

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: October 3, 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 3, 2012

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Marsha Rummel, Richard Slayton, Henry Lufler, Melissa Huggins and Cliff Goodhart.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 3, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item at the request of District 3 Alder Cnare. Registered and speaking in opposition was Barbara Davis.

Ald. Cnare, District 3 spoke to ask the Commission to refer this item. All Commissioners received a memo from Planning staff at the last minute. Ald. Cnare considered this highly unfair to ask Commissioners and the development team to absorb this information at the last minute.

Wagner pointed out the importance of having written staff comments to review ahead of time. If this is one of the process changes to occur it needs to be executed with some skill.

Barbara Davis spoke in opposition, stating that many of the issues that originally caused resistance to this project are still unresolved. The most critical issues fall into nuisance factors and the acoustic impact. The developer was not open taking the suggestion into consideration that the dumpster and loading dock be enclosed. The new application still has loading docks and dumpsters open. Residents who live in close proximity will be greatly impacted. The applicant cites the idling ordinance; there will be trucks idling when the temperature is above 80 degrees or below 40 degrees, which is a good part of the year and could be any time during the day. One of the stipulations that allowed this project to pass the City Council is the preservation of mature trees west of the switchbox. In looking at the condos on Gemini Drive, the backyard houses four mature trees; three of those are not depicted in the developer's application. They've gone to great lengths to show where a tree would be preserved but they haven't pointed out what won't be preserved. Those trees were there when the condos were purchased and will serve as screening from the parking lot lights. There has been discussion about how the community is going to manage the landscaping; the neighborhood has not received an answer as to who financially is responsible for this maintenance.

ACTION:

On a motion by Lufler, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-0).