# **AGENDA#8**

## City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PRESENTED: September 24, 2008

TITLE: 4021 Grand Crossing Road – Amended **REFERRED:** 

PUD-GDP for Retail, Large Retail, Office and Movie Theater. 17<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (10258) **REREFERRED:** 

**REPORTED BACK:** 

AUTHOR: William A. Fruhling, Acting Secretary ADOPTED: POF:

DATED: September 24, 2008 **ID NUMBER:** 

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski; Chair, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, Ald. Marsha Rummel, Ron Luskin, Dawn Weber, Bruce Woods, and John Harrington.

## **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of September 24, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** a request for an amended PUD-GDP for retail, large retail, office and movie theater located at 4021 Grand Crossing Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Henry Gempeler, Katie Falvey, Michael Cummings, Christopher Thiel, and Jeff Tomachek. Falvey stated that they are proposing to construct a facility with 16 movie screens, a bowling alley and a restaurant to serve as an anchor for the project. They are also proposing to construct the internal street system, including the loop street. Cummings reviewed the design for the theater facility and concepts for the "Main Street" buildings. He explained that locating the theater at the end of the street will draw people through that space and make it attractive for retail development. Gempeler noted that the "Main Street" buildings will be built out as the market demands. Thiel described the plaza area design, stating that it could host public activities such as a farmer's market, performances, or art fairs. He also stated that a stormwater management system will be incorporated throughout the site and that LEED certification will be sought for the theater.

The Commission's discussion focused on the following items:

- The amount of surface parking and the possibility of incorporating parking structures now or in the future. It was suggested that a potential future phasing plan could be created to reflect the ultimate potential build-out of the site.
- The location and orientation of buildings on the site (including the placement of parking areas) and whether their relationships would create an engaging environment that would encourage people to walk from building to building.

Ald. Joe Clausius registered in support, noting that he has heard overwhelming support from neighborhoods in the area and from the East Side Business Association.

## **ACTION**:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** a request for an amended PUD-GDP for retail, large retail, office and movie theater located at 4021 Grand Crossing Road, requesting that the applicants address the following:

- 1. Locating the theater so that it is the hub of the overall development (it was noted that this could possibly be achieved in a linear fashion);
- 2. Rethinking the size and location of the parking lot behind the theater;
- 3. Pulling the two proposed larger retail stores closer to the center of the site;
- 4. Exploring a placeholder for a future parking structure (topography should also be considered);
- 5. Considering the orientation/design of the theater building in relation to the northwest winter winds;
- 6. Exploring placing a building, instead of the small parking lot, in front of the theater;
- 7. Enhancing the active spaces along the front of the theater.

The motion was passed on a vote of (5-3) with Slayton, Host-Jablonski and Luskin voting no.

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 3, 5, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9/7.

### URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 4021 Grand Crossing Road

|                | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape<br>Plan | Site<br>Amenities,<br>Lighting,<br>Etc. | Signs | Circulation<br>(Pedestrian,<br>Vehicular) | Urban<br>Context | Overall<br>Rating |
|----------------|-----------|--------------|-------------------|---|-------|---|------------------|-------------------|
| Member Ratings | 5         | -            | 5                 | -                                       | -     | 5   | 6                | 6                 |
|                | -         | -            | -                 | -                                       | -     | -   | -                | 7                 |
|                | 5         | 5            | 5                 | -                                       | -     | 6   | 6                | 5                 |
|                | 5         | -            | -                 | -                                       | -     | 5   | -                | -                 |
|                | -         | 7            | -                 | -                                       | -     | -   | 2                | 3                 |
|                | 7         | 6            | 7                 | 8                                       | -     | 7   | 7                | 9*/7              |
|                | 7         | 7            | 6                 | -                                       | -     | 7   | 6                | 8                 |
|                | -         | -            | -                 | -                                       | -     | -   | -                | 5                 |
|                |           |              |                   |   |       |   |                  |                   |
|                |           |              |                   |   |       |   |                  |                   |

### General Comments:

- Lots of potential, but not quite there.
- Interesting pedestrian main street concept with activity in contrast to existing east side site. Comments were in support of that exciting goal.
- Too much parking.
- Sorry, but this is just not good urban design. It is a small suburban mall with a "lifestyle" strip next to it. It is a drive-to destination, not the neighborhood center that was originally approved.
- \*On saving the tree. Isolated doesn't mean affording poor design. "Kalwall" windows at bowling alley. Two sided buildings around plaza. Architecture fine. Not an issue of parking count specifically, but placement of buildings.
- Not even a good example of suburban retail center hoping you will create a great place.