



PREPARED FOR THE URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

Project Address: 4716 Sheboygan Avenue

Application Type: Major Amendment to Existing PD for a New Hotel in Madison Yards at Hill Farms in Urban Design District (UDD) 6

UDC is an Advisory and Approving Body

Legistar File ID #: [78595](#)

Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Background Information

Applicant | Contact: Kyle Strigenz, HKS Holdings, LLC | Ethan Skeels, Kahler Slater

Project Description: The applicant is proposing a major amendment to the existing Madison Yards at Hill Farms Planned Development Zoning for the construction of a five-story, approx. 104,000 GFA, 144-room hotel on Block 4.

Project Background:

- The UDC recommended approval of the Madison Yards at Hill Farms Planned Development - General Development Plan (PD-GDP) on July 11, 2018 (Legistar File ID [48873](#)).
- UDC received an Informational Presentation on March 11, 2020, for a residential/commercial mixed-use building on this site, "Block 4." (Legistar File ID [59852](#)).
- On April 23, 2018, Plan Commission recommended approval, and Common Council subsequently approved the Madison Yards at Hill Farms PD-GDP on May 1, 2018 (Legistar File ID [50130](#)). Common Council approval of the PD-GDP established the zoning text and development standards within the Planned Development (recorded PD-GDP attached below).
- UDC received an Informational Presentation on this request on July 26, 2023.

Approval Standards: The UDC is an **approving body** on this request. The site is located in Urban Design District 6 ("UDD 6"), which requires that the Urban Design Commission review the proposed project using the design standards and guidelines for that district in [MGO Section 33.24](#)(13).

The UDC is also an **advisory body** on the Planned Development request. For Planned Developments the UDC is required to provide a recommendation to the Plan Commission with specific findings on the design objectives listed in Zoning Code sections 28.098(1), Statement of Purpose, and (2), Standards for Approval (PD Standards Attached), including PD Standard (e), which generally speaks to coordinating "...architectural styles and building forms to achieve greater compatibility with surrounding land uses and create an environment of sustained aesthetic desirability compatible with the existing or intended character of the area and the statement of purpose of the PD District."

Zoning Related Information: The project site is located within the Madison Yards at Hill Farms Planned Development (PD) Zoning District, Block 4. As noted in the Madison Yards at Hill Farms PD Zoning Text, hotel uses are considered permitted uses, and in Block 4 building heights are required to be between two and eight stories (20-95 feet), with gross floor area ranging from 30,000-160,000 square-feet. In addition, the text also includes guidelines related to the building location, orientation, massing and articulation, materials, and landscaping and open space design, among other design-related considerations.

The project site is also located within the TOD Overlay district ([MGO 28.104](#)), which enumerates requirements related to setbacks (MGO Section 28.104(7)(a)), entrance orientation (MGO Section 28.104(7)(b)), and automobile infrastructure (MGO Section 28.104(8)).

With regard to setbacks, the TOD Overlay requires that 30 percent of the primary street-facing building facades shall be within 20 feet of the primary street. In addition, on corner lots, at least 30 percent of the street-facing facades shall be setback no more than 20 feet from the secondary street. In this case, Sheboygan Avenue and Gardener Road, are the primary and secondary streets, respectively. As proposed, the building **appears to meet** this standard as setbacks along Sheboygan Avenue are a maximum of 17 feet for over 30 percent of the building façade and 12 feet along Gardener Road for the entire street-facing façade.

As noted in Section MGO Section 28.104(7)(b), principal building entrances on all new buildings shall be oriented towards their primary abutting street (Sheboygan Avenue) and be located within the maximum setback (20 feet). With regard to the entry orientation, the Zoning Administrator has determined that the building entry located along Sheboygan Avenue **is consistent** with the TOD Overlay entrance orientation requirements. The entrance is designed to “...have a functional, operable door, open to the public during the same hours as all other building entrances...” and it has a consistent design aesthetic with other main points of entry into the building.

