

## AGENDA # 8

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION  
TITLE: 857 Jupiter Drive – Amended PUD-  
GDP for Grandview Commons Town  
Center. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ald. Dist. (24689)

PRESENTED: January 18, 2012

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: January 18, 2012

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, Melissa Huggins, John Harrington, and Henry Lufler.

### SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 18, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** an Amended PUD-GDP located at 857 Jupiter Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Jeff Rosenberg, Brian Munson and Dan Day, all representing Veridian Homes; Chris Winter and Michael Schmitt, representing Rollie Winter & Associates, LTD.; Dan Farrell, representing Roundy’s Supermarkets, Inc.; and Dan Brinkman, representing DSI Real Estate Group. Appearing and speaking in opposition were Paul Reilly, Barbara Davis, Greg Cieslewicz, Alan Auby (representing neighbors Alan Hunter, Georgette Horne, Alan Sweet and Jerry Miller); Rosemary Jackson and Ald. Jill Johnson, District 16. Registered in opposition but not wishing to speak were Joe Wirag, David Sebald, Tiffany Taha, Supervisor Dave de Felice, Robert Montgomery, Carolyn Montgomery, Jacob Wirag, Tom & Nancy McVary, Dean Matuszak, Armando Hernandez, Mike TeRonde, Karen TeRonde, Donna Sebald, Cindy Glaeden-Knott, Michael Knott, Mary Driscoll, Sarah Herwig, Peter Anderson, Heather McFadden, Nicole Jenkel, Larry & Casey Moen, David Rajkovich, Robert & Andrea Hogan, Jill Schaefer and Tammy Rozek.

Rosenberg began by stating how much time and how many meetings have gone into this project. Munson presented a culmination of comments from various City departments as well as the neighborhood. Detailed elevations, cross-sections and materials were covered in display boards. Specific components that have been adjusted include creation of a new public street through the site and the creation of a new central spine through the parking lot. An approximate 50-54-foot wide walkway is now proposed with opportunities for landscaping, breaking up the central parking lot into two areas. Enhancements to the front of the store include either a raised traffic table or along with connecting that walkway to the front of the store, making sure that vehicles have clearly marked routes through that space and can have enough room for drop-offs. Access to Gemini Drive is being proposed as a natural street to offer further connections north-south off Cottage Grove Road. A sidewalk across the entire northern edge of the lot offers another pedestrian walkway. Incorporation of another access point towards the back of the store as a private walkway and connect the sidewalk from Kilpatrick Court through the screening buffer area and to the sidewalk along the northern portion of the grocery store. A summary of a traffic study done by KL Engineering with full build-out show this as a viable mixed-use project that can handle the traffic load.

Paul Reilly spoke in opposition, feeling compelled to write to the Commission for a third time because of a letter sent out by Ald. Cnare. The many meetings have resulted in very few changes. He doesn't believe the development team has been responsive to who is affected. The proposal for a big box store is contrary to all the principles of new urbanism. The size of this store in an existing neighborhood is not a good fit. He concluded that they have given up on the compact pedestrian-oriented structure and are now planning a regional shopping destination, supported by the fact that about 75% of the vacant land will be dedicated to parking. He challenged the statement that there is equal support and opposition for this project. It's not about a grocery store, it's about size and site. The existing neighborhood plan is sound. The burden of defending that plan should not rest with the neighbors.

Barbara Davis spoke about concern for the stated 13-foot grade change between the finished floor of the store and the adjacent home sites. Plans indicate the floor elevation is at 1017; the next page shows storm sewers at 984-feet; between the two that's 32-feet and if your house is on that corner, 32-feet in the air puts your eyes at the floor of Roundy's. That's a very different "grand view" than what we bought into in our neighborhood. This proposal is totally out of scale. All the changes that have been shown are eye candy and gloss. The things that matter have not been changed.

Greg Cieslewicz spoke in opposition. Initially proposed at 63,000 square feet, now reduced to 58,000 square feet is about a 7.5% reduction. In some worlds maybe that's a huge concession but I don't think that's much of a concession. Changes made are purely cosmetic, it's like putting lipstick on a pig.

