

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 do 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