

From: [Susan Wolf](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: item 86419 pc meeting Mon Jan 13, 2025
Date: Monday, January 13, 2025 2:21:46 PM

You don't often get email from wolfsusan5@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

To the Plan commission: I am opposed to the current request 86419 on the Mon Jan 13, 2025 planning commission meeting agenda for demolition of two adjacent houses, on Edgewood and Jefferson streets. My primary reason is that mounds have been reported on that site and no appropriate permission from the appropriate state government historical unit regarding mounds has been received. That should be settled and the decision publicly recorded before any request to modify the site is made. A secondary reason is that while the house facing Edgewood is less desirable, the house facing Jefferson is in reasonably good shape and has historic value. If permission regarding mounds is obtained, I would not be opposed to the owners being allowed to recombine the two lots, raze the smaller house facing Edgewood, and enlarge the house facing Jefferson in a style consistent with the historic neighborhood.

Susan Will Wolf
1921 Madison St.
Madison, WI USA 53711
email: wolfsusan5@gmail.com

From: [Evers, Tag](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Fw: Demolition Permit 2121 Jefferson St & 1007 Edgewood,
Date: Monday, January 13, 2025 2:18:36 PM

Forwarding this input from a constituent.

From: Hans Borcharding <hansborcharding@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2025 12:08 PM
To: Evers, Tag <district13@cityofmadison.com>; All Alders <allalders@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: Hans Borcharding <hansborcharding@yahoo.com>
Subject: Demolition Permit 2121 Jefferson St & 1007 Edgewood,

Some people who received this message don't often get email from hansborcharding@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Plan Commission

I am asking you to deny the demolition permit for the two houses located at 2121 Jefferson St and 1007 Edgewood to help maintain the historic character of our neighborhood. Yes they both; have deferred maintenance and vinyl siding. The original windows, siding and trim work are underneath waiting for restoration. This does not equate to the houses being uninhabitable and not worthy of saving.

The historic character of the neighborhood is waiting to come out with basic renovation and repair all the other houses in our neighborhood have undergone or need. The houses have retained their beauty and character inside. Yes the kitchen is not original but the floors, trim, doors and layout remain relatively unchanged. Many of us envy the original undamaged and unpainted clear interior woodwork throughout the houses. We moved here for historic character and beauty of the entire neighborhood. These houses are also part of the history of Edgewood and also a long Native American culture, do we want to erase this as well?

We all have needed to replace plumbing, wiring, heating, landscaping, and make upgrades to modernize our houses to meet current code and changing needs, but have not gone the route of tearing down and replacing the houses we love. because they were "too far gone".

The loss of these two houses would degrade the historic nature of the Vilas Neighborhood, as well as reduce the availability of affordable housing in the near downtown area.

In closing please deny the demolition request.

Thank You
Hans Borcharding
12524 Jefferson St
Madison, wi, 53711

Thank You Hans Borcharding 1524 Jefferson St. Madison, WI 53711 Cell 608-220-6909

From: [Eileen Hornberger Thompson](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Wells, Chris](#)
Cc: [Carol Borcharding](#); [Hans Borcharding](#)
Subject: Fwd: Plan commission mtg 1-13-25/ agenda #7
Date: Monday, January 13, 2025 1:57:35 PM
Attachments: [Hans and Carol Borcharding _opposition letter.docx](#)

Some people who received this message don't often get email from eileenlittleredt@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Hi Chris Wells, and Plan Commission,

Please see attached previously submitted letter transcribed from the email with permission to resubmit in email.

Regards, Eileen Thompson

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Carol Borcharding** <carol.borcharding@wisc.edu>
Date: Mon, Jan 13, 2025 at 1:26 PM
Subject: Re: Please resubmit your letter today by 3:00PM / Save Historic Homes
To: Eileen Hornberger Thompson <eileenlittleredt@gmail.com>, hansborcharding@yahoo.com <hansborcharding@yahoo.com>

Dear Eileen,

I give you permission to resubmit the statement below on our behalf written by Hans Borcharding and Carol Borcharding to tonight's meeting, Agenda #7.