Lastly, pursuant to Section 28.104(8), Site Standards for Automobile Infrastructure are delineated, including “...automobile parking, loading, drive aisles, driveways, vehicle sales and service windows and drives...shall not be allowed between the primary abutting street-facing facades and the primary public or private street.” As designed the surface parking lot **does not** comply with the TOD Overlay district requirements because the surface parking area, loading area, and driveway are located between Sheboygan Avenue and portions of this street-facing façade. As such, the proposed surface parking can only be approved if a specific exception to this TOD Overlay requirement is granted as part of the PD approval process.

Summary of Design Considerations

Planning Division staff requests that the UDC review the proposed development and provide comments based on the standards for Planned Developments and UDD 6 requirements and guidelines, including the design considerations noted below.

- **Off Street Parking and Loading.** The development proposal includes a surface parking area that abuts Sheboygan Avenue, which is the primary abutting street. As noted above, the surface parking lot **does not** comply with the existing TOD Overlay requirements so to approve this plan an exception to this requirement would need to be granted as part of the PD approval process.

The UDD 6 guidelines for Off-street Parking and Loading Areas state that, “*Off-street parking and loading areas should be integrated into the overall site development*” and that careful consideration should be given to the relationship of such areas to the building they serve as well as the street, including locating these areas at the side or to the rear of buildings, rather than in the front, and utilizing landscape berms to screen the view of parking areas. As stated in UDD 6 Basis for Design Review, the Commission shall “...consider the requirements and guidelines as may be appropriate....development shall be meet the requirements and conform as much as possible to the guidelines.”

Staff continues to believe that given the intended urban mixed-use character of the Madison Yards Development, consideration should be given eliminating or significantly reducing the surface parking area. Doing so could result in a stronger urban edge along Sheboygan Avenue, with the potential for an alternate building footprint/type, an improved amenity space, and better building orientation and

relationship to the primary street and to the high frequency transit line on Sheboygan, as well as with the surrounding development.

Staff requests the UDC provide feedback and findings on the proposed surface parking lot, especially as it relates to the UDD 6 guidelines, PD standards, and the intent of the original GDP, which originally anticipated a courtyard U-shaped building with structured parking with the courtyard open space orientated towards the central green.

- **Building Design.** The project site is unique in that it is bounded on all sides by public and private streets, with Sheboygan Avenue and Gardener Road being the primary and secondary street, respectively. As a highly visible site, and subsequently highly visible building, not only internally to the development framing the central green, but also externally, consideration should be given to maintaining a positive building orientation and an enhanced design aesthetic on all four sides of the site and building.

Staff requests the Commission provide feedback and make findings on the overall building design and composition as it relates to the UDD 6 guidelines and requirements, as well as the PD standards, especially those that speak to maintaining consistency and compatibility with intended character of the area, utilizing an enhanced design aesthetic, especially at the ground level and across all four sides of the building, and minimizing/avoiding blank walls, including those on west elevation.

- **Wall Packs.** As noted on the elevation drawings VTAC louvers are proposed on all elevations. Staff notes that it has been the current practice to not locate such mechanical louvers/units on street facing facades, though they have been approved in some situations when found to be well integrated into the façade's design. Staff requests the Commission's feedback and findings on the proposed VTAC louvers/wall pack units.
- **Building Materials.** The building material palette is comprised of masonry, metal panel and fiber cement board with aluminum siding faux wood accents. Consideration should be given to the UDD 6 guidelines and requirements which generally speak to utilizing high-quality, durable materials that are sensitive to context, minimizing blank walls, and utilizing four sided architecture and design detailing, especially along the west elevation. In addition, consideration should also be given to the PD standards, including those that speak to maintaining consistency and compatibility within the PD and creating enhanced aesthetic desirability.

As noted by the Commission in their Informational Presentation comments, consideration should be given to minimizing the number of materials, and in providing a greater contrast between materials, including utilizing a more dynamic color palette or introducing more textures between them.

Staff requests the UDC provide feedback and make findings on the proposed material palette.

