

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** January 7, 2009

TITLE: 160 Westgate Mall – New
Construction/Addition/Remodeling of
Retail in Excess of 40,000 Square Feet;
Hy-Vee Grocery Store/Westgate Mall. 20th
Ald. Dist. (12582)

REFERRED:
REREFERRED:
REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary **ADOPTED:** **POF:**

DATED: January 7, 2009 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Chair; Mark Smith, Dawn Weber, Richard Wagner, Richard Slayton, Jay Ferm, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett and John Harrington.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 7, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of new construction/addition/remodeling of a retail center located at 160 Westgate Mall. Since Woods abstained, the Vice-Chair Barnett acted as Chair on this item. Appearing on behalf of the project were Henry A. Gempeler, Pete Hosch, John Brehm, Bob Johnson and William H. Dunlop, all representing Hy-Vee; E. Patrick Listermann and Paul Zarnikow, representing J. Herzog; Matt Paske and Marge Axelsen, representing Westgate Mall; David Schreiber, Kathy Wedig, Nadine Pfothenhauer, Mary Lou Reinwaird, Jim Rodman, Karl Schlenker, Jerry Gulesserian, Theresa Shimmers, Gary Baldarotta and Anne Albrecht. Appearing neither in support nor opposition were Denise Lamb, representing Joint Steering Committee; Chris Schmidt and Mike Slavney, representing the Westmoreland/Midvale Heights Neighborhood Planning Committee; Ed Freer and Judy Skog. Hosch, Brehm and Atty. Gempeler provided an update on the modified plans that was followed by public testimony both for and against the development proposal. Following the presentation, public testimony and discussion by the Commission, Wagner made the motion for referral, seconded by Rummel. The motion stated the Commission's appreciation for the turnout and the significance of Westgate in providing services to the area residents. The motion emphasized the need for the applicant to provide the traffic study, details of the plaza and its design, address concerns stated within the December 17, 2008 report on this item, in addition to the following:

- Still too much hard space in parking lot; need more trees.
- The pharmacy drive-up with liquor next to parking is dangerous; eliminate parking, reduce conflicts.
- The regulations for "big box," require more information to determine if met.
- Provide details on canopies' width and design, and sidewalk width.
- Qualify grade changes between eastern elevation and easterly lot line adjacent to the park.
- Consider the use of a green roof system or PDM roof.
- Provide more articulation of the eastern elevation.
- Proposed plantings in the adjacent park needs a maintenance program.
- Provide more trees in the parking lot.
- Look at grouping of trees in parking lot tree islands and around building.

- Look at pedestrian “desire” lines to determine number and location of parking lot walkways.
- Provide tree islands at an interval of 12-15 parking stalls.
- Plaza treatment critical for “eyes on the street;” especially for the T.J. Maxx façade design.
- Consider bringing cars across front façade with the realignment of the Odana Road drive aisle.
- Fully address traffic related issues per previous review of project including a TDM plan.
- Provide details on pharmacy drive-up, surface parking and Odana Road driveway conflicts.
- Provide a readable chart that identifies parking per tenant lease area.

ACTION:

On a motion by Wagner, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0-1) with Woods abstaining. The motion required address of the above stated concerns.

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 5, 5, 5, 5 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 160 Westgate Mall

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	4	5	6	-	5	5	5
	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
	5	6	6	6	-	4	6-7	6
	5	6	5	5	5	4	5	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	5	5	5	-	-	4-5	-	5

General Comments:

- Not sure why you were at UDC today with all the 11th hour info and not addressing large retail ordinance issues. Support your mission to update mall and hope property owners choose to look at entire mall versus redeveloping grocery store.
- Insufficient progress was made by applicant since last presentation. Solutions for traffic problems need to be presented for project to move forward. Traffic Engineering needs to work with applicant and neighborhood to get to solution.
- Traffic, traffic, traffic. Interesting, good potential but needs to meet neighborhood plan.
- LEED qualified? Good idea. Traffic and circulation is a problem, it must be resolved in a comprehensive way. Look at and plan entire site, not just Hy-Vee area.
- Parking lot access/traffic study is the primary issues.