

## AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

|  |   |
|--|---|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION   | <b>PRESENTED:</b> August 8, 2007                                |
| TITLE: 2425 Jeffy Trail/Lot 77 of Hawks Creek<br>Plat – Planned Residential Development<br>(PRD). 1 <sup>st</sup> Ald. Dist. (06626) | <b>REFERRED:</b><br><b>REREFERRED:</b><br><b>REPORTED BACK:</b> |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary  | <b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>                                     |
| DATED: August 8, 2007  | <b>ID NUMBER:</b>   |

---

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Richard Slayton, Michael Barrett and Todd Barnett.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of August 8, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PRD located at 2425 Jeffy Trail. Appearing on behalf of the project were Don Schroeder, Dennis Grosse and Rich North. The modifications to the plans since initial approval consist of the following:

- The elimination of crabs in favor of alternative plantings such as amelanchier.
- The creation of fenced/landscaped areas/privacy areas adjacent to ground level patios.
- The exterior façade noted as previously proposed, except for the elimination of dormers on the four-unit building type with a departure from adjoining duplex garages to be separated to relate better as individual units.
- In several instances, the previously proposed utilization of dual drives has been eliminated to provide for shared drives to reduce the amount of curb cuts, as well as providing for the general narrowing of dual drives to be maintained.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Barrett, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (5-0). The motion required that the fascia be wood, hardiplank, smart board or similar durable material.

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, 6, 6 and 7.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2425 Jeffy Trail**

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

General Comments:

- Good to see shared driveways and scaled down widths. There should have been pedestrian connections to this property to the west.