Alan Auby spoke to his concern of this not fitting the neighborhood. When he purchased his condo talk was for an 18,000 square foot grocery store. Putting a big box grocery store right in the middle of a neighborhood doesn't make any sense. As an example, at their neighborhood meeting with the City this past Wednesday it was obvious that the majority of people are not in favor of this proposal and he doesn't understand why after two years this is still in discussion.

Rosemary Jackson spoke in agreement with the majority of comments. Before purchasing their condo they were given a detailed plan for development and loved the idea for a town center. But they do not need a 58,000 square foot big box grocery store.

Ald. Jill Johnson requested denial of this project. This is a rezoning project, it changes the neighborhood and that's a really big deal. It opens up the possibility that things will be done differently than perhaps what is shown. Once they sell to the developer (Rollie Winter) and lease to the grocery store, Veridian is out of it. Many of her constituents across Cottage Grove Road have concerns because they are within 200-feet of the store site. The neighborhood meeting held last week was held during a snowstorm, and 150 people showed up. For anyone to characterize it (as Ald. Cnare did in her letter to the Commission) as a simple disagreement or 50/50, that simply isn't the case. There is overwhelming opposition to this, any reasonable person looking at this would know that the neighbors are extremely concerned. We haven't had an adequate traffic study to date because it didn't take into account problems being created by people cutting through from Buckeye. We've looked at a lot of pictures and a lot of this is speculative because they won't be built for some time. When asked to give examples of where this has been done in Madison, the developer cannot answer that. If you were to want a walkable store in this area, why wouldn't you site it closer to the higher density housing? This is a really beautiful neighborhood and area and she feels this proposal destroys part of that. It's their right to ask for a zoning change, but it's also our right to say no to that. Just because somebody is persistent doesn't mean we can't say no. This is a wholesale change to the original plan. The adjustments they've made are good, but this proposal does not work.

Munson and Day then addressed some of the issues brought up by Ald. Johnson. The total grade change would be 30-feet across the whole site. The site tapers down to Kilpatrick and McClean Streets at around 992-feet with sloping upward approximately 14-feet to the back parking lot. The first floor of the houses abutting the 14-foot wall would be at about 996-feet. Trying to get delivery at a lower level and shrink the footprint beneath that just doesn't work. After much research and much work this is the town center model that will work economically.

Further discussions by the Commission included the following:

- I really wonder what the viability of the land abutting the grocery store would be in terms of who is going to want to build a single-family residence there.
  - We have a fair amount of experience and we wouldn't be proposing this if we didn't think those home sites weren't viable. There are a lot of folks that would like to be a part of a walkable town center. There is an example on the west side of Madison and the Middleton Hills Copp's grocery store.
- We do have authority as Urban Design Commission because the GDP sets the footprint for the project. Can you help me understand your comments of traffic moving from Buckeye through and across this area.
  - The traffic study was done based on standard procedures, looking at intersections and lane capacities in this area. This proposal is very similar in traffic generation as to what is included there right now. There has already been 150,000 square feet of approved retail space, so these collector and arterial streets are set up to accommodate that. We went one step further taking the traffic study.
- Tim Parks, City Planner stated that the Copp's grocery store on Maple Grove Road on the southeast side of Madison. When the Cross Country Neighborhood Plan was adopted in 1983 it called for a neighborhood center to be located further south on the west side of Maple Grove Road. It was determined in the mid to late 90s that that layout wasn't conducive to development and the plan was amended to relocate the commercial activity closer to McKee Road.
- The three big issues are the size, the traffic and the size of the parking. It needs that traffic to be successful. Have you exhausted looking at ways of trying to reduce the footprint, put parking under the building, etc.?
  - The placement does relate back to the ability to incorporate other solutions, i.e. underground parking. The economics here do not support that. We're leaning on the expertise of Roundy's and this is the lowest they've said they can go. We've talked to others over the years about the possibility of making it smaller but could not find a business willing to do so.
- I'm struggling with this. Is it the one big box store? What if it were split into three 20,000 square foot buildings, would that make a difference?
- The scale, the parking lot is also an issue. We don't know when this anticipated development is going to occur. We don't have the money to build the library any time soon.
- The leap of faith is the grocery store. Along with that you do assume that the other stuff goes forward. The changes are good, but it is still a big building. Part of what seems so forced is the very organic, fluid plan of the whole development and then you plop in a very rigid footprint with no overlap, erosion of something that's more fluid.
- In looking at this store in comparison to what was initially approved, you are still holding to that concept of 150,000 square feet of retail. Today instead of having a grocer, liquor store, a bakery, we have it provided in one tenant. In my opinion the square footage is comparable to the initial intent of the project. The impact of traffic is also something I consider when I say I feel this is appropriate. The site has to modify to the topography. I understand that Copp's and Roundy's have standards to adhere to, but the parking has to adjust to the site. If we're going to include Gemini Drive, which makes sense, there should be parking on Gemini Drive. The sides of those buildings facing the street have to be "fronts."

