

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Renee Leilani Arakawa <reilani3@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 11:32 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: Opposition to any action to define escalator clause without homeowner and other stakeholder input
Attachments: ltr ComCouncil 21Nov2023.pdf

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

To Members of the Common Council.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak with you concerning the City's goal of creating needed housing in a transparent and inclusive process.

We are asking the Council to table Item 4 to provide for meaningful citizen and council dialogue on this matter.

We live in Parkwood Hills near Old Sauk Road and near two parcels, the last of the old Pierstorff farm, that are on Old Sauk Road. We speak on behalf of a group of people who do not have a platform for addressing the Council; families and individuals whose dream of homeownership has been denied because Madison is missing entry level homes.

We support developing these parcels to provide for such "Missing Middle" homeownership. This property with its shade trees and nearby schools and small home units (single family homes, condos and small apartments) is the perfect setting for "Missing Middle" small single family, duplex, quads or townhouse homes. This is the type of development Madison needs, especially in this type of neighborhood, on a 2-lane road, near the nature conservancy.

We urge the City to foster development of such homeownership through the use of appropriate future land use designations. That is not what is happening today. In the Generalized Future Land Use Plan (GFLU) these parcels are in the Low Medium Residential (LMR) category which allows development up to 30 DU/acre and 3 stories. Worse still, we have been advised that these parcels are subject to the undefined escalator provision that applies to LMR properties in "select conditions". This escalator more than doubles the allowable density to permit the development of a massive 4 story apartment complex with up to 70 DU/acre. The profitability of such complexes means that developers will pass over the opportunity to build entry level homes on any escalated LMR property.

The City needs to table Item 4 - a proposal to define the "select conditions" that permit escalating LMR property - for at least 30 days in order to **promote planning for "Missing Middle" development, transparency and inclusion.**

Reasons to table this action include the following:

1. Escalating LMR property works against "Missing Middle" development.
2. The term "select conditions" is currently undefined, therefore, citizens cannot tell whether it applies or not. There is no transparency around this clause.
3. If the term "select conditions" is to be defined, the Council's lodestar principles of inclusion and transparency require that homeowners and other stakeholders must be included in this planning process. Meaningful citizen involvement is absolutely critical whenever the City defines a variable that will impact the density and type of development on the property.

For these reasons, we ask the City to defer action on this provision and provide for citizen input. This matter should be tabled for 30 days or however long it takes to give citizens a chance to participate in this important matter.

Thank you for your consideration,

Renee Arakawa, Parkwood Hills, Madison, WI

Matthias, Isaac L

From: mikehbridwell@icloud.com
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 1:46 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: Item 4 Escalator Clause

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

With respect to Item 4 concerning the Escalator Clause for LMR zoning, I would ask that it be tabled at tonight's meeting for further evaluation with impacted stockholders. Often times issues such as these are not obvious to those affected by them. Individual property owners within a reasonable distance from the affected property(s) should be contacted and provided with a coherent explanation of the proposed changes so they can provide informed input into deliberations concerning those changes.

In addition to tabling the above action I would also like to voice our opposition to any re-zoning along the Old Sauk Road corridor east of Gammon Road, regardless of the designations in the general planning documents. This corridor is almost completely developed within the context of current zoning designations. Individuals have invested so much of their time, money and lives into the surrounding properties with expectations of land use based on the zoning currently in place. To change that zoning now in order to intensify the land use of the last remaining undeveloped parcel in the area would be extremely unfair and disheartening to those individuals. Some of these individuals will see a significant reduction to the value of their properties due to such a re-zone, while a developer with no ties to the area, and no stake in the long-range outcome walks away with a significant benefit. The impact to existing residents who could be negatively affected by zoning changes such as these should be weighed much more heavily than non residents when evaluating this potential re-zone request.

Matthias, Isaac L

From: cmbrown710@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 2:41 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: Common Counsel Meeting

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

We are writing to comment on an item which is on the agenda for the 11/21/2023 Common Council meeting. Item 4 proposes changes to the city's Comprehensive Plan regarding the Low-Medium Residential (LMR) category and, in particular, the LMR "escalator clause". It appears that these changes would broadly affect LMR areas, significantly increasing density under certain "select conditions" which do not seem to be defined. The community needs to be given time and opportunity to understand and comment on the implications of these changes.

Escalating the density of low-medium residential in this way leads developers to build more profitable, higher density projects and discourages development of the "missing middle" (LMR, including starter homes) which Madison sorely needs.

We ask you to please defer Item 4 and allow time for meaningful community input.

Connie and Jeff Brown
Sauk Woods Condominiums

Sent from my iPhone

Our names are Timothy Burns and Beth Robinson, and we live at 17 E Spyglass Court in Madison. We oppose the Council proceeding on the “escalator clause” that is being proposed.

Our street backs up to two parcels, totaling approximately 4 acres, on Old Sauk Road. These parcels are the last remaining part of the farm from which this neighborhood was built. Our backyard is just across a narrow easement from this parcel. When we bought our house (less than 2 years ago) we expected that property would be developed, but expected that houses or condos would be what would be built.

We have been notified that these parcels are now proposed for development. The proposed developer had a community meeting to tell us they want to build a 4 story, approximately 175 unit apartment building on the site. It was a shock to us, as the rest of the area is 2 story houses and condos, with some 2 story apartments.

The current zoning for the largest development parcel is SR-C1, with a smaller eastern portion of SR-C3. The proposal to develop was so out of whack with the zoning that we have been trying to figure out how they could possibly do this.

We have met with several neighbors and now understand there are proposals to allow this development through rezoning and the use of an “escalator clause” that would allow the developer to put this building on that property. We are still trying to catch up on what is going on, but it has been brought to my attention that the Council will consider this “escalation clause” at the November 21 meeting. From things said at the community meeting, the developer believes this is a done deal. We hope it is an item for discussion with all involved.

We oppose the type of development that is proposed, and from the comments of numerous people at the community meeting, there are lots of others opposed as well.

We read how Madison needs housing, but do not believe large apartment buildings are the answer in every area of the city. We believe that properties such as this should be developed to allow people to buy their homes. It appears that Madison is stuck building tall apartment building after tall apartment building, while the types of property that people can purchase are being neglected.

It isn't clear to us whether the escalator clause already exists, or if it is being proposed. The agenda language isn't clear about that. We have read the proposed language, and it seems quite nebulous. The first thing we note is that going from the current zoning to 70 units per acre is quite a jump!

In reading the proposed factors to be considered, it isn't clear what they mean or how they would be applied. It's also not clear how these factors came to be. Who came up with these? What community input or involvement was used? Do citizens agree that these are relevant or important factors? Did people want other factors considered? How did we get here?

The language of the factors raises more questions. Relationships between proposed buildings and their surroundings – what does that mean? Who decides what these relationships are and what

their impact on the decisions might be? How do they decide? Is traffic such a factor? The size or height of existing buildings? If so, how do such things weigh in the decision making process? What natural features are relevant, and how so? In our case, does the existence of what is essentially a farmstead and woods (a natural feature) militate toward 70 units per acre and 4 story buildings, or against it? Who decides? How do they decide? What are lot and block characteristics? How are these different from the relationships between the proposed buildings and their surroundings? What are the factors for this factor? Access to urban services – what does that mean? What are “urban services”? Is that intended to mean a place? Garbage pickup? Schools? If a road goes there, is that access? Is there a proximity factor? If so, what is it? Parks – how is that factor applied? Proximity? If so, how does that weigh in the equation? What exactly are amenities? Are all of these factors equal? Are some of greater weight than others? If so, how is a person to determine that?

