AGENDA#6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PRESENTED: July 26, 2006

TITLE: 6001 Kilpatrick Lane – PUD(SIP), **REFERRED:**

Attached Townhomes. 3rd Ald. Dist. **REREFERRED:**

(04008)

REPORTED BACK:

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

DATED: July 26, 2006 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Lisa Geer, Acting Chair; Ald. Noel Radomski, Todd Barnett, Cathleen Feland, Michael Barrett and Robert March.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 26, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(SIP) located at 6001 Kilpatrick Lane. Appearing on behalf of the project was Brian Munson of Vandewalle & Associates. In address of the Commission's previous comments on the project, the modified plans featured the following:

- In order to distinguish the front door from that of the garage door of the same color, windows have been provided.
- In regards to a request for drives to act as walkways, the applicant noted its preference to maintain separate walkways and driveways but did provide for the combination of certain walkways and driveways to provide for more green landscaped space in front of the buildings.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Barrett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0).

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, 6.5, 7, 7, 7.5 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 6001 Kilpatrick Lane

| | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|----------------|-----------|--------------|-------------------|---|-------|---|------------------|-------------------|
| Member Ratings | 7 | 8 | 7 | 7 | - | 8 | 8 | 7.5 |
| | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 7 |
| | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6.5 |
| | 7 | 6 | - | - | - | 7 | 8 | 7 |
| | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | - | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 8 (changes) |
| Me | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

General Comments:

- Excellent. Do we want such a dense landscape screen between open space areas of proposed and adjacent project?
- Window on garage doors are big improvement. Thank you!
- Much improved.
- Fine project. The substantial windows on the garage and the door (and its surround) really make the building much more street-friendly than most townhouses over garages.
- Appreciate added windows.