- **Landscape and Screening.** UDD 6 Landscaping guidelines and requirements generally speak to providing landscape that is functional as well as aesthetic, providing year-round screening, color and texture. Staff requests the UDC provide feedback and make findings related to proposed landscape planting plan and plant list, especially as it relates to providing effective screening, breaking down blank walls, and adding pedestrian interest along all street frontages.

Staff refers the Commission to their Informational Presentation comments including those related to utilizing larger specimens at the time of planting, incorporating a tree canopy into the outdoor amenity space and providing adequate screening for the parking area (i.e. a screen wall designed to be cohesive with the building design/materials and placed to hold the urban edge).

Staff notes that while there are several walls shown on the site and landscape plans, including a screen wall at the southwest corner of the site intended to screen the surface parking area, details of such walls were not included in the submittal materials. As such, staff recommends that the UDC include conditions related to the proposed walls as part of their formal action.

- **Lighting.** Staff notes that there appear to be inconsistencies with the proposed outdoor lighting and MGO 29.36, Outdoor Lighting, including uniformity ratios in excess of 5:1, light levels in excess of 25 footcandles at the property line, and light levels greater than 2.5 footcandles in pedestrian areas. The applicant is advised that revisions to the photometric plan will be required. Staff recommends that the UDC include a condition related to lighting as part of their formal action.

Summary of Informational Presentation Comments

As a reference, the Commission's comments from the July 26, 2023, Informational Presentation are provided below.

The Commission had the following questions for staff and the development team:

- It looks like the wood material comes down to the ground. How does that perform in Wisconsin winters with salt?
 - It's an aluminum product, used extensively out at Madison Yards, it's the same material we've used for the shade and cladding structures on Whole Foods. It's very durable.
- In the section, where is the finished floor relative to what you're showing as the bottom of the window in typical hotel rooms and how does that relate to where P-tack units are located?
 - We have vertical units as opposed to P-tack. Our guest room windows actually come all the way to the floor, the V-tack unit sits adjacent to the window behind the corrugated metal.
- So the P-tack units are located behind the metal louvers?
 - Yes.
- The precedent images with twinkle lights. Have you looked at the dark sky ordinance?
 - That has come up internally, as well as the idea of fire pits without things hanging over it. We're open to discussion as to what those lights would be for activation and dark sky compliance.
- That terrace area is very appealing, except on a day like today. Have you looked at sun shading?
 - Yes, the fire pits are one of the considerations there. We want the ambience at night, any shading would have to be away from that and the grill stations. The height of the screen wall and use of vertical fins will actually create some shading. But shading should be considered in more detail.
- The entry off Sheboygan is referred to as the south entry, but that's a major entry for TOD. I'm curious if you've tried any further investigation in your floor plan layout to make that a more prominent actual entry versus kind of the back door?
 - We have created a space, we feel it's a usable space for guests to utilize the courtyard. We feel it will be used by people using the BRT line and entering from Sheboygan. We created a seating group there, using it to navigate the grade change on the site. The function of guest arrival and guest experience is desirable from the perspective of the overall development, with the canopy along the central green and pedestrian realm being created within Madison Yards. Other projects within the development are oriented inwards. We feel the connection and double corridor we've created is an extension of the lobby using the courtyard as an organizing element.
- The loading berth is next to the outdoor courtyard?
 - It is, we are a relatively tight site. It is larger than we would like it to, but would be open to discussions about shortening that. We've pushed it closer to the courtyard to accommodate

vehicle circulation within the employee parking. Our food service is pretty limited, so we don't anticipate heavy loading and unloading for this use. We did use the grill station, and created a solid wall at 12-14 feet to block the view of that loading. It was preferable to get that off of Iron Street and centralized to the block.