Parking should be allowed behind the buildings at the Gemini Drive elevation. I do not think that the grocery can be placed at the same elevation of the retail on Gemini Drive. That store is going to have to be at a different elevation to nestle the parking lots into the site plan. There may need to be a ramped or sloped surface that will descend down to the parking lot on the north so we can get rid of that level of retaining to the street. A walk along the north edge will welcome your shoppers to walk to this location.

- Why do this when you can just build more housing? You're not persuading me. We're struggling with how we build these mixed-use centers.
- What I'm seeing here is a mass for a project with a flat site, and these drawings show a level site. I can't vote yes until I see clearly that you are incorporating the topography of the site. Right now this is a flat plan on a flat site, and that concerns me.
- I can't support this because the neighborhood doesn't support it. If I lived in the neighborhood I would support it, because if it's not approved it will lay vacant or become housing. Given the dynamics of retail this is probably as good as it would get. This is better than an empty lot or simply more single-family housing. I'm afraid it'll be a missed opportunity.
- In terms of looking at this as an overall development, we're looking at the proposal with a parking lot because that entire portion east of Gemini would be sold. It's also serving a library and future retail, so how many stalls can you accept as the bottom number you can function on in Phase 1?
  - The grocery store said they want 5 per 1,000. This is about 3.2 per 1,000 for the entire block, so we've already talked them down a significant amount. The reality is that shared parking approach allowed us to bring the stalls down in number, but that will function for the library, but the grocery store needs to have those stalls available. This parking count is lower than almost all of the grocery stores in the area. We're fully encouraging the library to consider a multi-level facility.
- We're trying to fit a round hole into a square peg here. I think it is telling that commercial has been pulled from other "new urbanist" developments. Looking at this from the neighborhood's perspective and what is best for the neighborhood, maybe this is just going to be a residential suburban development. It's not an urban neighborhood and will never be an urban neighborhood. You're just not going to get walkable neighborhoods in a suburb. Let it die a slow death instead of putting a big box that could go anywhere in the neighborhood. I don't think putting a big box there is going to encourage this town center.
- We've learned how to rebuild the urban fabric within the central parts of the City. Is there some middle ground we can find that says maybe this wasn't what we originally envisioned and instead of taking two steps forward, maybe we can only take 1 ½. That's a broader community decision.
- If you really want to create the ambience of something that could be walkable you cannot put the standard Roundy's box there. You have to think about the urban form and set the standard with this particular building. I would move referral to come back with a more urban form of the grocery store with the parking to be more sympathetic to the topography. Come back with something really interesting architecturally that might change the discussion for the neighborhood. Maybe have it not look like a big box.
- I need to see a plan that works with and without the possible library.
- Do the applicants think it is worthwhile to refer this?
  - What's going to end up happening, there are only so many variations with the site plan we can do. I think it's very unfair to characterize that the entire neighborhood is against this. People come in and give us constant letters about wanting to see a town square with a grocery store. If you want to end this then I would reject this. There's just no operator out there that will work with a smaller store.
- Do you feel that if they came back with a successful look, it's still the same size with the same number of stalls, is that something that would work for you and your constituents?