Please let me know if this might be possible for you to do for us.

Thanks!

Carol Borcharding

From: Hans Borcharding
To: Plan Commission Comments
Cc: Hans Borcharding; Carol Borcharding

Subject: Demolition of historic houses 2121 Jefferson St & 1007 Edgewood Ave. **Date:** Monday, September 23, 2024 1:03:25 PM

Dear Plan Commission

I am asking you reject the demolition permit for item #9 (84825) on the Monday September 23, 2024 Plan Commission meeting. I believe the integrity of the historic character would be eroded by the removal of two historic houses, with their replacement by a modern house. I feel it is important to stop the ongoing removal of existing sound housing stock to facilitate their replacement with modern houses that do not contribute to the historic character of the neighborhood.

Thank You ,
Hans Borcharding
1524 Jefferson St
Madison, Wi

Plan Commission Meeting : January 13,2025

Re: 2121 Jefferson St. and 1007 Edgewood Ave. File #7 / # 86419

Dear Plan Commission,

We are asking you reject the demolition permit for item #7 /8641 formerly #9 /84825) on the Monday September 23, 2024, now January 13,2025 Plan Commission meeting.

We believe the integrity of the historic character would be eroded by the removal of two historic houses, with their replacement by a modern house. I feel it is important to stop the ongoing removal of existing sound housing stock to facilitate their replacement with modern houses that do not contribute to the historic character of the neighborhood.

Thank You ,
Hans and Carol Borcharding
1524 Jefferson St
Madison, Wi

From: [Laura Flanagan](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Agenda Item: 7 86419 Demo Permit - 2121 Jefferson St & 1007 Edgewood Ave
Date: Monday, January 13, 2025 11:13:43 AM

You don't often get email from laurajkflanagan@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Hello,

My understanding is that the homes at 2121 Jefferson St and 1007 Edgewood Ave would be replaced with just one single family home. I oppose the demolition of two homes for just one single family residence. We must increase housing availability and density in order to meet the needs of our community.

If a proposed demolition would result in two or more residences, I would withdraw my opposition at this time. I would prefer anything that replaces the homes look cohesive with the neighborhood (e.g. similar visual style, not super modern) but my priority is increasing the volume of available housing.

Best,

Laura Flanagan
1440 Vilas Ave, Madison, WI 53711

From: [Don Sanford](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: PC Meeting Jan 13, 2025 Item 7
Date: Monday, January 13, 2025 11:09:04 AM

You don't often get email from dpsanford@charter.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

I have registered in opposition to the proposed demolition of these properties. Homes in a historic district come with many issues including but not limited to: tiny closets, cracked plaster, mice and leaky windows. It's all part of the charm of an old house. We decided to live in an old home in this historic district knowing what we were in for, mostly. These old homes can be brought up to code and modern standards while maintaining the character of the neighborhood. Replacing an old home with something new establishes a bad precedent for a historic district not just in Wingra Park but in every historic district in Madison. I urge the Plan Commission to deny this demolition request.

Donald Sanford

dpsanford@charter.net
608-225-7520

From: [James Gesbeck](#)
To: [Madison Mayor](#)
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Concerns Regarding Proposed Amendments to the Demolition Permit Process
Date: Monday, January 13, 2025 11:08:55 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from james@gesbeck.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Mayor Rhodes-Conway,

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed amendments to the demolition permit process as outlined in your office's recent announcement. Specifically, I object to the provision allowing administrative approval of demolitions determined by the Landmarks Commission to be non-historic without an additional review by the Plan Commission. While I understand and support the broader goals of streamlining processes to encourage housing growth, I strongly urge you to include a safeguard ensuring that such demolitions do not reduce housing density.

For example, the current demolition permit application under File 86419 illustrates why administrative review alone is insufficient. This application proposes demolishing two historic homes at 1007 and 1013 Edgewood Avenue to replace them with a single, larger home. Even if these properties were not historic, this type of redevelopment results in a net loss of housing units in a city already grappling with a significant housing shortage. Allowing such proposals to bypass Plan Commission review would undermine efforts to maintain and expand Madison's housing stock.

