

Fields, Debbie

From: Steve Tiffany <stevetiffany3@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 9:22 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: Legistar 93403 and 93404

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from stevetiffany3@icloud.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

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

Please kill Legistar 93403 and 93404. No one wants more traffic on local roads, and we especially don't want taller buildings looming over our homes. Destroying the character of residential neighborhoods is not progress.

Fields, Debbie

From: David Handowski <davidhandowski@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 9:27 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: Registering Opposition to Legistar 93404 - 50-foot conditional height for nonresidential buildings

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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

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

Alders,

There is a significant lack of transparency to residents on the impacts of passing and approving what is being proposed under Legistar item #93404.

The broad scope of this suggested legislation can have tremendous impact on Madison citizens without taking any opinions or feedback from your constituents. The lack of any information and detail provided to residents for any feedback is highly concerning.

I am formally registering my opposition to this legislation without further public discussion or communication from every Alder to every constituent in their District outlining the specific details and potential impacts to residents.

David Handowski
District 1 resident

Fields, Debbie

From: Jeri Grogg <jgrogg@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 10:55 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: Legistar 93403 and 93404

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from jgrogg@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

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

Alders,

Please take a close look at these two proposals coming up tonight, July 7, 2026, and oppose 50' buildings next to the modest houses that are in most Madison neighborhoods. This type of construction would not only be an eyesore among many small- and medium-sized houses, but easily would destroy the character of the neighborhood and certainly alter the environs of any houses next to or near a 50' building.

I live in a neighborhood with a 70-some foot tall apartment building, which is entirely out of keeping with the nearby houses. It is a very unwelcome addition to our small-house neighborhood and should never have been approved.

Jeri Grogg
226 Larkin St.
53705

Fields, Debbie

From: Linda <lehnertz.l@att.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 11:14 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: Legistar 93404, additional height for nonresidential

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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

In 12 of the zoning districts, nonresidential building height could exceed, with conditional use approval, the maximum height for residences (homes have a hard maximum of 35 or 40 feet). In 3 districts (TR-U1, TR-U2, TR-P) nonresidential would be capped at 50 feet, but residential uses are also allowed additional height as a conditional use. One might ask why, in the 12 districts, nonresidential height can exceed residential height.

When asked at Plan Commission what this change might cover, staff used examples of basketball courts and places of worship with more steeply pitched roofs. (Church spires, belfries, cupolas and domes, water towers, flagpoles, chimneys, communication towers and elevator penthouses are already allowed to exceed height maximums.) When professional NBA courts have a minimum recommended ceiling height of 30', it is hard to imagine why a local basketball court needs more height.

What was not mentioned is that at least one plan for a school, Toki/Orchard Ridge, Legistar 93829, is being proposed with a height of 43' in a zoning district that allows for a 35' maximum height.

While extra height for schools is not necessarily a bad result since schools tend to be sited on large lots with substantial setbacks (the Toki proposal has a minimum setback of 49.9'), it could be problematic for other nonresidential buildings on small lots where the extra height can be much more intrusive.

Staff also told Plan Commission that other zoning districts allow height to be exceeded, so this change would make it consistent across zoning code. There has always been a difference between residential and commercial districts. Just because commercial districts allow more height does not mean that is appropriate for residential districts. (Nor would there be full consistency across the zoning code since some districts have no height maximums.)

Staff also pointed out to Plan Commission that this is not a change by right, rather it just allows flexibility for design variances. Essentially, approval would be almost always guaranteed. Staff always advises that conditional use findings must be based on "substantial evidence" that directly pertains to each standard and not based on personal preference or speculation. Plan Commission rarely finds substantial evidence to deny a conditional use.

There are ways to allow a school such as Toki to proceed. The proposed ordinance could just address the height maximums in TR-U1, TR-U2, and TR-P, districts where additional height is already allowed, and allow nonresidential to increase 10', from 40' to 50', with conditional use approval. The Toki site could then be rezoned. Or the proposed ordinance could be changed to require additional setbacks on all sides – for example, an additional 2 feet of setback for every foot in excess of the district's maximum of 35' or 40'.

The existing maximum heights have been in effect for 15 years, apparently without a major incident. Those height limits help accomplish the purpose of residential districts, districts that are established to stabilize and protect the essential characteristics of residential areas.

Respectfully Submitted,
Linda Lehnertz

Fields, Debbie

From: Glori Sabin <kdietzman@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 11:32 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: Legistar 93403 and Legistar 93404

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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

Dear Alders

Both of these Legistars are affecting Zoning changes and are Agenda items 12 and 13 on tonight's Agenda. I'm totally in opposition to both of these issues and I'm imploring you to move them from the recommended action list so that these subjects are further investigated thoroughly. This is absolutely necessary to realize their full impact to all residents of the City of Madison. There needs to be facts and full analysis and therefore it's too premature to just approve them. The Council needs to make sound and meaningful decisions and therefore vote these two files down. They need to be sent back and direct staff to produce the reports that the public needs to have before any unsound decisions are made.