- I'd still have grave concerns about the size.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-1) with Slayton voting no. The motion requested that the applicant examine alternatives to the current proposal as noted above.

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 4 and 4.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 857 Jupiter Drive**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	4
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4

**General Comments:**

- Too great of deviation from neighborhood plan and present zoning, without neighborhood support. Want elevation showing building height and grade changes seen by housing to the east. Not neighborhood-friendly, suburban development.
- Suburban big box and years of planning a new urban edge neighborhood challenge us, as a City, to figure out the lessons from the last decade and continue to work on building a vital mixed-use neighborhood.

## AGENDA # 14

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: December 7, 2011

TITLE: 857 Jupiter Drive – Amended PUD-GDP for Grandview Commons Town Center. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ald. Dist. (24689)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: December 7, 2011

ID NUMBER:

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, and John Harrington.

### SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 7, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a PUD-GDP located at 857 Jupiter Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Brian Munson, Dan Day, and Jeff Rosenberg, all representing Veridian Homes; Ald. Lauren Cnare, District 3; Roger Guest, Alisa Allen and Tonya Nye. Appearing in support but not wishing to speak were Fred Marshall, Jodi Zander, John Brigham, Troy A. Nye, Jean Bachhuber, Jasmine Rogness, Ruby McFarlane, Greg Miller, Terri Drengson, Janice Munizza, Gigi T. Smith, Victoria Clack, Leslie Olson, Rachel Longley, Jay Longley, Mark Proeschel, Steve Bachhuber, Katie Lowe, Darren Klawitter, Taya Dolsen, Lynn Lemberger, Courtney Boyer, and Alan Zander. Appearing in support and available to answer questions were Chris Winter, representing Rollie Winter & Associates, Ltd.; Dan Brinkman, representing Veridian Homes; and Dan Farrell, representing Roundy’s Supermarkets, Inc. Appearing and wishing to speak in opposition were Barbara Davis, Paul Reilly, Ron Prince, Mary Boyd, Dean Matuszak, Tiffany Taha, Tara White, Jill C. Schaefer, and John Driscoll. Appearing in opposition but not wishing to speak were Robert Hogan, Pete Leonard, Peter Anderson, Sarah Herwig, Teresa Riley, Nicole Jenkel, Heather McFadden, Michael J. Teronde, Karen TeRonde, Mary Driscoll, Katie Peterangelo, Tony Peterangelo, Barbara Reilly, Andrea Hoffman, Geoffrey Hoffman, Michael Knott, Basel Taha, Greg Cieslewicz, Anna Tamarkin and Ted Szalkowski.

Rosenberg began the presentation by stating how solvent Roundy’s and Veridian both are. He cited examples of grocery stores in Madison that are greater than 25,000 square feet as the new norm. In order for a grocery store to succeed it has to have all the components of a larger store such as banking, floral, deli, pharmacy, etc. The plans for this Copp’s store are unlike any Copp’s in Wisconsin.

Brian Munson noted that Grandview Commons has been in development for over 10 years. The town center economic model is not working; approvals for buildings have been completed to the point of pulling permits but have gone without tenants. This store would supply the day-to-day services and walkability for the neighborhood. Two internal circulation points have been created; the extension of Gemini Drive which creates a nice sight line to the front door of a future library site, this breaks it into the “B Block” and “C Block” connecting this with the urban open space to the front door of the grocery store. First floor retail is encouraged and required. Transitioning is needed because of grade change on the site, accomplished with retaining walls and a north-south pedestrian walkway. Durable materials and a lot of glass are components of the buildings.

The loading area for the grocery store will be carefully screened from the neighborhood. Transit is not currently available at this location but they are in talks with Metro for future transit access. Patterning of the street grids has been modeled after Monroe Street, State Street and the Square. They don't feel they meet the needs of specialty retail shoppers (Trader Joe's, Whole Foods) and require a larger grocery store; Roundy's has made a commitment to this location.