If the intent of these amendments is to encourage infill development and increase housing availability, it is imperative to include a requirement that any application proposing to reduce housing density must be reviewed by the Plan Commission. This would ensure that all proposed demolitions are aligned with the city's broader housing goals.

The proposed package describes these amendments as "easy, common-sense changes to further support growth and streamline the path for smaller infill developments." While I support measures to promote housing growth, the loss of density resulting from demolitions like File 86419 runs counter to this objective. Reducing housing availability is neither "common-sense" nor supportive of the city's stated goals.

I respectfully request that you amend the proposal to include a provision requiring Plan Commission review for any demolition applications that reduce housing density. By doing so, you can ensure that these streamlined processes do not inadvertently harm

Madison's housing stock or exacerbate the housing shortage.

Thank you for your leadership on this important issue, and I appreciate your consideration of these concerns.

Sincerely,

James Gesbeck

9302 Harvest Moon Lane

Verona, WI 53593

NB: This is a City of Madison property but serviced by a Verona postal code.

From: [James Gesbeck](#)
To: [Planning](#); [Wells, Chris](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Madison Legistar 86419: Substantive Objection to Demolition Permit Application for 2121 Jefferson Street (Half Parcel) and 1007 Edgewood Avenue (Half Parcel)
Date: Monday, January 13, 2025 11:00:48 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from james@gesbeck.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the demolition permit request for 1007 and 1013 Edgewood Avenue. This application, in its current state, fails to provide essential evidence to justify the demolition of these two historic homes. The lack of transparency and the absence of critical information make it clear that this request is not only premature but also poses a grave risk to Madison's historic preservation efforts. Furthermore, granting this request would establish a harmful precedent for other property owners, encouraging neglect and incentivizing the destruction of our city's historic fabric. Below, I outline the significant shortcomings of this application and why it must be denied.

1. Lack of Evidence Supporting Rehabilitation Costs

The applicant has failed to provide any concrete evidence demonstrating that rehabilitating these historic homes is cost-prohibitive or that razing and rebuilding would be a more financially sound decision. This glaring omission is especially troubling given the lack of professional opinions from architects, contractors, or real estate professionals to support their claims. The "letter of intent" makes vague references to the costs of rehabilitation but does not even disclose who authored it, leaving us to wonder whether the information is credible. Was it written by the homeowners? Their attorney? Someone else entirely? Without clear attribution, the assertions within the letter carry little weight.

Many of the cited rehabilitation challenges—such as replacing a guard rail, installing smoke detectors, or adding shut-off valves to exterior faucets—are standard maintenance tasks that hardly justify the demolition of historic properties. These are routine repairs that any homeowner could reasonably address. To suggest that such minor issues warrant tearing down two contributing structures in a historic district is absurd. The applicant's failure to provide cost estimates for rehabilitation or to explore reasonable alternatives demonstrates a lack of effort and a disregard for the historical and architectural value of these homes.

2. Dismissal of Available Tax Credit Programs

The applicant's claim that it is "patently unfair" to expect them to seek tax credits is both misleading and unfounded. While no one expects homeowners to apply for every possible tax credit, the Wisconsin Historical Society offers a straightforward and accessible program specifically designed to assist in rehabilitating historic homes. This program requires minimal effort to apply for, with much of the documentation aligning closely with what has already been submitted for this demolition request. For example, the first page of the application simply asks for contact information, which the applicant has already provided. The second and third pages are similarly straightforward, requiring information that should already be readily available.

Submitting this application before beginning rehabilitation work ensures that homeowners can determine eligibility for tax credits early in the process. Given that the applicant has not provided any financial details about the cost of rehabilitation, their insistence on demolition without even inquiring about available credits appears dismissive at best and disingenuous at worst. The question must be asked: is it truly unreasonable to expect homeowners to take this simple step before proposing the irreversible destruction of historic properties?