We have heard from others that it appears that the only factors of significance are whether the property is on an arterial street (even a minor one) and whether there is a bus line. Neither of us knows where that information came from, but it seems inconsistent with the list provided. Has some decision been made on that, and if so, by whom? On what basis? Again, what community input was requested?

We oppose the application of this ambiguous escalator clause to this property. We oppose any action to define the escalator clause without first providing for homeowner and other stakeholder input. We don't live on Old Sauk, but what happens there is going to deeply affect our house on East Spyglass.

In looking at this in light of our situation, we are wondering what possible notice we could have had that buying in a 2 story residential neighborhood could lead to us living right next to a massive apartment building. We can't see any, and the escalator clause language simply muddies the water further.

We join others in asking the Madison City Council table all action on the “escalator” clause as it applies to property designated Low Medium Residential (LMR) on the Generalized Future Land Use Plan GFLU) in “select conditions” until there is meaningful stakeholder input.

At the top of the printed Agenda, we note the language: “Consider: Who benefits? Who is burdened? Who does not have a voice at the table? How can policymakers mitigate unintended consequences?” We imagine developers benefit from the escalator clause, existing property owners are burdened, and are not sure what voice we get to have at the table. The ambiguous language of this clause screams unintended consequences.

The Council should defer action on the escalator clause to define terms and to provide for citizen input. This matter should be tabled for however long it takes to give citizens a chance to participate in this important matter.

Thank you for considering our input.

Timothy Burns and Beth Robinson

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Timothy Burns <tjburns@fastmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2023 9:48 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: Comments on escalator clause for November 21 meeting
Attachments: Comments on Escalation Clause for 11-21-2023 Common Council meeting.pdf

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

Please accept the attached pdf file as my comments on the escalator clause agenda item.

Timothy Burns
Beth Robinson
17 E Spyglass Ct
Madison, WI

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Dylan Burrell <dbenvironmentart@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2023 11:45 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: Increase Brayton Height & Support Comp Plan Amendment

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

Hi,

I would like to share my strong support for increasing the height limit on the Brayton Lot to 10 stories as proposed in File 80307. We desperately need more housing in Madison and increasing the limit from 4 to 10 stories will allow more homes –many of them affordable -- to get built on this great location. The Brayton Lot is a golden opportunity for the City to shape development to fit our public needs. By allowing 10 stories, we will get more proposals for housing on the lot, and those proposals can be more creative in meeting our goals for affordable housing. We should allow the maximum creativity (up to 10 stories) in the proposal process and use the RFP process to ensure that any proposal – regardless of how many stories it is – includes deeply affordable and workforce housing. Please don't settle for four stories of downtown housing – increase the height limit to 10 stories and create more, affordable homes for Madison.

Additionally, I hope you pass Item 80281 as approved by the Plan Commission. This amendment to the Comprehensive Plan would allow increased density near Campus and Regent Street, eliminate references to maintaining house-like character in certain areas in favor of something more missing-middle friendly, and allow incremental infill on arterial streets in some circumstances. This is a step in the right direction and any attempts to water it down should be resisted.

Thank you,
Dylan Burrell

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Ann Conroy <annjconroy@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 9:29 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: Escalator clause

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

Dear Common Council,

I am a resident of Parkwood Hills and have been since 1989. While I know some development will happen at the farmstead on Old Sauk Road, I am against the size and scope of the building under consideration right now. I am very much against the passage of the escalator clause and would ask that the city council put this on a future agenda so that the neighbors can weigh in on it. This was just brought to my attention today.

These considerations have major ramifications to future development locally, and likely elsewhere, in Madison.

The definition of select conditions is not yet articulated and should reflect considerations other than maximizing units/acre. Such conditions might be what makes Madison the great city that it is; this could/would include the environment, a good setting to raise children, adequate green space at home, a future eye toward energy efficient housing, community engagement, etc.

As noted, this clause has serious ramifications for the appropriate development of property in an area. It is not an issue that should be taken lightly. In particular, I am concerned about the negative impact it would have on the West Side Plan which, as I understand it, is yet to be completed. It potentially causes the loss of housing options (e.g. affordable home ownership) that could positively impact the housing needs of Madison residents while respecting the integrity of existing neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Ann Conroy

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Susan Daugherty <susaninaruba@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 10:22 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: Escalator Clause--Old Sauk Road

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

I oppose the application of the undefined escalator clause. I oppose any action to define the escalator clause without first providing for homeowner and other stakeholder input.

I attended an online meeting about this issue, and many cogent reasons were given for why building a huge apartment block on the site of the old farm is a bad idea. Please listen to those reasons yourselves and realize that the plan has not been thought through.

I actually live in a dense area, and I moved into it intentionally. I am not opposed to all density. My back yard is a few feet from my neighbor's. I like living close to the University and the city center.

This building out on Old Sauk, near a forest preserve, and an elementary school, is inappropriate and will cause problems for the neighborhood.

The building should be scaled way back and more parking in and under the building needs to be provided in order not to cause a hazard.

I support more affordable and low-income housing in all planned apartment and condo buildings. Madison should be a model for such increased availability.

Sincerely,

*Kristin S. Daugherty
509 Hillington Way
Madison, WI 53726*

The walls of books around me, dense with the past, formed a kind of insulation against the present world and its disasters. -Ross Macdonald, novelist (13 Dec 1915-1983)

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Nicholas Davies <nbdavies@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 19, 2023 11:25 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: Yes to comp plan updates

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

Dear alders,

I support the proposed comprehensive plan updates, especially the LMR escalator clause. Where there is both demand and opportunity for a gradual increase in residential density, the comp plan should support it.

People love to complain about high-rises, the lack of "missing middle" housing, the loss of farmland in city limits, the lack of commercial amenities within walking distance of their house, traffic and deadly speeding on arterial streets, and the creeping horizon of suburban sprawl, but these things are all natural consequences of exclusive single-family zoning, compounded by letting a neighborhood plan set the status quo in stone for increments of five years or more.

Five years is a long time, for a neighborhood's envisioned land use to go un-updated! Consider here in Eastmoreland for example. Royster Oaks wasn't filled in five years ago, but today it mostly is. That means there are now opportunities for new types of land use in the area. And the evolution continues. Voit Farm will look completely different five years from now, likely creating new opportunities elsewhere on the Fair Oaks and Milwaukee corridors.

In addition, I support the specific adjustments to the comp plan that others in the city are overwhelmingly calling for, such as giving the Regent Street business community opportunities in future to redevelop higher and more vibrantly.

I support removing references to "house-like character". In neighborhoods where consistency is valued, historic districts already achieve that. But houses themselves shouldn't be bound by antiquated, regressive definitions of "house-like". We should encourage architectural diversity and vibrancy.

Thank you,

Nick Davies
3717 Richard St

Matthias, Isaac L

From: MadisonPragmatist <MadisonPragmatist@proton.me>
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2023 3:00 PM
To: Plan Commission Comments
Cc: council
Subject: Plan Commission Tonight Agenda Item 26 & 27 - Oppose

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

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to oppose the proposed amendment to the GFLU for the Low-Med districts. It seems to me that you should be making multi-family housing easier to build and not harder, especially on busier roads already future zoned for multi-family. We don't have the land to squander on single-family or low density uses. Don't approve this further restriction.