Barbara Davis spoke about the lack of integration with the Grandview Neighborhood Development Plan. She feels the neighborhood will be negatively impacted. Traffic impacts, property values along arterial streets, access points for other communities, pedestrian and bicycle access are all concerns. This project will contribute to the decline of the properties as well as in other neighborhoods. This community cannot handle another large grocery store in addition to Woodman's, Sentry, Hy-Vee, Target, and Walmart. Roundy's is currently exploring making shares public in order to fill a \$230 Million gap.

Tanya Nye spoke as a resident and realtor for Veridian. She looks forward to walking to the town center and using it. She has never heard one objection from anybody on what is projected in this neighborhood. She recently sold two condominiums because of the future grocery store. In her opinion the opposition may be louder but they are not the majority.

Paul Reilly spoke in opposition because it represents a huge change to the existing neighborhood climate. This is about a change to a neighborhood plan and dropping a big box store right in the middle of a residential area, which are totally and completely incompatible with a residential area. This is contained within the neighborhood plan, which he quoted. No one can carry 4 or 5 bags of groceries several blocks to their home. It's obvious they are expanding the market for this store and abandoning the notion of a neighborhood town center and replacing it with a regional shopping mecca. Furthermore big box stores don't add much value to residential property. There is ample land zoned properly that will easily accommodate a big box grocery store. Please maintain Madison's tradition and protect our neighborhood.

Lisa Allen and her husband built a home in this neighborhood because of the future grocery store. The developers come in a lot to give updates on the town center. They reached out to retailers and it became evident that an anchor would be needed. She hopes the City and the developers will hold accessible meetings where people can be comfortable to ask questions and form their own opinions.

Ron Prince spoke about the movement to have smaller neighborhood grocery stores for people to visit regularly. Beyond having access to fresh food it is also a destination for people to walk to. Because of the pedestrian and bicycle issues the Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission voted down this neighborhood amendment. This store is not designed to serve people visiting it every day; this is designed for people to visit once a week and buy a carload of groceries. It's not a store that's built to increase people's access to healthy fruits and vegetables. It will severely impact the Sentry store down Cottage Grove Road that currently is a very neighborhood-friendly grocery store. If this store goes in the Sentry store will go away and leave those pedestrians and bicyclists with no access to fresh foods. This is the sort of development that works against the model of providing groceries to people who don't drive.

Roger Guest spoke as a resident of Grandview Commons and an architect for Veridian Homes. As a former resident of the Hilldale area he and his wife are excited to have those services in Grandview Commons. The value of selling his Hilldale neighborhood house came from the surrounding amenities: the library, the mall, the Sentry grocery store. He sees this as a great contribution to the neighborhood.

Jill Schaefer spoke as a resident who enjoys the community feel and open space. She is concerned about a big box store on the edge of a green and forward-thinking neighborhood. When they purchased their home the



Veridian representatives spoke of a 25,000 square foot grocery store which was a selling point for them. The Veridian website also touts this as traditional neighborhood, which is in conflict with a big box store. She is concerned how this would affect the value of her property, increase in traffic in the neighborhood, air, noise and light pollution. She used to live behind the Sentry store on Cottage Grove Road and used that store almost daily, but not for bigger shopping.

Tara White addressed the issue of having small children and safety in the neighborhood. The increase in traffic flow and the size of the parking lot concerns her. She is not likely to walk to this store with her children as it wouldn't be safe. She stated she was intimidated to talk publicly against this project. She is concerned that there has not been a neighborhood meeting on this topic. Rummel inquired about there not being a neighborhood meeting; the last meeting held was in February of 2009.