3. Contradictory Claims About Property Condition

The applicant's architect has described these properties as "dilapidated and unhealthy," yet the home at 1007 Edgewood Avenue is currently listed as available for rent. The rental advertisement (accessible at <https://www.apartments.com/1007-edgewood-ave-madison-wi/lw8wvpf/>) includes photographs that depict a home ready for immediate occupancy. Nowhere in this listing are prospective tenants warned of the supposedly "poor condition" or "considerable safety risks" that the applicant claims make the property uninhabitable. This contradiction raises serious questions about the validity of their assertions.

If the home is indeed as unsafe and uninhabitable as the applicant claims, then why are they attempting to rent it out? Conversely, if the home is suitable for tenants, then the claims of "dilapidation" are baseless. This inconsistency undermines the credibility of the application and suggests that the applicant is exaggerating the property's condition to justify demolition. It also raises ethical concerns about renting a property they deem unsafe, potentially placing tenants at risk.

4. Harmful Precedent for Madison's Historic Districts

Allowing these demolitions would set a dangerous precedent for Madison's historic

districts. If property owners can alter contributing resources in unsympathetic ways—such as adding vinyl siding—and then use those alterations as justification for demolition, the integrity of our historic neighborhoods will be irreparably compromised. This would signal to other property owners that neglect and inappropriate modifications are acceptable pathways to obtaining demolition permits.

The applicant's plan to replace two historic homes with a single, larger home is equally troubling. Such actions erode the housing stock, reducing affordability and diversity in our neighborhoods. If this trend continues, Madison risks becoming a city accessible only to the wealthy. The applicant also fails to address how many other homes might meet the vague criteria they propose for demolition. Approving this request could lead to a rush of similar applications, threatening the survival of historic districts citywide.

5. Encouragement of Neglect

Approving this demolition request would reward neglectful property management and encourage future neglect of historic properties. Homeowners in historic districts have a responsibility to maintain their buildings, yet this application seeks to avoid that obligation entirely. Granting this permit would send a clear message that neglect and disrepair are acceptable strategies for justifying demolition, further undermining the preservation of Madison's historic neighborhoods.

6. Baseless Claims About Structural Deficiencies

The applicant's assertion that the properties' deficiencies cannot be addressed through reasonable maintenance or repair is entirely unsubstantiated. There is no evidence from an architect, contractor, or real estate professional to support this claim. Instead, the applicant relies on conclusory statements that are directly contradicted by their own rental advertisement for 1007 Edgewood Avenue.

Reasonable maintenance and repair should be the first course of action for historic properties, not demolition. Installing smoke detectors or replacing a stairway railing are routine tasks that do not justify destroying two historic homes. The applicant's refusal to explore repair options further demonstrates their lack of commitment to preserving these important structures.

7. Lack of Transparency About Future Plans

The applicant has not been forthcoming about the size or design of the proposed replacement home. Their vague description, claiming only that the new home will be a "size that will fit," leaves the community with little information about how the new structure will impact the neighborhood. This lack of transparency raises concerns about

the compatibility of the new construction with the surrounding historic district and the potential for overdevelopment.

The applicant wants the Planning Commission to believe that they will build a home that will fit into the neighbor. However, this is an applicant that was unwilling to invest the time and effort to even proofread their application for a demolition permit. Is this the sort of applicant that the planning commission believes will invest the time and effort to build a home that fits into the neighborhood?

8. Opportunities for New Construction Elsewhere

There are ample opportunities for the applicant to build their dream home elsewhere in Madison. Developments such as Acacia Ridge and 1000 Oaks offer a range of lot sizes and modern home designs without requiring the destruction of historic properties. The applicant's desire for new construction does not necessitate the demolition of two contributing resources in a historic district.

Conclusion

The applicant has failed to provide the necessary evidence to justify this demolition request. Their lack of transparency, dismissal of alternatives, and contradictory statements about the property's condition are deeply concerning. Approving this request would not only result in the loss of two historic homes but also set a precedent that threatens the future of Madison's historic districts.

I urge the Planning Commission to reject this application and protect Madison's rich architectural heritage for future generations.

Sincerely,

James Gesbeck
9302 Harvest Moon Lane
Verona, WI 53593

NB: This is a City of Madison property but serviced by a Verona postal code.

A Lot of Sizzle, but Where's the Steak?