Thanks,

Jack Dewi

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Peter Falk <pfalk@starkhomes.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 3:39 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: Zoning Density Escalator Clause Discussion

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

Hello City Alders,

I live in Parkwood Hills near Old Sauk Road where the Pierstorff farm is being considered for redevelopment. I am writing to express my concern and opposition to agenda item 4, which pertains to a possible density escalator clause.

In the Generalized Future Land Use Plan the farm parcel which is certainly ripe for development is in the Low Medium

Residential category which allows for the development of up to 30 dwelling units per acre and 3 stories in height. This seems much more in line with the densities of what has been built in the area for multi unit properties (although I don't believe there are any 3 story buildings in the immediate area). It seems that item 4 being discussed is looking to discuss "select conditions" where if met, density could be greatly increased. If this is the case, it brings to question why bother with zoning and comprehensive plans if you then try to think ahead of scenarios of possible conditions where maybe density can be doubled and still comply with zoning and therefore I assume approvals to build without any ability for residents to object to the scale and density.

It would seem to make things easier to remove this "select conditions" list and just leave it that if someone wants to build above what current zoning permits, that they can try to get all the approvals to do so, and that would be discussed taking into account traffic safety/flow, drainage, infrastructure (parks, sidewalks, etc).

I encourage anyone thinking this site can sustain double the current zoning with "select conditions" to spend some time on Old Sauk Rd at peak travel times and see if they still think this arterial road isn't already struggling with vehicle capacity and pedestrian safety (school, wildlife, steep hill at Old Sauk and Old Middleton that many vehicles can't traverse in heavy snowfall).

Again, it just seems a waste of time to me to try to come up with all the select scenarios where a project would be guaranteed higher density and to let the developer make the case to go above zoning and see if it makes sense for the site at that time.

Sincerely,

--

Peter Falk
Broker Associate, Stark Company Realtors
WI Certified Residential Appraiser

Accredited Buyer's Representative (ABR)

Certified Home Marketing Specialist (CHMS)
UW Madison Real Estate BBA, 2001

702 N. High Point Rd., Ste. 100
Madison, WI 53717

Office: 608-836-9300

Mobile: 608-698-0900

Fax: 608-836-3744

Email: pfalk@starkhomes.com

TO: COMMON COUNCIL

RE: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN INTERIM UPDATE

Legistar #80281

Some of you may be aware of my extensive experience with City of Madison planning processes. I have chaired the Plan Commission, the Community Gardens Committee, the Madison Food Policy Council, and served as interim director of the City's Department of Planning, Community and Economic Development from 2019-2020. Most recently, I chaired the Common Council's Task Force on Farmland Preservation in 2022-23.

I write in support of **Item K** on Staff's List of Proposed Revisions to the City's Comprehensive Plan **adding community gardens and urban agriculture** to the list of appropriate land uses in the Parks & Open Space category on page 25 and adding **a definition of community gardens** to the Glossary of Terms (Appendix E) as recommended by the Plan Commission. For decades, Madison has made significant efforts to locate (especially) community gardens in publicly owned areas to provide secure land tenure; it is important to acknowledge this history and support urban agriculture into the future.

I'd also like to highlight one of the stated reasons for undertaking this "interim update" process, i.e., to "acknowledge the existence of major policies/initiatives adopted since 2018". While this goal is mostly reflected in updates to the GFLU map generated by neighborhood plans, it's worth noting that the Council requested, received, and accepted a report from the [Task Force on Farmland Preservation](#) to provide much-needed guidance on policy and decision-making on a topic of growing importance (pun intended). This thorough report provides valuable background information, tools, and recommendations to guide land use decisions where growing spaces are possible and desired by the community. Based on the report, the City's Subdivision Regulations have already been revised to include the "preservation of farmland" as one of its purposes, and Economic Development Division Staff has drafted language to include this criteria in the City's land-banking policy. The "implementation matrix" in the Task Force Report (pages 12-15) also includes recommendations for every chapter of the Comprehensive Plan to be considered during the next 10-year update process acknowledging the important contributions that growing spaces in a broad range of sizes and locations make to our community. Until then, the Task Force Report will provide valuable guidance as you approach land use decisions until the fully updated Comprehensive Plan can more fully reflect these values.

Nan Fey, 444 West Wilson Street, Madison, WI 53703

11/15/23

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Fun to Build <foster07cn@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2023 8:56 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: 11/21/23 Meeting, Amendment to Comprehensive Plan, 4. 80281

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

Members of the Common Council,

My name is Gary Foster and my wife and I live on Old Sauk Rd about 1/8 mile from a LMR property that is going to be developed in the near future. I was unaware until very recently that density of the property could “escalate” dramatically and we have not had an opportunity to provide input into the factors that will permit escalated development. I estimate that our surrounding residential neighborhoods of many square miles has a density of about 5 DU/ac and with this potential escalation this future development could go to 70 DU/ac, an incredible factor of 14 times increase in density to our surrounding neighborhoods.

I simply ask that the Common Council table the motion to amend to Comprehensive Plan regarding the LMR escalator and defining “select conditions” for at least 30 days or until we and other affected stakeholders have a chance to be meaningfully involved in the decision making as to which factors should be considered.

Sincerely, Gary and Barb Foster
District 19

Matthias, Isaac L

From: the-greens31@charter.net
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 9:45 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: Written Comment for 11-21-23 Common Council Meeting
Attachments: 20231121 to Common Council from the Greens.pdf

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

Attached is a written comment that addresses Item 4 Comprehensive Plan 2023 Interim Update on your Common Council Meeting Agenda. Please postpone action on this item until there has been time for input from your constituents and more discussion of the negative implications of the escalator clause language.

Thanks for caring about Madison and valuing constituent input!

Mike and Lynn Green

21 November 2023

To: Members of the Common Council

There is a property at 6706 / 6610 Old Sauk Rd, tentatively up for sale, the future of which is very much of interest to the Sauk Ridge and Parkwood Hills communities; we are a part of the latter. At particular issue is, only, the size, height and scope of what eventuates. This in no way concerns who lives there!

In this regard:

We have serious objections to Item 4 “Adopting an Amendment ...”, in particular, recommendations from the Plan Commission having to do with (re)zoning “in select conditions”, also termed the “escalator clause”. These considerations have major ramifications to future development locally, and likely elsewhere, in Madison.

The definition of select conditions is not yet articulated and should reflect considerations other than maximizing units/acre. Such conditions might be what makes Madison the great city that it is; this could/would include the environment, a good setting to raise children, adequate green space at home, a future eye toward energy efficient housing, community engagement, etc.

As noted, this clause has serious ramifications for the appropriate development of property in an area. It is not an issue that should be taken lightly. In particular, we are concerned about the negative impact it would have on the West Side Plan which, as we understand it, is yet to be completed. It potentially causes the loss of housing options (e.g. affordable home ownership) that could positively impact the housing needs of Madison residents while respecting the integrity of existing neighborhoods.

We respectfully ask the Common Council to avoid any action regarding the escalator clause (rezoning & select conditions) until there has been adequate, meaningful citizen input and dialog with the Council. Please table any proposed LMR escalator language modifications at your November 21 meeting. Madison and it’s residents deserve this from our policymakers.

Thank you for your attention to this critical issue!