Thank you for addressing these subjects with the utmost importance that they represent. Please Vote NO on Agenda Item 12 and Agenda Item 13 (Legistar's 93403 & 93404) tonight.

Regards,
Glori Sabin
10 Jubilee Cir
Madison WI 53718-3119

Sent from my iPad

Fields, Debbie

From: noreply
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 12:27 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: [All Alders] Vote on allowing buildings 50'

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Recipient: All Alders:

Tuesday, July 7, 2026 – 12:26pm

JoAnn Levy

5117 Black Oak Dr

Madison, Wisconsin. 53711 No, do not contact me. All Alders Vote on allowing buildings 50' Im begging you....vote no. There is enough stress in everyone's life already. Please don't add more stress by allowing our wonderful single-family neighborhoods be destroyed by laying the current building codes, even more than they have already been changed. One of the endearing qualities of Madison is being able to choose the ambiance of the neighborhood you live in. Adding 50' structures in every potential location is going to destroy the family-oriented neighborhoods FOREVER.

Fields, Debbie

From: tom <cnse55@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 12:38 PM
To: Martinez-Rutherford, Dina Nina
Cc: All Alders
Subject: changes to zoning

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

VOTE NO ON :

The Common Council is set to pass changes tonight that allow "50 foot buildings in all residential districts and access to high traffic uses on local streets"

Tom,
Protect the 1st amendment, stop the censorship Google, FB, Twitter, MSM!

Fields, Debbie

From: ulrike dieterle <ulrike.dieterle@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 2:14 PM
To: All Alders
Cc: ulrike dieterle; Alex Saloutos
Subject: Legistar 93403 and 93404

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

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

Please postpone your vote on two citywide zoning text amendments, Legistar 93403 and 93404 coming before Common Council tonight until there is more time for residents to give input and weigh what these changes will mean to our neighborhoods.

The changes proposed were drummed through the Plan Commission meeting on June 29 without much discussion or evaluation. When a topic of this significance is pushed through in less than 6 minutes time with little attention to alternatives, options or potential problems, one has to wonder what the rationale is. Or is this simply another ramrod move by the Plan Commission ignoring negative impacts in favor of expediency? City of Madison residents should have a chance to thoroughly evaluate the details of these proposed changes. Residents need more time to ponder the potential impacts of these changes on their own properties and on their neighborhoods. Why are Alders Derek Field, Yannette Figueroa Cole, and John P. Guequierre supporting these misguided changes? What is the rush? What is the urgency? Who is benefiting from these proposed changes - the millionaire developers/contractors and the realtor estate lobby, some of whom have helped to finance aldermanic campaigns? Why do they get favored status over tax-paying, voting residents?

Please put these changes on HOLD until all alders have had a chance to present and discuss details and impacts with residents in their districts. Thank you.

Ulrike Dieterle

323 N Blackhawk Ave, Madison 53705

Fields, Debbie

From: J S <janet.schuresko@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 2:26 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: Postpone vote on 93403 and 93404 to allow more study

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

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

I oppose the proposal to allow 50 ft high buildings in all districts. This proposal has been inadequately studied, In addition, it does not do what the title suggests. In just three districts, the legislation specifies non-residential buildings can be over 50 feet, but in 12 others, the word residential is missing, meaning four story apartments could be built in neighborhoods now consisting of tiny postwar single story houses, most of them under 12 feet high to the roof. The staff report is only a fraction of a page, identifies no problems, does not examine alternatives, and ends by urging adoption. The plan commission has not fulfilled their job requirements with this sloppy piece of work.

I also oppose the proposal to allow high use buildings to exit onto low traffic residential streets. Children ride bikes, parents push strollers, people walk dogs, joggers work out on these low traffic side streets. The extra traffic would present a safety risk as well as a disturbance of peace and quiet.

I believe these two proposed changes have been inadequately studies and respectfully request that the vote be postponed to allow a more thorough report.