The eminent design and legal teams hired to promote a project(s) at 1007 Edgewood and 2121 Jefferson Streets have served up what appears to be an extensive menu of alarming construction "Defects" that all but begs for the wrecking ball. A team of equally qualified volunteer professionals from Madison's building community has been requesting access to the homes to verify the conditions listed in the inspection report but has been repeatedly denied access, raising question(s) for the reason(s) behind the denial.

In the absence of an in-person fact check, we can only scrutinize the documentation actually submitted, so I have carefully examined the 94-page condition report, and it certainly seems to have an excess of irrelevance, innuendo, alarmism, and a complete lack of following up on their own recommendations to follow-up.

The 94-page litany of "Defects" is primarily a well-crafted and commendable list of common maintenance issues and basic recommendations for home improvements, at least some of which likely exist in each of our own homes and many of the others that could be applied to the vast majority of older homes anywhere. Many of the listed items could be addressed by a skilled handyman.

Absolutely nothing of imminent danger has been demonstrated, and as far as relevance for a demolition permit, we have simply been served "one big piping hot nothing-burger!"

The following examples were taken **from only the first two (2) pages** of the 94-page condition report and **only from the bold red typeface portions of those same two (2) pages**:

1.) Conditions commonly found in older buildings listed in the first 2 pages that are irrelevant and easily repairable:

- "cracking and peeling paint"

2.) Unsubstantiated innuendo in the first 2 pages (my underlining):

- "support posts do not appear to be installed on footings";
- "window frames appear out of plumb";
- "gaps in the ceiling may indicate past water entry";

3.) Items in the first 2 pages that were compliant when the homes were constructed that are typically grandfathered until remodeled:

- "no GFCI noted at front porch."

4.) Potential defects in the first 2 pages recommended for "qualified" follow-up. (The submitter from AmeriSpec is apparently NOT qualified?) No evidence of follow-up is presented:

- (paint) "Recommend further review by a qualified contractor"
- (GFCI) "Recommend review and repairs by a qualified electrician..."
- (Porch) "Recommend further review by a qualified contractor..."
- (Stairs) "Recommend review by a qualified professional..."
- (Joists) "Recommend review by a qualified professional..."
- (Beams) "Recommend review by a qualified professional..."

This approach of irrelevance, unsubstantiated innuendo, alarmism, unfulfilled recommendations, and repetition continues throughout the remaining 92 pages.

The potential homeowners and their hired professionals have done an exhaustive job crafting an image of two dangerously deteriorated and historically irrelevant structures that can only be made safe by demolition. I heartily disagree.

Photos 6-9 and 16, 18, and 19 in the demolition photos as well as the photo on page 88 of the inspection report show intact interiors of each home with well-preserved original trim in the Bungalow/Craftsman style typical of that period and neighborhood. The trim wood further appears to be Tidewater Red Cypress, a rare and highly desirable species said to be Frank Lloyd Wright's favorite, and so popular in that era that it was logged out and has only recently become available, custom milled at a premium price.

Given the location, period of construction, and style of these homes it is a near certainty that at least one if not both homes were designed by Cora Cadwallader Tuttle, one of Madison's most significant and underappreciated female architects who was solely responsible for bringing Bungalow/Craftsman architecture to Madison in the early 20th century. She designed and lived at 1206 Grant St. and was the architect of the spectacular homes at 1202 Grant and 1811, 1813 and 1821 Vilas Avenue that define the Wingra Park Historic District. She also designed numerous other homes throughout our city, including the home I live in.

It is my belief that those two structures have restorable historical significance and with reasonable and economical maintenance and improvements could provide highly desirable housing for two large families as well as contribute to the historical significance and desirability of the Wingra Park Historic District.

I would also hope that architect Bruns, as an oft-stated professional guardian of "the public welfare" can appreciate that in a city where a lack of housing is critical, the public welfare is better served by maintaining two recently occupied and eminently livable structures in a desirable neighborhood rather than combining them into an as yet unspecified but potentially disruptive much larger single home, or even potential rental property(s).