Lynn and Michael Green
District 19 residents
Residents of Madison since 1965

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Rebecca Green <rebgreen40@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 10:55 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: Written Comment for Common Council Meeting

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

Dear Members of the Common Council,

My name is Rebecca Green. I am a homeowner in the City of Madison.

I oppose the application of the undefined escalator clause. I oppose any action to define the escalator clause without first providing for homeowner and other stakeholder input.

I have serious objections to Item 4 “Adopting an Amendment ...”, in particular, recommendations from the Plan Commission having to do with (re)zoning “in select conditions”, also termed the “escalator clause”. These considerations have major ramifications to future development throughout Madison.

The definition of select conditions is not yet articulated and should reflect considerations other than maximizing units/acre. Such conditions might be what makes Madison the great city that it is; this could/would include the environment, a good setting to raise children, adequate green space at home, a future eye toward energy efficient housing, community engagement, etc.

I respectfully ask the Common Council to avoid any action regarding the escalator clause (rezoning & select conditions) until there has been adequate, meaningful citizen input and dialog with the Council. Please table any proposed LMR escalator language modifications at your November 21 meeting. Madison and it’s residents deserve this from our policymakers.

Thank you for your attention to this critical issue!

Rebecca Green
City of Madison resident

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Matt Hamilton <matthewbhamilton@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 1:24 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: Table all action on the "escalator" clause

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

Dear Alders of the City of Madison,

Thank you for this opportunity to communicate my concerns and issues of transparency, due process, Open Meetings and inclusion.

My name is Matthew Hamilton. I am a homeowner in the City of Madison.

I oppose the application of the undefined escalator clause. I oppose any action to define the escalator clause without first providing for homeowner and other stakeholder input.

I would love to speak at tonight's Common Council meeting to express my concerns but unfortunately have a work conflict and cannot attend. I have registered my opposition.

I am asking the Madison City Council to table all action on the "escalator" clause as it applies to property designated Low Medium Residential (LMR) on the Generalized Future Land Use Plan (GFLU) in "select conditions" until there is meaningful stakeholder input. There are 3 reasons why the City should table this action.

1. The term "select conditions" used to justify escalating property density is undefined. Because it is undefined, citizens do not know when they face the risk that the density of an LMR property could be escalated. There is no transparency around this clause. Due process is completely lacking.
2. If the term "select conditions" justifying the use of the escalator clause is to be defined, homeowners and other stakeholders must be given the opportunity to participate in this process. Citizen input is absolutely critical whenever the City proposes a huge change in density.
3. Today's meeting agenda does not include an item that clearly notifies the public that the Council will address any issue involving the escalator clause, therefore, such action would be contrary to the Open Meetings Law.

In closing, the present undefined escalator clause should not be used by the City because it does not give citizens fair notice of the conditions that would justify its application. Consistent with the City's policy of providing for citizen input, if the term "select conditions" is to be defined, homeowners and stakeholders must be given an opportunity to provide input. Therefore, the City should defer action on this provision and provide for citizen input. This matter should be tabled for however long it takes to give citizens a chance to participate in this important matter.

Thank you,
Matthew Hamilton

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Joe Hanauer <misterjoeh@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 9:46 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: November 21, 2023 Common Council Agenda Item 4

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

Dear Alders of the City of Madison,

Thank you for this opportunity to communicate my concerns and issues of transparency, due process, Open Meetings and inclusion.

My name is Joe Hanauer. I am a homeowner in the City of Madison.

I oppose the application of the undefined escalator clause. I oppose any action to define the escalator clause without first providing for homeowner and other stakeholder input.

I would love to speak at tonight's Common Council meeting to express my concerns but unfortunately have a work conflict and cannot attend. I have registered my opposition.

I am asking the Madison City Council to table all action on the "escalator" clause as it applies to property designated Low Medium Residential (LMR) on the Generalized Future Land Use Plan (GFLU) in "select conditions" until there is meaningful stakeholder input. There are 3 reasons why the City should table this action.

1. The term "select conditions" used to justify escalating property density is undefined. Because it is undefined, citizens do not know when they face the risk that the density of an LMR property could be escalated. There is no transparency around this clause. Due process is completely lacking.
2. If the term "select conditions" justifying the use of the escalator clause is to be defined, homeowners and other stakeholders must be given the opportunity to participate in this process. Citizen input is absolutely critical whenever the City proposes a huge change in density.
3. Today's meeting agenda does not include an item that clearly notifies the public that the Council will address any issue involving the escalator clause, therefore, such action would be contrary to the Open Meetings Law.

In closing, the present undefined escalator clause should not be used by the City because it does not give citizens fair notice of the conditions that would justify its application. Consistent with the City's policy of providing for citizen input, if the term "select conditions" is to be defined, homeowners and stakeholders must be given an opportunity to provide input. Therefore, the City should defer action on this provision and provide for citizen input. This matter should be tabled for however long it takes to give citizens a chance to participate in this important matter.

Thank you,
Joe Hanauer

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Jim <jamesdharnett@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 10:20 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: Escalator Clause

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

Dear Alders of the City of Madison,

Thank you for this opportunity to communicate my concerns and issues of transparency, due process, Open Meetings and inclusion.

My name is James Harnett. I am a homeowner in the City of Madison, along with my wife.

I oppose the application of the undefined escalator clause. I oppose any action to define the escalator clause without first providing for homeowner and other stakeholder input.

I am asking the Madison City Council to table all action on the “escalator” clause as it applies to property designated Low Medium Residential (LMR) on the Generalized Future Land Use Plan GFLU) in “select conditions” until there is meaningful stakeholder input. There are 3 reasons why the City should table this action.

1. The term “select conditions” used to justify escalating property density is undefined. Because it is undefined, citizens do not know when they face the risk that the density of an LMR property could be escalated. There is no transparency around this clause. Due process is completely lacking.
2. If the term “select conditions” justifying the use of the escalator clause is to be defined, homeowners and other stakeholders must be given the opportunity to participate in this process. Citizen input is absolutely critical whenever the City proposes a huge change in density.
3. Today’s meeting agenda does not include an item that clearly notifies the public that the Council will address any issue involving the escalator clause, therefore, such action would be contrary to the Open Meetings Law.

In closing, the present undefined escalator clause should not be used by the City because it does not give citizens fair notice of the conditions that would justify its application. Consistent with the City’s policy of providing for citizen input, if the term “select conditions” is to be defined, homeowners and stakeholders must be given an opportunity to provide input. Therefore, the City should defer action on this provision and provide for citizen input. This matter should be tabled for however long it takes to give citizens a chance to participate in this important matter.

Thank you,
James and Marsha Harnett
District 19 residents since 1982

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Scott Jamison <skjbiz@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 19, 2023 6:22 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: Increase Brayton Height & Support Comp Plan Amendment

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

Hi,

I would like to share my strong support for increasing the height limit on the Brayton Lot to 10 stories as proposed in File 80307. We desperately need more housing in Madison and increasing the limit from 4 to 10 stories will allow more homes –many of them affordable -- to get built on this great location.

The Brayton Lot is a golden opportunity for the City to shape development to fit our public needs. By allowing 10 stories, we will get more proposals for housing on the lot, and those proposals can be more creative in meeting our goals for affordable housing.

We should allow the maximum creativity (up to 10 stories) in the proposal process and use the RFP process to ensure that any proposal – regardless of how many stories it is – includes deeply affordable and workforce housing.

