mega-mart. They have 6 grocery stores within 6 miles. The neighborhood has 98% car ownership which to her does not warrant a store that offers 55,000 items. It's sacrificing a group that doesn't have the same privileges as the people in her neighborhood have. The town center is another issue as it will be built only if economic forces are there. Given that she is a State employee with an 8% reduction in pay, she cannot afford to spend extra money on boutique shopping. She thinks many of the other neighborhood residents are also losing income during these economic times, which means the town center may never be viable. The Cub Foods east sits empty, no developer has come in and taken it over. This is increasing their carbon footprint. She worries about the increased use of heroin and what it will mean to have a parking lot that is three football fields long, given the changing tide of drug users in Madison.

Jill Schaefer spoke as a resident on the opposite end of the neighborhood of where the store will be built. She cares a lot about her neighborhood. When she moved to the Grandview neighborhood in 2010, her Veridian salesman and other Veridian employees all discussed the plan for a 25,000 square foot grocery store. They used words like neighborhood size, family size, small, comparable to the Sentry on Cottage Grove Road. The idea of a town center was a selling point for us and we took Veridian at their word of what we could expect in the future. She does not see anything innovative about putting a big box store in a residential neighborhood. She is concerned with the increase in traffic; just because these roads can handle the increased traffic doesn't mean they should, given the proximity of homes and people. The parking lot is entirely too large for the area. The scale is inappropriately large. In addition to noise, light and air pollution large stores often generate a lot of litter, and what will happen to all the rainwater that pours down on 400 parking spaces. She is bothered that Roundy's has not or will not provide the number of unique visitors expected at this store every day; citizens have a right to know how many people will be coming into their neighborhood and the lack of transparency is suspicious and disturbing.

Dan Brinkman spoke as part of the design team. For 14 years it's been his job to find retail use for Grandview Commons; he was here tonight to say he hadn't done the job he wished he had. He wasn't going to speak tonight but after listening to the testimony felt he had to. He hears the neighborhood saying they want a grocery store that would be a vital part of the community, but it should be smaller; and the developer is being obstinate by not agreeing to lower the square footage. He spent 14 years looking for that middle ground. A grocer with a 25,000 store is not coming. The density isn't there, the development surrounding it isn't there, and he's leased to 100's of business over the years. People are saying Copp's is great but we want a smaller store because that's our vision. A smaller store is not viable, he can't find a smaller store, and even if he could he would not advise

them to come here because there are experts that want to come to this place and said only one thing, that it needs to be viable with enough square footage. They've been very flexible on everything else. He is not in a position to tell Roundy's they are incorrect in how they run their stores. He urged the Commission to consider false choices. If you let the perfect get in the way of the good, there will be no grocery store and no town center. Rummel asked if this store were to be created, what retail uses would be attracted to locating there. Brinkman replied mostly supportive services, food uses, neighborhood services like dry cleaning, smaller restaurants, specialty retail, liquor stores. Rummel asked if it is just fast food but Brinkman stated it's finer grain because they cannot do drive-thrus at this location, which will eliminate a lot of opportunistic site users; these are very innovative plans. Rummel further stated that this body is not charged with economic uses, but if they are to accept this larger format that goes against everything that has been approved, she would like comfort that enough research has been done and a sense of what to expect will come; it would be more helpful. Brinkman answered that his serious contacts were over 130 business for that area, including restaurants, beauty salons, grocers, across the whole spectrum.

Karen TeRonde spoke in opposition because she finds it very disturbing that something can't be changed with the size of the grocery store. Her house is located where the truck entrance is and does not want to sit on her back deck and look at the back of a building and all the trucks coming in and out. She's baffled that something of this size (big box) would go in such a location. She is worried about congestion. Veridian has talked about what a wonderful view there will be; but what about the views of the residents? Not in her lifetime will landscaping be grown enough to block her views.

Greg Miller spoke and stated this is the best concept he has seen. He moved to Grandview for the town center, he wants to retire here and the town center will not be viable if the grocery store is decreased in size. Big box is a misnomer for this store, it's medium-sized.