- (Secretary) To clarify the entry orientation to Sheboygan, in talking with the Zoning Administrator it is possible to have two front doors. The design team is working to design the entry on Sheboygan to appear to be more of the front door. Whether that meets the TOD requirements for a front door is up to the Zoning Administrator, but I don't think we're at that point in the design yet. This is a Planned Development, should they want to seek exceptions to the TOD they certainly can do that through an amendment process.
- The outdoor enclosed patio, is that over structure?
 - No, it is on grade.
- Has the neighborhood had any comment about the surface parking facing Sheboygan?
 - We had a positive neighborhood meeting. There wasn't any specific concerns about the surface parking lot, more general questions about hotel operations.
- You have designed other buildings in the area. I would really benefit from a reminder about context. When you come back it would be great to understand that. The intended use of that rooftop #2, is that a public amenity or is that for guests?
 - That is a guest courtyard. There is a security guard rail so it is closed off with guests being able to fob in. We did feel that keeping it open allowed for that activity to be visible from Sheboygan is important.
- This is a PD, could you tell us the objectives and what's their relationship to design, including green building technologies, land uses, important environmental features with placement of building, preservation of historic buildings, provision of more adequate usable open space recreational amenities, facilitation of high quality development consistent with the goals of adopted plans.
 - Talking about preservation and activation of open space, it is important to note that Sheboygan is important to the TOD aspects of the neighborhood. The central green is an important asset to the development and neighborhood, it's important to the objectives of the overall development that we create a pedestrian scale street experience along Hill Farms Place and Sheboygan. There is some contextual response to the adjacent development beyond our parcel to the south. We also have robust and significant landscaping, we've included a pedestrian area along the front of the building. It will be a four over one podium building with significant amounts of masonry, along the entire service area as well, and a base course of stone along the entire building for a high quality building that will last for many years. As far as green building considerations, we are upgrading our HVAC beyond what would normally be utilized in a hotel like this as opposed to individual units.
- I appreciate that. I agree with you about the spirit of Hill Farms Place, I'm not seeing much design on the building itself that encourages that pedestrian experience. It seems like the public amenities are at the other side.
 - We've added glazing going beyond the Hilton prototype, including moving the fitness amenity space along Hill Farms Place. We've also moved our employee area and administrative offices to the northwest corner to encourage active uses behind that. The employee area is a large space with open windows to activate that area.
- Can you talk me through the door location? It really seems like the more interesting entry is on Hill Farms.
 - We've been working on this for a number of years prior to the TOD being enacted. This is an adaptation to meet this new requirement. We do feel that we're meeting the spirit of that requirement with this adjacent lobby space that stretches the site. But from a guest experience and the vitality of the central greenspace, the vehicular drop-off and guest arrival should be in the heart of the development. That's not something we could replicate on Sheboygan Avenue. In addressing the pedestrian experience, that front court is not gated off in any way.

- Lost Audio 1:38:30...audio resumes 1:39:10 during a development team response to a question.
 - In the center of the site, we were reserving that space for any required stormwater management that we may need. As the engineering has progressed, and as you may recall that the Madison Yards Development has some incredible stormwater infrastructure that was designed and redesigned after flooding a few years ago, it was planned for a much larger building with less permeability. So we have more than enough stormwater capability and we did not end to provide underground detention, infiltration, rain garden, any of that wasn't necessary within the site. We have reduced the surface parking lot by half. We have taken comment to rotate it and push it into the corner while still allowing enough screening around it. That greenspace is up for interpretation, if you had thoughts on what you would like to see happening in there. We do feel it is something nice to look on and helps with views from above from the guest rooms, but it is greenspace that we feel is just clean and simple as an amenity for viewing.