Mary Boyd has lived in the Richmond Hill area for 6 years, prior to that 28 years in the Elvejem Neighborhood. Her issues are the about-face this is to the original plan. When she researched where she lives now she thought a 25,000 walkable grocery store was going to be included. She is also concerned with the affect this will have on other neighborhoods along Cottage Grove Road. You can't make a design change like this without having it impact other neighborhood designs. This will have a negative impact on Sentry. The amount of pavement is of concern and is not a good design feature. If the zoning can be changed for this, then the zoning for anything within the town center can be changed. This is not compatible.

Tiffany Taha spoke as the president of the homeowner's association. There is not a formal application filed for this store so we don't truly know what is happening. Once this change is made how do they really know what is going in there? The idea of a new urbanist neighborhood with walking stores does not fit with a 65,000 square foot grocery store; it's not realistic that this would be the anchor for a walking neighborhood. Cub Foods just closed and Woodman's and Hy-Vee are already there.

Steven Bachhuber spoke as a member of the McCullen Neighborhood Association. He does not see this as a new urbanist development, especially when they don't know what is even going to occupy these spaces. He is also concerned with the view, it will be chopped up and you will see the backs of a strip mall.

Ald. Lauren Cnare spoke to the need to stick to the mission statement of the Urban Design Commission. What we see here is an attempt to recreate other neighborhoods. There are elements that were promised to residents in the plan and she feels this change can accommodate those elements. What is the sense of place when in this town center? The farmer's market is great but it needs company, it needs more than just the Great Dane to activate the space. This is the catalyst which is needed for this area of town. This store will be walkable whether it is big or small. The reality is that plans evolve and change; help us get that walkable town center piece. When you talk about what makes a neighborhood, this is it. This is Madison's last outpost and needs to set the example by allowing this grocery store to move forward.

Ald. Jill Johnson spoke, mentioning the Ped-Bike Commission's strong opposition to this plan. She looked at curb cuts that are necessary, traffic along Cottage Grove Road, and the scale of the increase from 25,000 to 65,000 square feet. When a plan comes before us it doesn't have to be the final iteration. Troubling statements include comparing this to Hilldale Mall, that this departs so far from the original vision, these are zoning changes that are going to be made and scale issues are of great concern. She met with the developer three times and heard the same story and looked at the same plans each time; the developer insisted they needed a larger store. She feels that if the scale were reduced a lot of the opposition would go away.

The Commission made the following comments and questions:

- Regarding topography – how does that relate to walkability?
  - The high point gives the neighborhood its view towards the Capitol and downtown. The neighborhood was built around this slope. There is a 32-foot grade separation at Kilpatrick which fits into the design of parking lots, etc. The access drives have incorporated that grade and back to the loading dock, a two-tiered retaining wall would be installed. The goal was to make sure that all of this is walkable. The streets are all designed to bring people into the town center.

• Please talk about the truck access.

- This would be one-way coming in to address access and traffic flow through the area.

That seems to add more conflicts to that parking lot.

There's not a way to reroute and bring them back out the same entrance without making that a full access point. Other retailers will have access to delivery areas too. Our intent was to keep the traffic from going onto Cottage Grove Road.

A bigger store is going to have a lot of deliveries. Do you have estimates?

Roundy's representatives can answer that. Full sized semi-trucks are scheduled out of our distribution center in Oconomowoc so we can slightly control the truck deliveries. A store of this size is probably 2-3 semi-trucks per day. They don't necessarily get deliveries 7 days a week. The "drugstore delivery" vendors for milk, bread, soda, etc. depends on the day of the week, but on average between 10-15 of those vehicles per day. We can't schedule those trucks but we can certainly limit the times they are able to make deliveries. There would be double-bay loading.

What is the size of the parking lot?

We have about 300 stalls to serve the grocery store, library and future retail. There are currently 100 that would contribute to that.

It seems like the politics of a grocery store are really driving this. I really don't get why you think this grocery store will succeed given that the whole market has changed. Why do we need to change the Comprehensive Plan for this? Why do you think this one will succeed?