John Martens
4118 Hegg Avenue, Madison

My personal qualifications for this analysis:

- Five-Year Bachelor of Architecture degree *magna cum laude*, University of Southern California, 1971.
- Over 50 years' experience in Architectural Design, Development, Construction, and Building Science locally, nationally, and internationally.
- Major relevant projects in the Madison area include:
 - Development, restoration, and 25 years of ownership and management of National Register property, *Madison Candy Company*, 744 Williamson St.
 - Instrumental in the restoration of the 35,000 square foot historic *Theo Kupfer Ironworks* building, 149 Waubesa Street now owned and operated by the Goodman Community Center.
 - Primary member of the design team and construction manager for the \$6M *Deer Park Buddhist Temple*, Schneider Road, McFarland.
- Extensive research on Cora Tuttle for home restorations and neighborhood newsletter articles.
- 11-year member of Madison Zoning Board of Appeals, 6 years as Chair; member of Zoning Code Rewrite Committee, various other short-term mayoral committees.



Dominican Sisters OF SINSINAWA

Prioress of the Congregation | 585 County Road Z | Sinsinawa, Wisconsin 53824 | 608.748.4411 | cheltsley@sinsinawa.org

January 13, 2025

Dear Members of the Madison Plan Commission,

A blessed and happy New Year to each of you!

Please allow me to introduce myself; my name is Sister Christina Heltsley, and presently it is my privilege to serve as the Prioress (President) of the Sinsinawa Dominican Congregation. I write today in regards to the properties at 2121 Jefferson and 1007 Edgewood, Madison, Wisconsin. I write today as one who has personal experience with those homes as our Congregation owned them for many years and needed to sell them because they were no longer safe for older Dominican Sisters. Further, I am writing to express my strong support for Sami and Brittany's (the new owners) application for a demolition permit.

As the person, in the name of the Congregation, who sold these properties, I can personally attest to their condition and layout, which are not suitable for elderly residents or anyone with physical limitations. The narrow stairs and overall structure presented significant challenges, and ultimately, these issues made the houses unlivable for us without extensive and cost-prohibitive changes.

It is my understanding that the new owners presented a beautiful and neighborhood appropriate architects rendition of what a new structure would look like. In my opinion, it would grace those lots, is respectful of the tone of the community and would serve older and young residents. I further understand that Sami and Brittany plan to create a multigenerational home where Sami's aging parents will live with them, could safely navigate the new house and would receive the care they need. The existing homes are not conducive to such a setup. The homes' current states would pose risks and obstacles for Sami's parents as they age.

It is also my understanding that the two parcels were at one time a single parcel. The approval of the new owners plans would allow a return to the original intent of that space and that was to accommodate one beautiful home. As someone with firsthand experience of these houses, I urge the Commission to approve the demolition permit. Thank you for considering this application. Please feel free to reach out with any questions I might be able to answer at the contact information provided above.

Blessed day,

Christina Heltsley, OP.

Sister Christina Heltsley, OP

Prioress of the Sinsinawa Dominican Sisters

From: [Amie Goldman](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Cc: [Evers, Tag](#)
Subject: Agenda Item #7 - Demolition Permit
Date: Monday, January 13, 2025 9:18:40 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from atgoldman@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Hello,

I'm writing in favor of granting the demolition permits submitted by Sami and Brittany Kawas for the houses at 2121 Jefferson and 1007 Edgewood Ave.

My husband and I purchased our home at 2121 Madison St. in 2016. Even though the home had been well maintained over the years, it needed extensive work to maintain safety and its long term integrity. For example, we had to replace knob and tube wiring because previous owners had blown in insulation around the wiring creating a fire hazard. Previous owners had also removed a support beam creating an issue with structural integrity. The foundation of the carriage house was cracking and the building had deteriorated beyond repair. Additional changes were needed (e.g. addition of a first floor bathroom) to make our home accessible to our aging parents. Having the original 1910 blueprints for the home allowed us to make other changes bringing the home closer to its original state.

The extensive investments we undertook made economic sense as our home was generally in very good condition, was architecturally unique and was on a large lot (previous owners and neighbors had purchased the empty adjacent lot and divided the property). We could replace the crumbling carriage house with a modern two car carriage that could be wired to charge future electric cars.