Please don't settle for four stories of downtown housing – increase the height limit to 10 stories and create more, affordable homes for Madison.

Additionally, I hope you pass Item 80281 as approved by the Plan Commission. This amendment to the Comprehensive Plan would allow increased density near Campus and Regent Street, eliminate references to maintaining house-like character in certain areas in favor of something more missing-middle friendly, and allow incremental infill on arterial streets in some circumstances. This is a step in the right direction and any attempts to water it down should be resisted.

Thank you,

Sent from my iPhone

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Dominique Jamison <jamoballer23@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 19, 2023 2:55 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: Increase Brayton Height & Support Comp Plan Amendment

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

Hi,

I would like to share my strong support for increasing the height limit on the Brayton Lot to 10 stories as proposed in File 80307. We desperately need more housing in Madison and increasing the limit from 4 to 10 stories will allow more homes -- many of them affordable -- to get built on this great location.

The Brayton Lot is a golden opportunity for the City to shape development to fit our public needs. By allowing 10 stories, we will get more proposals for housing on the lot, and those proposals can be more creative in meeting our goals for affordable housing.

We should allow the maximum creativity (up to 10 stories) in the proposal process and use the RFP process to ensure that any proposal – regardless of how many stories it is – includes deeply affordable and workforce housing.

Please don't settle for four stories of downtown housing – increase the height limit to 10 stories and create more, affordable homes for Madison.

Additionally, I hope you pass Item 80281 as approved by the Plan Commission. This amendment to the Comprehensive Plan would allow increased density near Campus and Regent Street, eliminate references to maintaining house-like character in certain areas in favor of something more missing-middle friendly, and allow incremental infill on arterial streets in some circumstances.

This is a step in the right direction and any attempts to water it down should be resisted.

Thank you,

Dominique Jamison
District 6

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Cailey Jamison <cailey.jamison@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 19, 2023 12:20 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: Support for agenda items 80307 and 80201

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

Hi,

I would like to share my strong support for increasing the height limit on the Brayton Lot to 10 stories as proposed in File 80307. We desperately need more housing in Madison and increasing the limit from 4 to 10 stories will allow more homes –many of them affordable -- to get built on this great location. Given the proximity to transit and many low to moderate wage jobs, it's extremely important that we maximize the number of units available to folks who wish to live downtown, especially affordable and workforce housing.

The Brayton Lot is an important opportunity for the City to shape development to fit our public needs. By allowing 10 stories, we will get more proposals for housing on the lot, and those proposals can be more creative in meeting our goals for affordable housing. We should allow the maximum creativity (up to 10 stories) in the proposal process and use the RFP process to ensure that any proposal – regardless of how many stories it is – includes deeply affordable and workforce housing.

Please don't settle for four stories of downtown housing – increase the height limit to 10 stories and create more, affordable homes for Madison.

I Also would like to share my support for the comprehensive plan updates in item 80201 as passed by plan commission. I am especially hopeful that it allows increased density on the west side of campus and changes language to be more explicit about the city's need for missing middle housing. Please do pass this item as is.

Thank you,
Cailey Jamison

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Ian Jamison <ianjjamison@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 19, 2023 3:26 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: Increase Brayton Height & Support Comp Plan Amendment

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

Hi,

I would like to share my strong support for increasing the height limit on the Brayton Lot to 10 stories as proposed in File 80307. We desperately need more housing in Madison and increasing the limit from 4 to 10 stories will allow more homes –many of them affordable -- to get built on this great location.

The Brayton Lot is a golden opportunity for the City to shape development to fit our public needs. By allowing 10 stories, we will get more proposals for housing on the lot, and those proposals can be more creative in meeting our goals for affordable housing.

We should allow the maximum creativity (up to 10 stories) in the proposal process and use the RFP process to ensure that any proposal – regardless of how many stories it is – includes deeply affordable and workforce housing.

Please don't settle for four stories of downtown housing – increase the height limit to 10 stories and create more, affordable homes for Madison.

Additionally, I hope you pass Item 80281 as approved by the Plan Commission. This amendment to the Comprehensive Plan would allow increased density near Campus and Regent Street, eliminate references to maintaining house-like character in certain areas in favor of something more missing-middle friendly, and allow incremental infill on arterial streets in some circumstances.

This is a step in the right direction and any attempts to water it down should be resisted.

Thank you,

Ian Jamison
District 6

Matthias, Isaac L

From: ccjaskowiak@tds.net
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 3:55 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: 11/21/23 Council Meeting: Item 4 Legistar 80281

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

Hello Alders:

I represent the Saukborough Property Owners Association made up of 22 individual homeowners located along Sauk Ridge Drive near Old Sauk Rd.

We are asking that the Council table all actions on the so called "escalator clause" as it applies to LMR areas in the GFLU until the language proposed with regard to the "select conditions" meaning is given a public hearing for transparency purposes and better understanding.

In addition, we are against any rezoning that would permit the construction of a 4 story 180 unit apartment complex on Old Sauk Rd (east of Gammon Rd). Such a development makes no sense in this area for so many reasons, from traffic safety, water run-off, impact on property values to name a few.

We look forward to having a better understanding and definition of clauses that would permit zoning changes to allow high density construction in residential areas - LMR.

Thank you for your consideration.

Charles Jaskowiak

President

Saukborough Property Owners Association

To Members of the Common Council:

We live in Parkwood Hills near Old Sauk Road and the Pierstorff farm that is being considered for redevelopment. We are writing to express our opposition to agenda item 4, which pertains to an escalator clause.

In the Generalized Future Land Use Plan the farm is in the Low Medium Residential category which allows for the development of up to 30 dwelling units per acre and 3 stories in height. We have been advised these parcels could be subject to the escalator clause mentioned in item 4 if it falls under the “select conditions” category, which is undefined. This escalator clause would more than double the current allowable density.

As a resident and homeowner in the neighborhood for the past 37 years this proposed zoning change is unacceptable. Its approval would drastically change the character of the neighborhood in terms of traffic flow, places additional burden on our schools, surface water runoff and on street parking to name a few concerns.

We realize some type of development will happen but, ask the City table Item 4 until the term “select conditions” is defined which permits escalating the density for property currently defined Low Medium Density.

The homeowners and other stakeholders in the area must be included in this planning process. Our involvement and input are critical for something that directly affects our safety and wellbeing.

Thank you for your consideration,

Greg and Ann Keller
602 San Juan Trail
Madison, WI 53705

Matthias, Isaac L

From: michelle Klagos <michelle.klagos@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 10:47 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: Escalator clause being discussed tonight

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

Hello Alders of Madison,

Please do not make decisions on this escalator clause you have on your agenda tonight. This clause needs at least some kind of parameters that protect and support the people of Madison that live here, in my case all my life.

I think when you become alders you are there to support the community, not the builders who want to stuff as many people as possible onto land. I acknowledge there might be times where this actually makes sense, but in order to do that there needs to be parameters so existing neighbors are not negatively affected to the point of losing the value of their property.

I do know someone decided and planned out what could be done for development - they already put in place those parameters. Please don't make this change a free for all for anyone who wants to develop something that is clearly too big for the area and needs to be that big for the builders to make money - please set parameters on this to protect Madison.

