

02319

Agenda item #23

Phone calls received in the Council Office re: Whole Foods

Date	Name	Address/phone	Support	Oppose	Comments
4/29	Ann Lewis	Hilldale Neighborhood Resident		X	Supports PC decision
5/1	Joyce Hoffman	District 14		X	Size, design wrong for n'hood
5/1	Connie McCabe	District 11		X	
5/1	Gary Humphrey	4709 Lafayette Dr. (Dist. 11)		X	Sentry is adequate for the area
5/1	Robert & Delores Tramen	4425 Hillcrest Dr. (Dist. 11)		X	Don't go against the Plan Commission's recommendation
5/1	Bill Hoyt	3 Waupaca Ct. (Dist. 11)		X	Don't think you know better than the Plan Commission; follow their recommendation
5/1	Dr. Charles Larkin	525 Charles Ln. (Dist. 11)		X	
5/1	Betty Bodenheimer	District 19		X	
5/1	Nola Dupuis	3514 Lucia Crest (Dist. 11)		X	Too much parking space vs. what Sentry gets; Sentry has been a good neighbor for many years
5/1	Nancy Williams	District 11		X	
5/1	Jody Alexander	426 N. Segoe Road, Apt. B77		X	Support Sentry
5/1	Delores Liamba	5315 Manitowoc Parkway		X	Opposes Whole Foods
5/1	Harold & Thelma Rasmussen	2850 Barlow Street		X	Opposes Whole Foods project
5/1	Ann Walker	Shorewood Hills		X	Problem is parking -- should consider ramps; design may be problematic; Council should not ignore Plan Commission's recommendation
5/1	Nancy Nystrand	5106 Juneau Rd. (Dist. 11)		X	Any kind of big box is inappropriate for the n'hood
5/1	Gail Corrigan	Sheboygan Ave. (Dist. 11)		X	Traffic would be horrible at the corner; another food store in the area is ridiculous.
5/1	Marguerite Bulgrin	5818 Idledale Cir. (Dist. 20)		X	Pro-Sentry
5/2	Marjory Michael	4715 Sheboygan Avenue		X	Against the Whole Foods proposal

Agenda item #23

Phone calls received in the Council Office re: Whole Foods

5/2	Gita Bessman	113 Ozark Trail			X	Against the Whole Foods proposal
5/2	Fred Gooding	321 S. Midvale			X	Against the Whole Foods proposal
5/2	Jean Breheny	401 N. Eau Claire Ave. (Dist. 11)			X	
5/2	Maynard Briggs	Carolina Apartments 409 N. Eau Claire Ave. (Dist. 11)			X	Too much like Wal-Mart.
5/2	Jake Bennison	Manitou Way (Dist. 10)			X	1. Adding Whole Foods will only contribute to what already looks like a cluttered mess 2. It would be a slap in the face to override the Plan Commission's recommendation 3. Believes in supporting local businesses like Sentry
5/2	Teresa Shinnars	4802 Regent Street			X	Against the Whole Foods proposal
5/2	Joan Huebschmann	Sawyer Terrace (Dist. 11)			X	There are many people in this area who use wheelchairs and scooters; the sidewalks between Sawyer Terrace and Hilldale are already inadequate and unsafe; the Whole Foods proposal would increase traffic, making the area even more unsafe it already is.

REDEVELOPMENT STORMWATER REQUIREMENTS

Q *Is an erosion control plan required?*

A If the site disturbance exceeds 4000 square feet, a plan with Universal Soil Loss Equations (USLE) is required.

Q *When are stormwater management practices required on a redevelopment site?*

A Redevelopment requires stormwater management practices if the disturbed area exceeds 4000 square feet.

Q *If stormwater management is required what components are required and when?*

A Redevelopment has four (4) stormwater management requirements: **sediment control** (40% or 20-micron particle), **thermal control**, **stormwater detention**, and **oil & grease control**.

Q *When are those specific requirements triggered?*

Sediment control applies if there any exposed parking area included as part of the development. Rooftops do not need to be treated for sediment control.

Oil & grease control applies if the exposed parking area has forty (40) or more parking spaces, or if there is a drive-thru facility on the property.

Thermal control applies if the area is in the Sugar River Watershed.

Stormwater detention is required if as part of the redevelopment 20,000 sf of additional (over the previous existing impervious area) impervious area is being added as part of the proposed development, or if the development is in an area with flooding problems (University Avenue/Midvale Boulevard).

Q *When these practices are mandated what are the goals that must be met?*

A **Sediment control** – 40% control of sediment leaving the paved areas of the site is required. In Dane Co effectively means the 20-micron particle must be controlled, post construction, during a 1-year rain event.

Oil & Grease control – an approved method must be utilized to trap oil and grease from the first ½” of runoff from the paved areas. There is no hard and fast standard for approving the device, the ordinance refers to best available technology being utilized.

Thermal control – again there is no hard and fast standard for this, the applicant must show that they are making an effort to reduce the temperature of the storm water discharging from the site. This is typically done with rock cribs, rain gardens, or other infiltration devices.

Stormwater detention – the post development peak flows from the 2-year and 10-year storm events must match peak flows from the area in the pre-developed state.

Q *When is infiltration required?*

A Infiltration is not required by City or State requirements on a redevelopment site.

Dear Alders,

I am writing on my own behalf, but for informational purposes only, I am a citizen member of the Urban Design Commission.

It is my understanding that UDC's approval of the Whole Foods has been used as justification for council approval of the project. This is a mistake.

In my opinion, this is a gross misinterpretation of the character of that vote. Probably no one on the UDC was happy about that approval, even among those who voted for it.

The UDC reviewed the Whole Foods - Hilldale proposal several times. At each stage of review, the site plan was harshly criticized by the commission as a whole. The massive surface parking lot with no mitigating urban features such as mixed use improvements or shared/minimized/structured parking was the source of most of the criticism. From the informational presentation through the initial and final approval stages, the project was heavily criticized for undermining the quality New Urbanist themes of the first phase of the Hilldale redevelopment. The project was sent back for referral with major stipulations to re-design the entire site plan with a mind toward an urban, rather than suburban solution. Each time the developers returned it to us with nothing more than minor tweaks. Many commission members were incensed by this intransigence, so much so that there was strong sentiment for an outright rejection. However, some members being mindful of past criticism of the UDC in relation to business-friendliness as well as timelines, momentum and synergies with the first phase, a deadlock emerged. (Please keep in mind the significance of this: The UDC rarely rejects projects, the UDC rarely deadlocks over anything, and to even consider rejection--for any project--is itself a rare event.)

To break the deadlock over rejection of the project in its entirety, half of the project was in fact rejected. Furthermore, other heavy stipulations were put in place, requiring intense comprehensive planning of the rest of the Hilldale site before further site reviews would be considered.

And finally, had I been able to attend that meeting (another conflicting meeting at the Board of Public Works regarding my personal residence and those of my immediate neighbors), there would have been no deadlock; the entire project would have been rejected outright.

Thus, it was by a quirk of scheduling that this project passed the UDC.

Please reject this affront to good urban design in one of Madison's great neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Michael D. Barrett
2137 Sommers Ave.
Madison, WI 53704
(608)245-1059