Others have argued that the Kawas family could do the same with their two properties. I disagree. For better or for worse, the property values in the Vilas neighborhood have skyrocketed in the 8 years we've owned our home. The acquisition cost for those properties are (\$639,400 and \$582,300) evidence of that. If the Kawas family were to invest in the extensive work needed to address all of the structural and maintenance issues and to update the houses, based on our experience, the costs would be in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. The idea that either of the houses, given their size, physical layout, lot sizes and lack of garages would be worth the almost \$1 million investment in each is absurd.

The houses are old and not historic. Replacing them with a single home that respects the character of the neighborhood is the right choice for the neighborhood. I believe that the new replacement house will add to the character of the neighborhood and that the loss of the two existing houses will not detract from the overall historic nature or character of the neighborhood. It's also the only option that makes economic sense for these properties.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments. I am out of town and unable to be there in person tonight.

Amie Goldman

2121 Madison St.

From: [Sandy Wolens](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Evers, Tag](#); [council](#)
Subject: 2121 Jefferson St and 1007 Edgewood Ave demolition and replacement
Date: Monday, January 13, 2025 8:15:17 AM

You don't often get email from lovemotherearth9193@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

To Whom It May Concern,

We are opposed to the demolition of 2121 Jefferson Ave and 1007 Edgewood Ave and to the creation of yet another modern monstrosity in this beautiful historic neighborhood.

The real question is WHY would such a request would be approved by any government body? Is the WHY for the acceptance of the temporary gain of **one** individual, lucky enough to have purchased these 2 homes for great prices, or for the **one** family who will occupy the new, perfectionists' dream of a home?

The destructive precedent for this and other historic neighborhoods for the long-term, the lack of consideration for current guidelines for the preservation of historic homes and of Native American (Ho-chunk) burial grounds on these properties and the turning of a blind eye for government approved tax credits in order to update/repair these characterful and well-crafted homes would be travesties.

We've been lucky to live in this beautiful neighborhood for 34 and counting years. It will be rare in the future to ever replicate the beauty of the wood, design and craftsmanship of these homes. Through the years we have updated and replaced everything that has been mentioned for the needs of the above mentioned homes and even more (this year finished knob and tube, new basement sewer line and drain, new pipes to replace galvanized steel). We still have the pain-in-the-butt old-fashioned pulley/ballast windows and the windows that need the top section pushed upwards before the bottom section can be pushed up and locked. Our home, and those homes and burial grounds, don't need to be torn down and replaced, just deeply appreciated for their location, their history and their craftsmanship.

Sincerely,
Sandy Wolens and Michael Feldman
1010 Van Buren St, Madison, WI 53711

From: [Nancy Daly](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Cc: nmdaly@charter.net
Subject: Demolition of Vilas neighborhood houses, item 86419
Date: Friday, January 10, 2025 10:06:09 PM

[You don't often get email from nmdaly@charter.net. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

I strongly oppose the demolition request for these two properties!

We have lived in the neighborhood just a couple blocks from these houses for over 32 years in a 1927 home.

All older homes need continued repair and upkeep, these are no exception. Demolishing them goes against the aim of increasing housing density in the isthmus areas. We need to keep the smaller and more affordable homes this neighborhood to we can continue to welcome a range of home owners.

There is historical value in homes of this vintage, don't let them be demolished in favor of one large single family home!

Please,

Nancy M. Daly

From: [Dennis Noonan](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed Demolition of Houses at Jefferson and Edgewood
Date: Monday, January 13, 2025 5:30:53 AM

You don't often get email from dennishnoonan@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Hello,

As a former home builder and contractor I am writing to oppose the demolition of the two circa 1905 houses located at Jefferson and Edgewood. Unless there is a compelling reason for the homes to be demolished, I consider it unethical and imprudent to destroy existing dwelling places in order to erect a single, larger dwelling

I trust your judgement on this, but wanted to offer my opinion.

