

AGENDA #3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: June 16, 2010
TITLE: 1862 Beld Street – Minor Exterior Remodeling, Cellular Equipment Installation in UDD No. 7. 13 th Ald. Dist. (18581)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: June 16, 2010	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, Ron Luskin, R. Richard Wagner, Mark Smith and Jay Ferm.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of June 16, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of cellular equipment installation located at 1862 Beld Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was Jim Weinmann, representing US Cellular. The project provides for the installation of cellular antennas and cables on the façade and roof of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Madison Multi-Cultural Center property. Weinmann presented information as to what US Cellular’s needs are and why they are proposing this equipment installation. The basis for this proposal is that US Cellular has a great need in this area for improved or enhanced signal strength. The need and use of wireless data transmissions is exploding; the only way to address this growing capacity is to add additional antennas to handle that capacity. Options include locating the antennas on a roof, in vent pipes, or behind the façade below the roof of the building. One design option extends the stairwells beyond the roofline; the other shows the façade extending from the side of the building. Staff explained that adding antennas to a building rooftop is a minor alteration to an existing conditional use, as well as a minor alteration to a building façade in UDD No. 7, staff requires that they screen it and make it as invisible as possible. The team presented two versions of the project; the original version which staff rejected features a faux brick covered coaxial cable enclosure or shroud at the streetside corner of the building with proposed antenna also screened within the shroud on the corner at Park Street off the building’s northwesterly corner; in addition to unscreened antennas on the easterly parapet of the building at Beld Street. An alternative proposal provides for the faux brick cable shroud at Park Street as previously proposed with faux brick shrouded elevator over run enclosures atop the building at both Park and Beld Streets. Comments from the Commission were as follows:

- I don’t have a problem with this.
- I’m a little leery. If it was a stand-alone it probably wouldn’t be noticeable, but with EIFS I’m not so sure.
- Agree that the towers add something.
- Basically friendly to the idea of this. I can attest that you guys need better coverage in the area. Concern with what this will look like as it ages and weathers. Is there an architectural design that doesn’t mimic the brick but provides shrouding and complements the design?
 - The material is new; high quality.
- Set it back from the building so it’s not in line with the brick.

- The towers should be taller than they are wider.
- Integrate with the architecture further and eliminate it “sticking out.”

ACTION:

On a motion by Wagner, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0). The motion instructed the applicants to look at placing the cable chase (enclosure) with an offset of the building’s façade on the westerly elevation facing Park Street, along with the use of a totally different material rather than EIFS or faux brick with a strong recommendation to consult with an architect to better deal with integrating the design of the cellular equipment with the building.

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, 5, 5, 6 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1862 Beld Street

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

General Comments:

- Stair tower option seems OK to me.
- Use brick at cable runs. Explore alternate material at antenna.
- Hire an architect to integrate design into existing architecture.
- Architectural solution to cell tower screening is welcome.