Thank you
Michelle Klagos
6414 Shenandoah Way, Madison, WI 53705

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Connie Kolpin <conkope@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 2:17 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: Old Sauk Road Zoning

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

I'm writing to strongly oppose the proposed zoning change in order to build a 4 story 180 unit apartment building with at least 200+ vehicles entering in and out of a residential neighborhood with multiple schools full of kids crossing streets! It is just not the right area to squeeze in that many apartments and vehicles. Duplexes or 4 unit condo buildings similar to the neighboring homes would be welcomed, safer, and much better suited to blend in with the surroundings. Old Sauk Road is extremely busy all day especially at rush hour/school times and getting out of the side streets onto Old Sauk is dangerous now...only to become more so if the zoning changes to allow this. The current zone is there for a reason!

Gary and Connie Kolpin
Parkwood Hills resident for 46 years

Sent from my iPad

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Jill Krieger <krieg.jw@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 11:13 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: ESCALATOR CLAUSE

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

Dear Alders of the City of Madison,

Thank you for this opportunity to communicate my concerns and issues of transparency, due process, Open Meetings and inclusion.

My name is Jill Krieger. I am a homeowner in the City of Madison.

I oppose the application of the undefined escalator clause. I oppose any action to define the escalator clause without first providing for homeowner and other stakeholder input.

I would love to speak at tonight's Common Council meeting to express my concerns but unfortunately have a work conflict and cannot attend. I have registered my opposition.

I am asking the Madison City Council to table all action on the "escalator" clause as it applies to property designated Low Medium Residential (LMR) on the Generalized Future Land Use Plan (GFLU) in "select conditions" until there is meaningful stakeholder input. There are 3 reasons why the City should table this action.

- 1, The term "select conditions" used to justify escalating property density is undefined. Because it is undefined, citizens do not know when they face the risk that the density of an LMR property could be escalated. There is no transparency around this clause. Due process is completely lacking.
2. If the term "select conditions" justifying the use of the escalator clause is to be defined, homeowners and other stakeholders must be given the opportunity to participate in this process. Citizen input is absolutely critical whenever the City proposes a huge change in density.
3. Today's meeting agenda does not include an item that clearly notifies the public that the Council will address any issue involving the escalator clause, therefore, such action would be contrary to the Open Meetings Law.

In closing, the present undefined escalator clause should not be used by the City because it does not give citizens fair notice of the conditions that would justify its application. Consistent with the City's policy of providing for citizen input, if the term "select conditions" is to be defined, homeowners and stakeholders must be given an opportunity to provide input. Therefore, the City should defer action on this provision and provide for citizen input. This matter should be tabled for however long it takes to give citizens a chance to participate in this important matter.

Thank you,
Jill Krieger

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Janet Kuhnen <janet.kuhnen@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 1:16 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: Escalator clause

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

Dear Alder of 19th District,

Having been alerted to the escalator clause in negotiations Re the proposed huge apartment complex on Old Sauk Road, I wish to express intense opposition to that type of clause in ANY documents unless said escalator clause would be very publicly stated, via open meeting(s), and input by the affected constituents.

My observations of recent city decisions have been that those citizens affected and/or taxpayers, in general, are totally left out of input, EXCEPT to foot the bill and have to live with resultant negative impact on quality of living.

Please do not allow the inclusion of the escalator clause!

Sincerely,
Janet Kuhnen
306 Acadia Dr (Parkwood)
Madison, Wi 5717

Sent from my iPad

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Grace Kwon <gskwon22@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 12:01 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: Opposition to Item 4. 80281
Attachments: 94ed61dd-0304-4b6a-b892-cebc66b2b905.jpeg; ATT00001.txt

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

Dear Common Council,

My name is Grace Kwon.

I am writing to you concerning my objection to Item 4 . 80281 Adopting an Amendment ...", in particular, recommendations from the Plan Commission having to do with (re)zoning "in select conditions", also termed the "escalator clause".

I am part of the Saukborough Property Owner's Association off of Old Sauk Road and Sauk Ridge Trail.

Our Association has a mix of single homes, condos and 32 rental properties.

Our neighborhood already has a 20% rental density.

This summer's 7 water main breaks on the West side is a testament to our aging infrastructure. One of these water main break happened to be on our association's private street The Court of Brixham costing us ~\$75,000.

Another neighbor measured the city's increased water pressure from 60psi to 120psi during that time.

This neighborhood is over 40 years old and most of the water mains are on city property so if there is another water main break, it will be their responsibility at our taxpayers expense.

Unfortunately, our association has another private drive that is estimated to cot \$225,000 if there is another water main break at our members expense.

The Pierstoff's 3.8 acre property at 6610-6707 Old Sauk Rd is surrounded by single family homes on 3 sides and 32 unit rentals on 2.32 acres.

I would suggest a similar density total of 52 units on the 3.8 acre property at a maximum of 3 stories.

I am opposed to any changes in the rezoning of these properties in question to allow for an undefined escalator provision that applies to LMR properties in "select conditions".

Thank you for your consideration.

Grace Kwon

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Ann MacGuidwin <annmacpack@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 12:09 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: Escalator Clause

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

Members of the Common Council

I am asking the Common Council to table Item 4 on tonight's agenda: the "escalator" clause as it applies to property designated Low Medium Residential (LMR) on the Generalized Future Land Use Plan GFLU) in "select conditions". This is an extremely important issue to me and needs to be deliberated in a transparent and inclusive process. The term "selective conditions" is extremely vague and needs discussion and input from a wide and diverse audience to ensure that changes to land use consider human safety, environmental sustainability, and the ability to support a dramatic increase in the demand for utilities and city services.

An immediate example demonstrating the importance of thoughtful planning is the proposed development of two parcels on old Sauk Road that are being considered for a 170-unit apartment complex. As proposed, this project requires passage of the escalator clause, which is a bad decision for many reasons. Increased traffic, parking, and concentrated left-hand turns on a two-lane road is a safety concern for bikers, pedestrians, and children walking to nearby Crestwood School. Concentrated soil sealing from a large, high-density project is concerning given the current and on-going issue of water runoff. This concrete example of land-use change that could result from passing the "escalator clause" clearly illustrates the need to proceed thoughtfully in defining and detailing "select conditions". In this case, housing consistent with the current zoning, such as condos, small entry-level homes, and duplexes is much more likely to increase housing without significant negative impact.

I was surprised to learn today of the Council's plan to consider this topic without opportunity for citizen input. More than 150 people attended a recent on-line meeting presenting the plan for the Old Sauk Road development – just one specific example of a project impacted by this clause - so it is clear that there are many voices that would like an opportunity to be heard. Please table Item 4 and allow us a voice.

Dr. Ann MacGuidwin

39-year resident of the Parkwood Hills Neighborhood, District 19

Members of the Common Council

I am asking the Common Council to table Item 4 on tonight's agenda: the "escalator" clause as it applies to property designated Low Medium Residential (LMR) on the Generalized Future Land Use Plan GFLU) in "select conditions". This is an extremely important issue to me and needs to be deliberated in a transparent and inclusive process. The term "selective conditions" is extremely vague and needs discussion and input from a wide and diverse audience to ensure that changes to land use consider human safety, environmental sustainability, and the ability to support a dramatic increase in the demand for utilities and city services.

