

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: October 17, 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 17, 2012

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley, John Harrington, Henry Lufler, Cliff Goodhart and Tom DeChant.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 17, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of an Amended PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 6002 Cottage Grove Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Jeff Rosenberg, representing Veridian Homes; Brian Munson, representing Rollie Winter Associates; Alisa Allen, and Ald. Lauren Cnare, representing District 3. Appearing in support and available to answer questions were Domenico Ferrante, Chris Winter, Michael Schmitt, Dan Day, all representing Rollie Winter Associates; Dan Brinkman, representing Veridian Homes; Max Dietman and Nathan Zywicki. Registered and speaking in opposition were Barbara Davis and Paul Reilly. Registered in opposition but not wishing to speak were John Driscoll, Dean Matuszak, Nicole Jenkel, Heather McFadden, and Carolyn Montgomery. Munson presented the updated plans for the grocery store component of Grandview Commons. There is an outdoor plaza space, a refined central walking spine, a pergola and landscaping that ties the grocery store front back to Gemini Drive and the town center. An additional island has been added to the northern portion of the site to break the parking lot up. On the east side of the store they worked on the grades to reduce the heights of walls to the east and the length of walls, and they enhanced the landscaping. They have gone from a 3-bay wide loading to two loading bays facing north with the compactor moved into a fully enclosed area. Four of the mature trees near the phone switch location have been saved. The landscape plan is four times the point requirements to provide buffers in meaningful and real ways, with additional vertical elements to provide a sense of enclosure and permanence to the site. A slide show presented still shots of the architecture, including the main entrance, the tower element, windows, different building materials, awnings and canopies and the pergola. A plaza space with outdoor seating and landscaping is proposed at the entrance that ties with the tower and Cottage Grove Road in a meaningful way. The roof plan shows the HVAC clustered internally to the store with two screening lines around the center of the store that is a vertical visual screen that is separate from the units to serve as functional purpose for visual as well as acoustics.

Paul Reilly spoke to the importance of the design issues to the neighborhood. He believes that, in part, approval of the rezoning and General Development Plan was based on Veridian’s credibility and good reputation. The neighborhood has expressed concern that Veridian will sell this property and it will be out of their control. The

fountain represented along the pedestrian walkway is not there, and the neighbors on the south still have to face a very large blank wall. Some of the neighbors visited the Roundy's site in Middleton Hills and are disappointed to see that many of their amenities are not included in this proposal, such as the exterior mechanicals, the loading dock camouflaged with a wall but is not enclosed, failure to put things such as compacting, food waste, etc. inside the building. Something has to be done to the southern elevation to soften the wall. He is concerned that once initial approval is granted, the neighborhood's concerns will be pushed aside and not receive adequate discussion.

Alisa Allen spoke with excitement about what the plan looks like. She does not think this looks like a grocery store and sees the changes as developing a real asset to the community.

Barbara Davis spoke in opposition, citing that many concerns are missing from the newest design. The loading dock remains open and back up to homes of residents who did not purchase because of the promise of a grocery store. Mature trees are being razed with condos that back up to some of these trees. Those trees serve as screening to the original condo owners in the community. She asked that they hold the developer accountable to the amendment proposed by Ald. Rummel at City Council that these trees be preserved. She asked that Tim Parks comment on the revision from his first recommendation to the UDC and the second recommendation letter, particularly in reference to "additional design work is needed before the proposed building can be found to meet the large retail establishment ordinance." She asked the UDC to go beyond looking at the "spirit of an ordinance" and to look at the ordinance to the letter and protect the people who invested in the Grandview vision.

Ald. Cnare spoke in support of the project. She praised that this development looks very different from any other grocery store in the area. This design offers more than they have seen in previous iterations. She asked the Commission to look at this project while thinking about what the large format retail ordinance means. If there is a piece of this that does not fit perfectly with a line of the ordinance, does the meet it in another way? There may be better ways than our original intent with the ordinance to prescribe what buildings like this should look like.

Ald. Jill Johnson spoke with concern regarding the screening and mature trees. She feels an injustice was done to the owners who purchased in this neighborhood with a certain understanding of what the zoning was going to be. Furthermore she felt that this particular version of the zoning was one of the marketing aspects used by the developer to develop the area. Saying you're not going to comply with the big box ordinance is like adding insult to injury; the ordinance was there long before this dispute. She asked the Commission to refer this item pending another neighborhood meeting.

Tim Parks spoke to the Commission regarding his Planning Division memo. As far as staff is concerned the site plan and landscape plan are more than sufficient.

The Chair read from the big box ordinance Large Retail Development provisions in MGO, Section 33.24(4)(f), specifically regarding the loading area, and noted that it does not require enclosure of the area, but there is reference to the acoustic impact of these functions being fully contained. Parks listed several big box developments in Madison that do not have fully enclosed loading areas. He noted that it does fall to the Urban Design Commission to apply the requirements and make a determination on how they feel the project should go forward. Staff supports what the Urban Design Commission will come up with and do not anticipate rehashing these at the Plan Commission. Staff want these elements to come out more, more needs to be done on the rooflines to provide the variation that is required, including more information and details on mechanical screening and acoustic noise mitigation. Need more roofline variation and the center of Cottage Grove Road elevation and more relief of façade with vertical elements. The front right side elevation needs to relate more to