We do a detailed market analysis to help guide us. One of the things we see here is that within one mile there is no grocery store. To be a neighborhood store you still need to fulfill the weekly needs of a grocer. You need to provide a service opportunity for people to call it their grocery store. It will depend on your needs on any particular day. We look at much more of a neighborhood type store but that is a 65,000 square foot store that can fulfill all your grocery needs.

- If we can get an ice cream store, a toy store, in addition to the library, with the grocery store then we've created a walkable destination. That's why we're going through this long and difficult process.

• When you talk about big boxes and all the smaller parts of the grocery business, you are in fact not supporting local neighborhood businesses because you're creating a big box space that consumes the opportunities for those smaller business owners.

- Copp's has done a wonderful job of acknowledging they are part of the town center. Middleton Hills is a perfect case study. The design team and developers of that site would say that if the Copp's didn't happen they wouldn't have the walkable district around it. That was the catalyst that got the balance of the town center. If you look at Trader Joe's, before they moved in after Ken Kopp's left there was question as to how viable that area was. We've contacted over 130 business operators to come out here, and so far Great Dane is the only one.

Why not just put more housing in?

- A lot has changed since the Comprehensive Plan of 2006 and the Sprecher Neighborhood Plan. The Zoning Code makes it so that we have to revisit the Comprehensive Plan for detailed zoning and the neighborhood plan. The entire town center has to be looked at. This was done 10+ years ago when we weren't doing these kinds of neighborhoods.

Rosenberg noted that we're going to have to change the plan anyway. The lodge folks said they were going to be there forever but now there's a vacant building there. Building more housing would certainly be easier than this. But the neighborhood plan and the GDP allows for 200 apartment units for this area. My bankers ask me the same question. We're at a crossroads, but I go back to the fact that my family has made some pretty nice neighborhoods, and to fulfill that dream of Grandview Commons, it will set a standard that there are great things that we can still accomplish. This might not be the same plan as it was 10 years ago but things have changed since then. Just because the store is bigger than 25,000 doesn't mean it still doesn't have the fresh fruits and vegetables. Just because it's bigger doesn't mean you have to walk the whole store.

- These new urbanism neighborhoods, we've sort of figured out how to do the residential aspect fairly easily, but the commercial pieces have been a lot more difficult to pull off. This is a chance that we're struggling with.
- Putting the grocery store size out of my mind, this is clearly a vehicular thoroughfare (between the town center future phase and grocery store anchor) so there will be traffic we have to accommodate. Primarily we should be looking at how people will walk to this building. At this point the design with the building and a large parking field is the piece that needs the most massaging. To walk 400 feet, across a block is not a long distance and people will walk much further to get to this location but it's what's around you as you're walking. That's going to be the real challenge, how we make the approach more walkable.
  - We've talked with Traffic Engineering about that, how do we make this as walkable as possible. We could look at double sidewalks on one side. This will be a full walking street with terrace treatments and sidewalks. The store won't be allowed to have that back door aspect to it. We have more of that walkable area along Sharpsburg and down into the urban square. We tried to create opportunity so that it's comfortable to walk back and forth. That's our goal. We have to accommodate the parking so that there is enough for all users, but we've really honed down this lot.
- The disjuncture between the town center and the grocery, somehow that has to make amends. If we can get those two connected physically, more appropriately I think that's the magic piece in making this work.
- This vehicular access really starts to make this feel like a big lot parking area. Consider one-way traffic with slanted parking stalls. You could have smaller lots. Consider that as a way to make this feel more pedestrian safe and slow the cars down. Check out the Sentry Hilldale parking lot. I know you need the stalls but the more you make this feel like a park edge rather than a parking lot the better it's going to be. I'm not going to talk about the size of the grocery store, you need to work that out with the neighborhood, but in order for this to feel comfortable, with 3 kids in tow, while I'm carrying a wagon full of groceries without worrying about traffic, that's the nut to crack.
- Utilize one-way traffic drive aisles through the stalls, you don't have to worry about traffic coming at you from both ways.
  - One of TE's concerns that we're working to address is to make sure there's good traffic flow out to Gemini Drive. Minimally this would have to be maintained as a vehicular access point.
- Roundy-about!
- I don't think we've had as passionate of voices here in awhile. I'm thinking about the size of the grocery store, I walk to Trader Joe's. If it were bigger I'd still shop there. When it's close you buy what you want at the time you want. In terms of the size and being a destination, I'm trying to wrap my head around that in terms of the neighborhood. To me it's more about the location than the size; if it's close I'm going to go to it. I can't tell you how much more food I wasted when the store was farther away.
- There's a concern about traffic coming from the north. Have you talked about closing this off?