An immediate example demonstrating the importance of thoughtful planning is the proposed development of two parcels on old Sauk Road that are being considered for a 170-unit apartment complex. As proposed, this project requires passage of the escalator clause, which is a bad decision for many reasons. Increased traffic, parking, and concentrated left-hand turns on a two-lane road is a safety concern for bikers, pedestrians, and children walking to nearby Crestwood School. Concentrated soil sealing from a large, high-density project is concerning given the current and on-going issue of water runoff. This concrete example of land-use change that could result from passing the "escalator clause" clearly illustrates the need to proceed thoughtfully in defining and detailing "select conditions". In this case, housing consistent with the current zoning, such as condos, small entry-level homes, and duplexes is much more likely to increase housing without significant negative impact.

I was surprised to learn today of the Council's plan to consider this topic without opportunity for citizen input. More than 150 people attended a recent on-line meeting presenting the plan for the Old Sauk Road development – just one specific example of a project impacted by this clause - so it is clear that there are many voices that would like an opportunity to be heard. Please table Item 4 and allow us a voice.

Dr. Ann MacGuidwin

39-year resident of the Parkwood Hills Neighborhood, District 19

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Jaime Madden <jlmadden1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 11:02 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: Opposition to Escalator Clause

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

Dear Alders of the City of Madison and to Members of the Common Council:

Thank you for this opportunity to speak with you concerning the City's goal of creating needed housing in a transparent and inclusive process. I ask the Council to table Item 4 to provide meaningful citizen and council dialogue on this matter.

I live in Woodland Hills/Stonefield near Old Sauk Road and near two parcels, the last of the old Pierstorff farm, that are set to be developed.

Along with *every single neighbor I have spoken with*, I speak on behalf of a group of people who do not have a platform for addressing the Council; families and individuals whose dream of homeownership has been denied because Madison is missing entry-level homes. I support developing these parcels to provide for such "Missing Middle" homeownership. This property with its shade trees and nearby schools and small home units (single-family homes, condos, and small apartments) is the perfect setting for "Missing Middle" small single-family, duplex, quads, or townhouse homes. I urge the city to foster the development of such homeownership using appropriate future land use designations. That is not what is happening today.

In the Generalized Future Land Use Plan (GFLU) these parcels are in the Low Medium Residential (LMR) category which allows development up to 30 DU/acre and 3 stories. Worse still, we have been advised that these parcels are subject to the undefined escalator provision that applies to LMR properties in "select conditions". This escalator more than doubles the allowable density to permit the development of a massive 4-story apartment complex with up to 70 DU/acre. The profitability of such complexes means that developers will pass over the opportunity to build entry-level homes on any escalated LMR property.

The City should table Item 4 - a proposal to define the "select conditions" that permit escalating LMR property - for at least 30 days to promote planning for "Missing Middle" development, transparency, and inclusion.

1. Escalating LMR property works against "Missing Middle" development.
2. The term "select conditions" is currently undefined, therefore, citizens cannot tell whether it applies or not. There is no transparency around this clause.
3. If the term "select conditions" is to be defined, the Council's lodestar principles of inclusion and transparency require that homeowners and other stakeholders must be included in this

planning process. Meaningful citizen involvement is critical whenever the City defines a variable that will impact the density and type of development on the property.

4. Moving forward in the proposed manner sets a dangerous precedent for future development of this nature. It provides a path for developers to capitalize and profit while diminishing the integrity of existing neighborhoods at the expense of its current residents. The city should not align itself with developers, rather it should work to provide access to homeownership for its residents by providing access to more entry-level homes.

For these reasons, I ask the City to defer action on this provision and provide for citizen input. This matter should be tabled for 30 days or however long it takes to give citizens a chance to participate in this important matter.

Thank you for your consideration,
Jaime Madden
933 Pebble Beach Drive
Madison, WI

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Lindsay Marks <lhaskins25@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 12:17 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: meeting tonight

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

Thank you for this opportunity to speak with you concerning issues of transparency, due process, Open Meetings and inclusion.

My name is Lindsay Marks. I live in Parkwood Hills near Old Sauk Road and near two parcels, the last of the old Pierstorff farm, about 4 acres in total, that lie on Old Sauk Road. We understand that these parcels will be developed in the near future. We support development to provide for “Missing Middle” homeownership.

In the Generalized Future Land Use Plan (GFLU) these parcels are in the Low Medium Residential (LMR) category. This would allow development up to 30 DU/acre and 3 stories. However, I have been advised these parcels are subject to the undefined escalator provision that applies to LMR properties in “select conditions”. Application of the escalator provision would more than double the allowable density of housing to permit the development of a massive 4 story apartment complex with up to 70 DU/acre.

I oppose the application of the undefined escalator clause to this property. I oppose any action to define the escalator clause without first providing for homeowner and other stakeholder input.

I am asking the Madison City Council to table all action on the “escalator” clause as it applies to property designated Low Medium Residential (LMR) on the Generalized Future Land Use Plan GFLU) in “select conditions” until there is meaningful stakeholder input. There are 3 reasons why the City should table this action.

- 1, The term “select conditions” used to justify escalating property density is undefined. Because it is undefined, citizens do not know when they face the risk that the density of an LMR property could be escalated. There is no transparency around this clause. Due process is completely lacking.
2. If the term “select conditions” justifying the use of the escalator clause is to be defined, homeowners and other stakeholders must be given the opportunity to participate in this process. Citizen input is absolutely critical whenever the City proposes a huge change in density.
3. Today’s meeting agenda does not include an item that clearly notifies the public that the Council will address any issue involving the escalator clause, therefore, such action would be contrary to the Open Meetings Law.

In closing, the present undefined escalator clause should not be used by the City because it

does not give citizens fair notice of the conditions that would justify its application. Consistent with the City's policy of providing for citizen input, if the term "select conditions" is to be defined, homeowners and stakeholders must be given an opportunity to provide input. Therefore, the City should defer action on this provision and provide for citizen input. This matter should be tabled for however long it takes to give citizens a chance to participate in this important matter.

Lindsay Marks

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Rosemary Neu <rosemaryneu19@charter.net>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 8:12 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: 6610-6707 Old Sauk Road Development

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

This email is being sent to OPPOSE Amendment 4. 80281 that would permit development of apartment complexes on Old Sauk Road up to 4 stories in height an 70 DU/acres on the Pierstorff property.

Thank you for considering my opposition to this amendment.

Rosemary May
9 Sauk Woods Ct.

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Dona Meicher <djmeicherwerwie@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2023 9:19 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: Old Sauk road proposed development

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

I would ask that you and the the related city departments please take time to thoroughly investigate the proposed Old Sauk Rd 175 unit apartment development. My property intersects with this site and I would like to have a voice in the future of our neighborhood.

I am not in favor of the proposed development and foresee a multitude of potential problems. It would be prudent for the appropriate city committees/departments to take the necessary time and actions to address the surrounding neighborhoods concerns. For example, one concern is the escalator clause, we need clarification of the considered "conditions". What are the conditions and how will they impact our neighborhood?

Please help us be a part of the process. As you move forward please give us a voice in this proposed development.

Thank you.

Dona Meicher-Werwie

Sent from my iPhone

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Terry Mouchayleh <terrymouchayleh@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 10:36 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: "Select Conditions" under Point 4 on the Common Council Agenda (meeting 11/21)

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

My name is Terry Mouchayleh. I live in Parkwood Hills, just off Old Sauk Road on Mount Rainier Lane, near two parcels, the last of the old Pierstorff farm, about 4 acres in total, that lie on Old Sauk Road. I understand that these parcels will be developed in the near future. Let me make one thing clear: My husband and I support development to provide for "Missing Middle" homeownership. However, I am deeply troubled and concerned to learn that the City Council is discussing imposing the escalator provision to these parcels with no input from residents in the area.