Cottage Grove Road with the elongation of the entry element (arcade) closer to the outdoor seating/activity area. He did note that the outdoor plaza area that is proposed for neighborhood use is the farthest spot away from where you would purchase that type of food inside the grocery store; this issue could be addressed by moving the foyer and perhaps an arcade of the entry element that brings the south facing entrance to the foyer closer to Cottage Grove Road.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- I think we can place this in its site a little bit more. For example, the south face with the clear glass is going to bake. My opinion is that in the intent of staff to add some depth and variation in this area, what if a horizontal sun shade were added to cut some light and get some depth and perspective on that face.
 - This exhibit will help explain what's going on. First off we have awnings and canopies projecting out from the façade. The pier offers horizontal and vertical breaks along the façade. The idea of an awning is definitely something we can think about. We're focused on the functionality of the store insides and outsides.
- Regarding the outdoor café area, Cottage Grove Road is going to be a bear to cross. You've made an incredible effort to make a pedestrian effort on this side of the building. Is it possible to investigate having the outdoor dining in the area where that food is sold inside the store?
 - The decision from Roundy's in terms of how the interior operates led to a left-hand store. We wanted to have it be unbalanced a bit because that breaks it up in a way. There could be some tables there certainly, but we felt we had a better opportunity here in this space because of how it functions inside. You come in, you buy something in the deli and then circle around to the tellers. The distance from where you pay to either location is about the same distance and we wanted to keep that activity closer to Cottage Grove Road. We also struggled with this basically being a highway. We focused on how we could create this plaza space with amenities to help serve that function and bridge out to Cottage Grove Road, but we also thought maybe there wouldn't be a lot of traffic from that direction.

That's why I'm suggesting a better pedestrian connection. There's a way to make it a space and confine it. There's no real synergy here.

- I'm reminded of the Sentry at Hilldale, they built a little indoor café area. It might be a more pleasant space to sit through the remainder of the year.
 - The square footage component has been a concern all along; this would bring additional building mass and square footage.

So maybe a covered element with columns to bring some more shelter. Staff noted that the need to address this concern with an increase in interior square footage could be considered with the PUD approval.

- I would like to know what size the trees are that are being removed. What really bothers me is that there's a lot of potential but it's not there yet. Is there a way we can move these trees so there is equal distance, creating a much stronger movement in here. You need to carry these trees across. Spread out trees at Gemini on both sides of the drive.
- Question the use of large trees on one side with small on the other, use equal size trees and carry alley across drive and provide tree islands at a twelve stall interval.
 - In terms of the design intent of the landscape, we were trying to layer it a bit both as you look through and travel down. The view to the north and to the south is now layered across the central spine. We have the challenge of sequencing with pedestrians, bicycles and vehicles.

I don't mind the driveway but with a little creativity you could tweak this to carry these trees so they carry across there. Right now it seems very unbalanced.

- Perhaps the “dominant” and “minor” trees need a different relationship on this walkway so they are more centered to get more space and the smaller ones become subservient. That may help out with the closer alignment.
- This pergola perhaps needs a greater presence; more of a node feel to it so it starts to become an event rather than part of the passage. And may need to lose parking stalls to accomplish.
- To go and sit in this area, it’s going to be lost. People are coming from the parking and the neighborhood. Maybe this is an opportunity for an occasional farmer’s market kind of thing, seasonal things. That animates a space visible from the highway and doesn’t create a place where I don’t want to sit. Look at placing activity at the northwest corner with an outdoor display/activity on the southwest corner.
- On elevations CMU is not a fancy detail for walls; look at a different material, more upscale.
- The “Feeseey Ribbon Grass” type of grass that is invasive, it can’t be in there.
- The scale of the building is good in that you’re breaking it down without making it false. But if you look at your west parking lot elevation, I’d look at a little bit more at the articulation of the volume that people enter, versus the other volume at Cottage Grove Road. They’re looking too similar right now.
- Look for some richness in your building materials. Think about your mortar color.
- Question directed at Ald. Johnson: Has your neighborhood asked for a meeting?

- It’s something I think is appropriate for a project of this scale.

My question is has your neighborhood asked for a meeting.

My neighborhood has asked for more discussion of this, not specifically for a meeting. My point is this is significantly different than what we were talking about this past summer. In addition for those who are not visual, I think there is enough change that would warrant another meeting.

Ald. Cnare: I’m going to disagree with that. I think the essential elements of this project that most people were paying attention to have already been addressed. There are some very fine details that you are looking at now; the opportunity for the public comment takes place now. Everyone was informed that this meeting is occurring tonight and everyone will know when the Plan Commission and Common Council meetings are. It is at the point now that this belongs to the public, to all people. I would ask that you continue to treat this as any other project you would go through. I think it’s time to move on with this.

- Look at placing your secondary signage on top of the canopies, simple letters on top rather than up high. It’ll be more at pedestrian scale.

ACTION:

On a motion by Lufler, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion provided for address of the following, in addition to the comments made:

- Examine the entry location as it relates to the south elevation outdoor seating area.
- Reexamine the south side of the building, the articulation of the façade, upper parapet, including screening and acoustic noise mitigation details.
- Look at the alley/tree issues.
- Reexamine enclosure element and monitor the acoustic impacts.
- Phalaris arundinacea “Feeseey” invasive species to be removed and substituted.

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, 7 and 8.

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	5	6	6	-	-	5	7	6
	8	8	8	7	6	7	9	8
	7	6	7	-	-	-	6	7

General Comments:

- Strengthen alley.
- Consider covered canopy south of main entry at plaza and horizontal sun shades at south elevation.
- Pretty good for a big box.