Yours,

Dennis Noonan
Founder, Isthmus Handyman, LLC.1

--

Dennis J. Noonan
608 244-8473

dennishnoonan@gmail.com

From: [Nicholas Davies](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: No to the same demolition proposal as before (86419)
Date: Sunday, January 12, 2025 11:20:37 AM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Plan Commission,

It's not often that I find myself weighing in against demolition and fresh construction. However, the item before you is not substantively different from what you rejected before.

The applicants managed to buy two houses in one of Madison's most affluent and historic neighborhoods, with the intention of tearing down both and constructing one larger house, without even certainty about whether it'd be allowable.

Now the proposal is back before you, with letters of support from the neighborhood association (not a democratic institution, of course) and other property owners of the historic district (also not democratic/representative). Even if these groups were unanimous in their support, the support of allies (cronies, pals, whatever you choose) does not negate the Landmarks Commission's finding that these existing houses are historic.

If this type of Landmarks Commission finding is generally to be considered an obstacle to demolition, then that should be applied with some consistency--not with exceptions for the wealthy and well-connected.

To be transparent, my sympathy for the proposed demolition would be considerably greater if the plans for the site included an addition to housing (rather than a subtraction), or some other type of neighborhood amenity, like walkable commercial space.

Thank you,

Nick Davies
3717 Richard St

From: [Paul Mueller](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Demolition of 1007 Edgewood & 2121 Jefferson
Date: Sunday, January 12, 2025 2:30:04 PM

You don't often get email from p.l.mueller@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Hello PC

My name is Paul Mueller, and I live at 1911 Adams st. I want to voice my opposition to the demolition permit for these 2 historic homes. There are always things wrong with every home in the Vilas neighborhood, but replacing these structures with a NEW home will continue to change our beloved neighborhood. The maintenance issues being used as reasons to demolish these homes would allow you to tear down most of the houses in Vilas. When my wife and I bought our home in 1991 we faced every issue currently listed as reasons for demolition. We didn't ask to replace our home, we got to work correcting these flaws. Today, 1911 Adams is a wonderful up to date structure that will last my lifetime and the next owner as well. Please do not allow the demolition of these homes. Thank you. Paul Mueller

From: [HOPE HAGUE](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Cc: [Evers, Tag](#)
Subject: Oppose house demolition on Jefferson and Edgewood--Legislative file #86419
Date: Sunday, January 12, 2025 7:58:50 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from hahague@wisc.edu. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Commisioners:

I oppose the demolition of 2121 Jefferson St and 1007 Edgewood Ave. because I love the housing stock of this larger neighborhood, where I have walked the streets and alleys for over 30 years, watching the changes and seeing the love of the residents in their landscaping and maintenance.

It was sheer blind luck that I acquired 1426 Drake St (built in 1929) at the foot of the Bear Mound in 1991, and was able to raise my three children here, and we all have come to love this house, the view up to the Mound, the park, the schools, and the neighborhood. Someone could have the same experience with the two houses on Edgewood and Jefferson.

Owning an old, well-built but somewhat decrepit house is an adventure, and in my case, with the help of two historic district tax credits, I was able over the years to get the necessary work done: roofing, new furnace, siding repair, rehab of old windows (by Larry the Sashman!), painting, porch masonry, etc., while gradually paying off the house. There is someone out there who would do the same for the houses across from the Edgewood campus. Give them a chance!

Respectfully yours,
Hope Hague

From: [Karen Sack](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Opposition to demolition of historic homes hearing (#86419)
Date: Sunday, January 12, 2025 9:13:43 PM

You don't often get email from karensack@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

We write in strong opposition to the demolition of 1007 Edgewood Avenue and 2121 Jefferson Street. We have lived at 1115 Van Buren Street for over 50 years and support efforts to preserve historic homes in our neighborhood.

Karen and Robert Sack

From: [Alison Gold](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Agenda Item 86419
Date: Monday, January 13, 2025 5:31:37 AM

You don't often get email from alisongold@msn.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

I respectfully oppose the demolition permit for the two homes listed on this agenda item.

The preservation of historically-viable buildings is very important to me, and it shows that the city cares about such buildings.

Neighborhoods in Madison should not be altered in such a way as is being suggested here.

Thank you.

A. Gold