The Commission discussed the following:

- I've always liked the Madison Yards project, this fits in nicely with it, it's a very simple, modern building; it works. The only thing I have a problem with is the five different materials that all look the same. If you are going to have a modular brick that is gray and fiber cement that is almost gray, why not have them be the same material. A burnished block that is dark and a metal panel that is dark, why not have that be the same material. I think you can narrow the number of materials down. They're so similar in color. That's the only issue I have. You could simplify some of the five materials. I love the wood accent, it's a great contrast to everything, the monochromatic thing you have going on here.
- And the plan works, you don't need to program every bit of this space, so having some open just regular greenspace works.
- It's a well-designed project with the exception of all of the different materials that are similar colors. If they were different colors, it works, but the fact that they are the same color but different materials, it tends to be a waste of detailing.
- The brick looks flat, a lot like the cement board, and the metal panel looks like it could have some texture and throw some shade/shadow in interesting patterns. Maybe the brick could be handled differently than the cement board so that there is not only more texture to the building but also a bigger difference between the brick and the cement board. The textured metal panel is intriguing, the different ins and outs on that, I wonder if color effects that at all; how dynamic that is. The dark charcoal might take away from the shade and shadow, a lighter color may show more shade and shadow; something to consider.
- This is an attractive project, my first reaction was a bit of surprise with the courtyard being more Sheboygan facing. I had always imagined that indoor/outdoor relationship being oriented to the north towards Hill Farms Place. Your courtyard is a really great space, maybe if you can work in some tree canopy and make the fire places work, that space could really sing and be an incredible place to hang out. On that side, I like the repetition or rectangular spaces you have. For the green next to the parking lot you have some differing plans. I like the rigorously outlined geometry that plays off the courtyard; one recommendation is to make sure that landscape material, or wall, or hardscape material reinforces that edge so kids can play freely there and not worry about the front end of cars hanging into it. That sort of like relief from the building mass and the walled in courtyard is exciting and the lighting could be a great contributor to this as well. The repetition of the wood accent facing Hill Farms Place on the first floor level. That playfulness of the façade is really interesting. Thinking about the treatment of some of the edges of the parking lot.
- When you come back, I would call it metal panel with a wood look, not a wood accent.
- I agree with most of what's been said. It's a fairly handsome project with a nice amount of regularity and some specialness by using some of the features with the taller parapets. I appreciate that the mechanicals are hidden. One thing that I too a little surprised that there wasn't a stronger urban edge

along Sheboygan. Is there a way to extend that metal wood look across that southern edge and strengthen that with landscaping so it has a firmer edge? Think about the connection between the courtyard and the proposed lawn area, if there is an actual physical connection between those.

- I'm still struggling to understand the hierarchy of streets, and knowing that it is not our purview, can you assist in helping understand why Gardener is a secondary street and not Hill Farms Place? Seems to be me that Hill Farms and Sheboygan are the major focal points to this building and they are each attractive in their own ways.
- (Secretary) Ultimately the Zoning Administrator determines that, a lot of times that has to do with where you are taking access from and pulling your address from. Sheboygan is the primary street in this general zone. You are also looking at the classification of the streets as well. In this case, Gardener is the secondary and Sheboygan in the primary.
- I still think Hill Farms Place is the focus, but the Zoning Administrator doesn't address that at all?
- (Secretary) Not at this time. At this point, since the project is still conceptual, there will be more to come on that. It is unfortunate that a definition for a primary street was not included in the TOD overlay for clarification, something worth considering for an update to the ordinance.
- Primary and secondary streets are confusing. I was struck looking at these plans, trying to Rubik cube this building and parking lots into different configurations that would go along more with following the letter of the law. It seemed to me that the development team structured this pretty much the most obvious aesthetically pleasing way that it should go. That secondary entrance on Sheboygan Avenue, I don't see too many people arriving at this hotel by BRT, it will be in cars or Ubers or taxis and getting dropped off at the real front door which is on Hill Farms Place, which seems to me where it should be. A hotel like this being forced to have their main entrance or even the side streets, as opposed to Hill Farms opening up to a central park area, that seemingly was designed to interact with the surrounding building would not make any sense. This whole project was designed with certain goals that seem antithetical to what those goals are. I hope accommodations can be worked out to make this end up in a layout that is at least mostly similar to this.
- As far landscaping, it will be key, to block the view of the employee parking lot and some of these other areas too. Do some really well thought out plantings in a mix of deciduous and evergreens and to assign extra money in the budget to accommodate larger sized specimens to plant. This is not a project to plan saplings in and let them grow into the space. I hope that the foundation plantings, the border plantings along Gardener and the front of the building are not just like a single row of the same plant. Nobody wants to see another row of calamagrostis or a feather reed grass along there that we see on every other development in town. Show a little verve and imagination in the plant selection and it will go a long way towards complementing the building.
- That large yard space, there is not anything wrong with that being an unprogrammed space. If you choose the right selection of trees around the perimeter and do some nice uplighting, it could really be a striking extension of the courtyard area as well as something nice to look down at from the rooms above.
- I will echo some of the comments about the material finish. The material finishes and colors are a maybe little too understated, I'd like to see something more dynamic in textures and possible colors, but all in all it's a handsome project. This is seen as a replacement for the hotel at the corner of Segoe and University, which turned into an apartment. I kind of like the hotel better in this spot.
- You did show that adjacent residential building and I would just let this building stand out, I appreciate cohesiveness in the context of this Planned Development, but don't be too consistent with the surrounding buildings.
- UDD 6 talks about parking on primary streets, it should not be located there. So there is another conflict. I don't know if we really heard the applicant address those concerns. Just wondering what others think about that parking area. Should it be smaller, is it fine? I also assume there is parking in the structure, and that this is for staff. Just thought I would raise that since we have not discussed it.