Comments and questions from the Commission was as follows:

- What happens if the town center never happens? I hear this town center as being a key core value. What would it look like if that never happens?
  - We're asking for a rezoning to an amended GDP to bring what is currently zoned Agriculture for the Door Lodge parcel, and the unbuilt portions of the town center into an Amended General Development Plan. There is a request to modify the neighborhood plan and the Comprehensive Plan, because of the store size. Nothing happened in Grandview by accident. They are asking for the change in zoning because what is approved cannot be built. We have to go to an economically viable model. The SIP will set the site plan parameters. We put a lot of protections in there to make sure the first component is done well. The rest of the project will be phased. They anticipate the incorporation of the anchor grocery store will be the spur that gets all the other stores. As in Middleton Hills, you can't have all the supportive services without the grocery store.
  - The answer is almost a rhetorical question. At the end of the day we still have 40% of Grandview Commons left to go. That's the risk of the developer. We're not asking for any money from anybody else, we believe it's going to happen. Mark Opitz told you that's exactly what happened in a community right next to ours. This is revenue neutral for us. We're banking on the fact that this completes the vision for the neighborhood. We believe if we build this magnificent neighborhood, with the grocery store and the library, all these businesses that have talked to us will come.
  - The proposal for the GDP is for the entire town center.
- The original town center site plan, I want to commend you on that portion of the redesign because it's much better. It's tighter and has a much better feel. The original is very suburban, it's not truly a center.



If you compare that to the current proposal, leaving aside the grocery store, it's much improved and I like it. I would note that in your descriptions of what could be in this zoning district, I think there needs to be some residential uses as part of your town center; it clearly works in Middleton Hills and will be a very important part of this. I'm concerned that the density is going down. I don't think we should be going down, we should be going up; you're adding five more acres, going down is suburban.

- There's still a bit of a form, we want that mixture of uses and accommodate some flexibility but 130 units still allows for upper floor residential on the majority of the sites.

That's helpful, but I don't want to see the density go down in terms of the retail. You need a lot of activity and a lot of people in order to be successful. Don't let the additional five acres of land and the larger grocery store than you anticipated take away from that idea, it should be adding to it.

- Planning is going to insist on those multi-residential units.

I would have loved to see residential on top of the grocery store. I know Roundy's may be totally opposed to that but I think it would go a long way to mitigating the fact that this is a neighborhood grocery store.

- I concur on keeping the density high and increasing the residential.
- Normally when you come back you tell us what changed, and I'm not sure what you changed.
  - We explained it poorly last time, but we changed a lot. The truck pattern has changed to incorporate changes from Traffic. Essentially the plan itself was not explained properly. We spent a lot of time looking at cross-sections to incorporate all the comments and concerns. We didn't look at any major geographical, architectural or cosmetic changes, other than some of the minor tweaks we had looked at, but I just don't believe that we did a great job of trying to explain it the first time.
  - We spent most of the time testing the ideas embedded in the plan. We reevaluated the decisions that were made previously to see if we did miss an opportunity and I think that's reflected here tonight. We have to balance the economics and design. There's not a silver bullet out there that would make this all fall together.
- Are there restricted hours for the truck deliveries?
  - Yes, the zoning restricts it to between 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. We looked very closely at the truck routing.
- Cottage Grove Road is used by semi traffic as it is?
  - Yes.
- I'd like to point out that when we ask developers to see about asking their neighbor to go in on a shared parking arrangement, this parking arrangement with the clusters if buildings is ideal. You're not competing for the same stalls, they're on opposite ends. The number of stalls you have, do you see perhaps a 5% reduction being workable or a 5% increase as it grows?
  - What we're showing right now is location, geography and the fact that we don't have bus services, as of yet.

Is the Copp's on University Avenue a similar size to this Copp's?

That Copp's store is actually smaller but I believe it has a larger parking ratio.

It looks about the same size and arrangement with anchors on either side of that parking lot.

- Are there any opportunities for sustainability for stormwater management?
  - Possibly. The stormwater component is going to happen in several places. We have to test soil conditions first for rain gardens. The stormwater itself will be folded into the Grandview Commons neighborhood and we'll be expanding a basin to the north. Now stormwater pre-treatment will be required. In terms of individual techniques for sites, we welcome discussion but it's dependant on individual sites.
- Ald. Jill Johnson spoke to the various facts floating around. At the last UDC you had said there are no grocery stores within miles of this neighborhood. I would like to hear the distances to other grocery stores.

- We looked at any source of food, regardless of size, so this covers PDQ to Woodman's. It's a little over a mile to the Sentry on Cottage Grove Road, 3 miles to Piggly Wiggly, and a little over 3 miles directly in a straight line to the Woodman's on Milwaukee Street. What you'll notice are clusters of grocery stores throughout the City. There are areas that are underserved and this area east of the Interstate is definitely one of them.