- Going back to the original design there was always access through here. The design of all these streets through the neighborhood are to funnel them to this area. We want all of the neighborhood to have the benefits of coming here.
- How many parking spaces were originally planned?
  - We've added more acreage to deal with these proximities. About the same but we had more area to deal with.
- When you do the traffic study it would be interesting and essential to analyze the amount of traffic that would come down the street compared to what was proposed before and what you're proposing now.
- Did you look at the potential for introducing a second floor on top of this for some kind of use? Follow-up to that, I appreciate the grade change. Woodman's came here for a parking expansion with the same grade issue. Have you looked at a partial lot below grade?
  - That's used for employee parking.
  - We're trying to keep this framework at 150,000 square feet and not increasing the retail footage. We're comfortable about the balance we've struck with the walking district while accommodating the anchor. We have the opportunity above the retail in a two-story format, and there are alternatives under the Zoning Code for various types of uses. But no we did not look at a second floor use above the grocery store.
- I really like the idea about making a pedestrian way, that makes a lot of sense (between this site and remainder of the town center to the west).
- Middleton Hills was built 7 years ago? That Copp's is a little bit smaller than this. In regards to the comment made about property values going down, what kind of research have you done?
  - We looked at that very closely. If you look at the listings, there are numerous houses for sale in Middleton Hills that range from \$500,000 to \$1 Million. Another thing you'll find is that quite a few of them reference walking distance to a grocery store, and walkable distance to a town center. The economics are different because that's a different economic neighborhood but it does speak to the town center working well.
- The difference between this and Middleton Hills is that those buildings are together and form a campus; this does not. I think you need to explore that. If you make this a pedestrian way you need to make it unique. You have to change that context. Be innovative in how you do it. I'm not so sure it's the size of the grocery store people have issue with as it is what it brings with it. A good example would be the semi-trucks going through here.
- I would encourage you to think about this along here (Big Dipper Drive and properties to the east), you can screen that from people's views. You need to get that neighborhood meeting and talk to them on a level that they can understand. You need to get that neighborhood support, it's very important.
- I want you to look more at how this works, it makes me think about how malls work with people and trucks driving by. Have you looked at putting those skinny buildings on the outside?
  - The plan for Cottage Grove Road is a four lane road with no on-street parking, so you wouldn't be able to get near that store. That's why we've looked at having a street presence that people will want to walk to.
- You talk about urbanism facing the street, but nothing faces the street. I think it's something you should look at some more.
- In terms of the connectivity I don't think changing the surface treatment is going to do it. You're going to have to get it built from with interior units to create nice buildings to walk by. When you break it down into street scale I'm hoping your topography will nestle a bit better.
- There's a lot of congestion at that entryway.
  - Ped-Bike had that same concern too.

- Did you look at an option where it was set back so the parking would be on Cottage Grove Road so you didn't have the issue of this parking lot backed up, rather it was a building.
  - It's the balancing act of keeping the front door related to the town center, which goes to the parking. We've looked it up and down, back and forth and really came back to this one because it did create that separation of loading, and trying to keep the store to Cottage Grove Road, we did look at alternatives but it starts to look more like the store on Maple Grove Road.
- How small could you get?
  - We've been trying to get it smaller.
  - Copp's is 100% on board. I personally sat with the CFO of the company and he said if you can't get 58,000 square feet then find someone else to do it.

### **ACTION:**

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.

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 is 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 857 Jupiter Drive**

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

**General Comments:**

- Need neighborhood discussion.