- (Secretary) With regard to the parking, the big thing to note is that Sheboygan is considered the primary as coming from the TOD. Currently this site plan does not meet that requirement. They can ask for an exception to the TOD overlay requirements with the Planned Development. UDD guidelines and requirements cannot be modified as part of the Planned Development, the requirements must be met and the guidelines should be met as closely as possible. The Commission should provide direction or comment with regard to that parking and its location along the primary street, and if there are any suggestions or comments that the Commission has on how they can improve or alter it for the Commission to make a finding that the guidelines and requirements are being met.
- You answered my question that the UDD cannot be adjusted through the Planned Development process.
- With regard to the parking, I could see an argument that it's not necessarily between the building and the primary street, it's on the side really. It's not as though we have a big surface lot between the entire building and the street. I like the fact that there is an entrance on Sheboygan Avenue, TOD or no TOD. The thing that really strengthens it is that it's a one story element and you'll see a lot of daylight through those doors, that strengthens and identifies it as an entry element. It is a circuitous path to the front desk, but you're looking out to the courtyard, that strengthens and identifies it as an entry element. The number of materials is my biggest criticism, there could be one less material, my vote would be for removal of the cement panel; it doesn't have the richness that the brick and metal panel will have on a smaller scale. We see a lot of cement panel and how you detail it, if you're going to use it, will go a long way to make it feel like it's a high quality building. I would also reinforce comments about considering a building wall around maybe the corner, or at least along the way, maybe not continuous. A wall to reinforce that edge using some building materials that can incorporate all of your lush landscaping would really help screen the parking and make it seem like a cohesive development that belongs to the hotel.

ATTACHMENT
PD Zoning Statement of Purpose and Standards

28.098 (1) Statement of Purpose.

The Planned Development (PD) District is established to provide a voluntary regulatory framework as a means to facilitate the unique development of land in an integrated and innovative fashion, to allow for flexibility in site design, and to encourage development that is sensitive to environmental, cultural, and economic considerations, and that features high-quality architecture and building materials. In addition, the Planned Development District is intended to achieve one or more of the following objectives:

- (a) Promotion of green building technologies, low-impact development techniques for stormwater management, and other innovative measures that encourage sustainable development.
- (b) Promotion of integrated land uses allowing for a mixture of residential, commercial, and public facilities along corridors and in transitional areas, with enhanced pedestrian, bicycle and transit connections and amenities.
- (c) Preservation and enhancement of important environmental features through careful and sensitive placement of buildings and facilities.
- (d) Preservation of historic buildings, structures, or landscape features through adaptive reuse of public or private preservation of land.
- (e) Provision of more adequate, usable, and suitably located open space, recreational amenities, and other public facilities than would otherwise be provided under conventional land development techniques.
- (f) Facilitation of high-quality development that is consistent with the goals, objectives, policies, and recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan and adopted neighborhood, corridor or special area plans.