For a more detailed discussion of these issues, please see the article below, which landed in m morning

<https://www.77squaremiles.com/post/madison-says-the-new-50-foot-rule-is-for-nonresidential-buildings-the-proposed-text-does-no>

Respectfully,
Janet Schuresko
2620 Chamberlain Ave.
Madison. WI 53705

Fields, Debbie

From: Alex Saloutos <asaloutos@tds.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 2:38 PM
To: ulrike dieterle; All Alders
Subject: Re: Legistar 93403 and 93404

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

This is excellent, Ulrike! Thank you for sharing your comments with me, for reading my blog, and for taking the time to write to the Common Council about these changes, which could have a significant impact on every neighborhood in Madison. Now that you've written the Council, please consider sharing your comments and my story with your friends and on social media to spread the word so more of our neighbors can speak up on this issue. –AS

From: Ulrike Dieterle <ulrike.dieterle@gmail.com>
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 at 2:14 PM
To: <allalders@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: Ulrike Dieterle <ulrike.dieterle@gmail.com>, Alex Saloutos <asaloutos@tds.net>
Subject: Legistar 93403 and 93404

Please postpone your vote on two citywide zoning text amendments, Legistar 93403 and 93404 coming before Common Council tonight until there is more time for residents to give input and weigh what these changes will mean to our neighborhoods.

The changes proposed were drummed through the Plan Commission meeting on June 29 without much discussion or evaluation. When a topic of this significance is pushed through in less than 6 minutes time with little attention to alternatives, options or potential problems, one has to wonder what the rationale is. Or is this simply another ramrod move by the Plan Commission ignoring negative impacts in favor of expediency? City of Madison residents should have a chance to thoroughly evaluate the details of these proposed changes. Residents need more time to ponder the potential impacts of these changes on their own properties and on their neighborhoods. Why are Alders Derek Field, Yannette Figueroa Cole, and John P. Guequierre supporting these misguided changes? What is the rush? What is the urgency? Who is benefiting from these proposed changes - the millionaire developers/contractors and the realtor estate lobby, some of whom have helped to finance aldermanic campaigns? Why do they get favored status over tax-paying, voting residents?

Please put these changes on HOLD until all alders have had a chance to present and discuss details and impacts with residents in their districts. Thank you.

Ulrike Dieterle

323 N Blackhawk Ave, Madison 53705

Fields, Debbie

From: dakester@sbcglobal.net
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 3:41 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: FW: PLEASE VOTE NO TO THE TWO PROPOSED ZONING CHANGES AT TONIGHT'S COMMON COUNCIL MEETING

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

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

From: dakester@sbcglobal.net <dakester@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 3:39 PM
To: Julia Mathews (district12@cityofmadison.com) <district12@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: 'allallders@cityofmadison.com' <allallders@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: PLEASE VOTE NO TO THE TWO PROPOSED ZONING CHANGES AT TONIGHT'S COMMON COUNCIL MEETING

Greetings Alder Ms. Mathews:

Please vote no on the two proposed two citywide zoning text amendments, Legistar 93403 and 93404, at tonight's Common Council meeting.

One proposed change would permit buildings 50 feet high in most of Madison including residential areas.

The other proposed change would hugely increase traffic volumes. As explained in a blog published today by Alex Saloutos:

"The zoning code now requires ten types of uses to take their vehicle access from a collector or arterial street. The ten: assisted living and nursing facilities; convents and monasteries; farmers markets; hospitals; libraries and museums; accessory mission houses; outdoor recreation; places of worship; arts, technical, and trade schools; and public and private schools.[4] These uses can generate far more traffic than the homes around them. Legistar 93403 strikes that requirement, with one exception: a place of worship seating more than 600 people remains a conditional use and keeps the collector-access requirement. The rule matters because Madison sorts its 807 miles of streets into three tiers. Arterials typically carry more than 10,000 vehicles a day. Collectors carry roughly 1,500 to 10,000. Local streets carry fewer than 1,500 and, in the city's own words, provide access directly to homes.[5] The access

rule exists to keep the traffic these uses generate on streets built to carry it. Remove the rule, and the driveway serving a new school or hospital can open onto a local residential street.” [See, <https://www.77squaremiles.com/post/madison-says-the-new-50-foot-rule-is-for-nonresidential-buildings-the-proposed-text-does-not...>]

Both of these proposals would create potentially pernicious changes to the quality of life in Madison, and create many traffic dangers.

Please pause these proposals for greater review of the negative effects that these two huge changes would have on our everyday lives.

Thank you,

Dolores Kester

Aldermanic District 12

1818 Winchester Street

Fields, Debbie

From: gordian@nym.hush.com
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 4:12 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: Oppose item 12; Legistar 93403

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

Tue. July 7, 2026

Common Council members,

Please oppose Agenda item 12 Legistar 93403, which would remove the requirement of vehicular access to a collector street for ten use types.

The Planning Division Staff Report says,

"There are sites and uses where Traffic Engineering does not want vehicular access to be taken from a higher classified street due to various site and surrounding conditions like slope and safety considerations, but the zoning code requires it."

If "conditions like slope and safety considerations" make vehicular access to busier streets too difficult, it is a sign that the developer should look for a site that is suitable for its project. Solving the vehicle access problem by sending vehicles onto quiet streets simply substitutes one problem for another. It also shifts the developer's costs onto people using the surrounding streets.

Thank you.

Don Lindsay