AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORTED BACK:

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PRESENTED: May 19, 2010

TITLE: 4622 Dutch Mill Road – Demolition and **REFERRED:**

Construction of an Office Building for the VFW in UDD No. 1, Landscape Plan. 16th **REREFERRED:**

Ald. Dist. (17628)

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

DATED: May 19, 2010 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Slayton, Todd Barnett, Mark Smith, Bruce Woods, Richard Wagner, Dawn O'Kroley.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 19, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of construction of an office building for the VFW located at 4622 Dutch Mill Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Steven R. Ring, Paul Haffely, Robert Gile and Joe Ellis, all representing the VFW. Ring explained that the project's budget has never allowed for extensive landscaping. Haffely from McKay Nursery addressed the landscape issues. He stated they would be planting grasses around the pond, and two deciduous trees have been added to the plan including other modifications. It was suggested a Washington Hawthorne would be a better option due to space issues.

ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Smith, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (4-1) with Barnett voting no. Barnett noted his lack of support for approving a suburban site plan in an Urban Design District.

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 3, 5, 5 and 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 4622 Dutch Mill Road

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3
	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-
	5	5	5	-	-	5	4	5
	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5

General Comments:

- Prior comments addressed.
- Approval of a suburban site plan is unacceptable.