28.098(2) Approval Standards for Project

The standards for approval of a zoning map amendment to the PD District, or any major alteration to an approved General Development Plan, are as follows:

- (a) The applicant shall demonstrate that no other base zoning district can be used to achieve a substantially similar pattern of development. Planned developments shall not be allowed simply for the purpose of increasing overall density or allowing development that otherwise could not be approved unless the development also meets one or more of the objectives of (1) above. Conditions under which planned development may be appropriate include:
 - 1. Site conditions such as steep topography or other unusual physical features; or
 - 2. Redevelopment of an existing area or use of an infill site that could not be reasonably developed under base zoning district requirements.
- (b) The PD District plan shall facilitate the development or redevelopment goals of the Comprehensive Plan and of adopted neighborhood, corridor or special area plans.
- (c) The PD District plan shall not adversely affect the economic health of the City or the area of the City where the development is proposed. The City shall be able to provide municipal services to the property where the planned development is proposed without a significant increase of the cost of providing those services or economic impact on municipal utilities serving that area.
- (d) The PD District plan shall not create traffic or parking demands disproportionate to the facilities and improvements designed to meet those demands. A traffic demand management plan may be required as a way

to resolve traffic and parking concerns. The Plan shall include measurable goals, strategies, and actions to encourage travelers to use alternatives to driving alone, especially at congested times of day. Strategies and actions may include, but are not limited to, carpools and vanpools; public and private transit; promotion of bicycling, walking and other non-motorized travel; flexible work schedules and parking management programs to substantially reduce automobile trips.

- (e) The PD District plan shall coordinate architectural styles and building forms to achieve greater compatibility with surrounding land uses and create an environment of sustained aesthetic desirability compatible with the existing or intended character of the area and the statement of purpose of the PD District.
- (f) The PD District plan shall include open space suitable to the type and character of development proposed, including for projects with residential components, a mix of structured and natural spaces for use by residents and visitors. Areas for stormwater management, parking, or in the public right of way shall not be used to satisfy this requirement.
- (g) The PD district shall include suitable assurances that each phase could be completed in a manner that would not result in an adverse effect upon the community as a result of termination at that point.
- (h) When applying the above standards to an application for height in excess of that allowed in Section 28.071(2)(a) Downtown Height Map, except as provided for in Section 28.071(2)(a)1. and Section 28.071(2)(b), the Plan Commission shall consider the recommendations in adopted plans and no application for excess height shall be granted by the Plan Commission unless it finds that all of the following conditions are present:
 - 1. The excess height is compatible with the existing or planned (if the recommendations in the Downtown Plan call for changes) character of the surrounding area, including but not limited to the scale, mass, rhythm, and setbacks of buildings and relationships to street frontages and public spaces.
 - 2. The excess height allows for a demonstrated higher quality building than could be achieved without the additional stories.
 - 3. The scale, massing and design of new buildings complement and positively contribute to the setting of any landmark buildings within or adjacent to the project and create a pleasing visual relationship with them.
 - 4. For projects proposed in priority viewsheds and other views and vistas identified on the Views and Vistas Map in the City of Madison Downtown Plan, there are no negative impacts on the viewshed as demonstrated by viewshed studies prepared by the applicant.
- (i) When applying the above standards to an application to reduce or eliminate setbacks required by Section 28.071(2)(c) Downtown Setback Map, the Plan Commission shall consider the recommendations in adopted plans, including the downtown plan. No application to reduce or eliminate setbacks may be granted unless it finds that all of the following conditions are present:
 - 1. The lot is a corner parcel.
 - 2. The lot is not part of a larger assemblage of properties.
 - 3. The entire lot is vacant or improved with only a surface parking lot.
 - 4. No principal buildings on the lot have been demolished or removed since the effective date of this ordinance