One of the people who spoke tonight said that as late as 2010 home buyers were being told the grocery store would be 25,000 square feet but you've been telling us you've been looking at stores for 10 years. Why would homeowners be told in January of 2010 that you anticipated a smaller store?

- I'm not aware that homeowners were told that this would be 25,000 square feet. It was in the original zoning but it's not a part of any of our sales materials. It could be diligent homeowners who read the original zoning but I am not aware of any organization that went out and promoted a limitation of 25,000 square feet on the grocery store.

Had you concerned a different paradigm, instead of grocery store leads us to town center, have you ever considered we get more rooftops and then we get the grocery store. One of my constituents mentioned he had talked to Willy Street recently and the answer was they would be very interested if this neighborhood built out more. I'm left with thinking has anyone thought about shifting this paradigm to get more rooftops and get to the store that was the original vision. Everybody goes home happy. Some flexible alternative which is more in keeping with the original intent, with the grassroots folks that are in opposition and more in keeping with the Comprehensive Plan and the neighborhood plan.

- So what you're suggesting is the lands stay vacant until we get Willy Street comfortable enough to purchase the site? I can't answer the question until I'm sure I understand it.

I'm thinking of the density to support the store. Instead of imposing what I still say is a big box, and I asked the Planning Unit Director if this can be called a big box and he said absolutely it's a big box. So instead of what I regard as imposing a big box in existing residential, what about having the rooftops support the density and then you can get to something that's more in keeping with other things we've done, like Trader Joe's. My concern still comes back to the type of project that's before us. This is never about yes store or no store, this discussion has always been about this particular proposal. Could one entertain a different paradigm?

Let me just say that this is a debate for the Common Council and maybe the Plan Commission, but it's not an urban design debate. We have a proposal before us for design and I think we can comment on the design but whether the City wants a development strategy one way or the other I think is beyond what our charge is.

- 10:00 p.m. for trucks coming in seems a bit late to me and I wonder if you could address possibly shortening those hours. Could you also talk about what a covered loading dock looks like.
  - Middleton Hills does include a garage door that comes down in front of the loading docks. I've never seen the loading doors down. They do have a roof and sides. It also functions as a warehouse inside. It does have some design components to help enclose the loading. As part of an SIP it's something we can consider. We have looked at screening walls adjacent to it, we've also looked at orienting it north away from the homes. We've tried through both placement and orientation to restrict those. We've addressed loading through landscaping; we've set aside space east of the loading dock, north and south for additional landscape treatments to enclose that as much as possible. We'd have to talk to Roundy's about changing the truck loading hours. Roundy's has a central warehouse and they do their scheduling.
- I think there are a few spots in the parking lot that we can improve. But in terms of the GDP in front of us, I'm comfortable.
- The 50 residential units, where are they in the GDP? The GDP map doesn't show the location.

- This map shows one development scenario. The allocation and approval in the zoning was for 110-130 residential units, allowed on all sites within the neighborhood mixed-use center. Those could be a component of any building as they move forward to the SIP stage, predominantly in upper floor uses.

You identify on the concept plan to have the 50 units but the map doesn't show where those units are going to be.

- On Page 20 it goes building by building.

Right, but it doesn't show where it's going to be.

At no point does it say "and residential."

- That should be modified to be retail or residential.

- I was really struck by the 55,000 products that will be at this store. Frankly, do you need that many products? Is that sustainable and what new urbanism is? That's a different discussion.
  - We are evolving and if we had 20 more years...but it's going to take a long time.
- When you go to the Copp's in Middleton Hills, you come in and exit off of Century Avenue. You don't take a drive through the neighborhoods and I think this will be a similar situation. You can go in and shop and you leave, this accommodates the neighborhood very nicely.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by O'Kroley, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-1) with Rummel voting no. The motion passed with the following conditions:

- The density of the retail shall at least remain at the 135,000 square feet as in the original town center; the applicant shall explore how the 58,000 square feet could be incorporated into the density.
- The applicant shall include at least as many dwelling units as were in the original town center.
- The applicant shall return with information on how those would be integrated into the development, and explore what the increase in heights should be in some of those mixed-use buildings.
- Identify on the Revised General Development Plan Map where the fifty residential units will be; as noted within the text.

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 is 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 857 Jupiter Drive**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6