In the Generalized Future Land Use Plan (GFLU) these parcels are in the Low Medium Residential (LMR) category. This would allow development up to 30 DU/acre and 3 stories. However, I have learned these parcels are subject to the undefined escalator provision that applies to LMR properties in "select conditions". Application of the escalator provision would more than double the allowable density of housing to permit the development of a massive 4 story apartment complex with up to 70 DU/acre.

I strongly oppose the application of the undefined escalator clause to this property for a variety of solid reasons. Further, I oppose any action to define the escalator clause without first providing for homeowner and other stakeholder input. I am asking the Madison City Council to table all action on the "escalator" clause as it applies to property designated Low Medium Residential (LMR) on the Generalized Future Land Use Plan GFLU in "select conditions" until there is meaningful stakeholder input.

There are 3 reasons why the City should table this action.

1. The term "select conditions" used to justify escalating property density is undefined. Because it is undefined, citizens do not know when they face the risk that the density of an LMR property could be escalated. There is no transparency around this clause; there is absolutely no due process. As a citizen, I feel that this approach is at best questionable and at worst duplicitous.

2. If the term "select conditions" justifying the use of the escalator clause is to be defined, homeowners and other stakeholders must be given the opportunity to participate in this process. Citizen input is absolutely critical whenever the City proposes a huge change in density.

3. Today's meeting agenda does not include an item that clearly notifies the public that the Council will address any issue involving the escalator clause; therefore, such action would be contrary to the Open Meetings Law.

In closing, I reiterate that I support development to provide for "Missing Middle" homeownership. However, the present undefined escalator clause should not be used by the City; it does not give citizens fair notice of or an opportunity to respond to the conditions that would justify its application. Consistent with the City's policy of providing for citizen input, if the term "select conditions" is to be defined, homeowners and stakeholders must be given an opportunity to provide input. Therefore, the City should defer action on this provision and provide

for citizen input. This matter should be tabled for however long it takes to give citizens a chance to participate in this important matter.

Sincerely,

Terry and Imad Mouchayleh

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Josh Olson <jo.olson03@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2023 10:06 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: Increase Brayton Height & Support Comp Plan Amendment

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

Hi,

I would like to share my strong support for increasing the height limit on the Brayton Lot to 10 stories as proposed in File 80307. We desperately need more housing in Madison and increasing the limit from 4 to 10 stories will allow more homes –many of them affordable -- to get built on this great location. The Brayton Lot is a golden opportunity for the City to shape development to fit our public needs. By allowing up to 10 stories, we will get more proposals for housing on the lot, and those proposals can be more creative in meeting our goals for affordable housing. We should allow the maximum creativity (up to 10 stories) in the proposal process and use the RFP process to ensure that any proposal – regardless of how many stories it is – includes deeply affordable and workforce housing. **Please don't settle for four stories of downtown housing** – increase the height limit to 10 stories and create more, affordable homes for Madison.

Additionally, I hope you pass Item 80281 as approved by the Plan Commission. This amendment to the Comprehensive Plan would allow increased density near Campus and Regent Street, eliminate references to maintaining house-like character in certain areas in favor of something more missing-middle friendly, and allow incremental infill on arterial streets in some circumstances. This is a step in the right direction and any attempts to water it down should be resisted.

Thank you,
Josh Olson

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Michael Onheiber <michaelonheiber@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 10:44 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: Agenda Item 4: Redefinition of "Select Conditions" - Impact on Parkwood Hills and Sauk Ridge Neighborhoods

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

November 21, 2023

To the Madison Common Council
Re: Agenda Item # 4 and potential development of 6706-6710 Old Sauk Road

We have been Parkwood Hills residents for 30 years. We are joining with many others to express our opposition to Agenda Item # 4, part of a rushed and obscure process by which the undefined term “select conditions” may be revised to trigger a doubling of currently permitted DU density at 6706-6710 Old Sauk Road (and other similarly situated property in similar residential neighborhoods throughout the city).

A change of this magnitude should not be quickly pressed forward without serious regard for community concerns and interests. Such a development would substantially exacerbate the already poorly managed traffic problem on Old Sauk Road and extend it into both the Parkwood Hills and Sauk Ridge residential streets. We, like so many other community members who are opposed to this “redefinition” would welcome reasonable development on Old Sauk Road that could help meet the long-neglected need for more affordable housing, including affordable entry level ownership.

Please Table Agenda Item 4. Do not move forward with a rushed redefinition of “select conditions” – foreclosing real dialogue with the affected residents and setting an inevitable course for other neighborhoods as well, that further limits, instead of expanding, opportunities for affordable home ownership.

Michael and Patrice Onheiber
6706 Carlsbad Drive

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Travis and Missy Rumery <tmrumery@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 10:32 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: LMR Property "Escalator Clause"

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

To Members of the Common Council,

Thank you for this opportunity to speak with you concerning the City's goal of creating needed housing in a transparent and inclusive process. We are asking the Council to table Item 4 to provide for meaningful citizen and council dialogue on this matter.

We live in Parkwood Hills near Old Sauk Road and near two parcels, the last of the old Pierstorff farm, that are ripe for development.

We speak on behalf of a group of people who do not have a platform for addressing the Council; families and individuals whose dream of homeownership has been denied because Madison is missing entry level homes. We support developing these parcels to provide for such "Missing Middle" homeownership. This property with its shade trees and nearby schools and small home units (single family homes, condos and small apartments) is the perfect setting for "Missing Middle" small single family, duplex, quads or townhouse homes. We urge the City to foster development of such homeownership through the use of appropriate future land use designations. That is not what is happening today.

In the Generalized Future Land Use Plan (GFLU) these parcels are in the Low Medium Residential (LMR) category which allows development up to 30 DU/acre and 3 stories. Worse still, we have been advised that these parcels are subject to the undefined escalator provision that applies to LMR properties in "select conditions". This escalator more than doubles the allowable density to permit the development of a massive 4 story apartment complex with up to 70 DU/acre. The profitability of such complexes means that developers will pass over the opportunity to build entry level homes on any escalated LMR property.

The City should table Item 4 - a proposal to define the "select conditions" that permit escalating LMR property - for at least 30 days in order to promote planning for "Missing Middle" development, transparency and inclusion.

1. Escalating LMR property works against "Missing Middle" development.
2. The term "select conditions" is currently undefined, therefore, citizens cannot tell whether it applies or not. There is no transparency around this clause.
2. If the term "select conditions" is to be defined, the Council's lodestar principles of inclusion and transparency require that homeowners and other stakeholders must be included in this planning process. Meaningful citizen involvement is absolutely critical whenever the City defines a variable that will impact the density and type of development on the property.

For these reasons, we ask the City to defer action on this provision and provide for citizen input. This matter should be tabled for 30 days or however long it takes to give citizens a chance to participate in this important matter.

Thank you for your consideration,

Travis and Melissa Rumery
6405 Shenandoah Way
Madison, WI

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Patricia Schultz <pgeschultz@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 2:41 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: Item 4 of tonight's Common Council meeting

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

Dear All,

Please take time to consider the implications of the clause in item 4 on tonight's agenda regarding changing the zoning for the proposal of a new housing complex on Old Sauk Rd. We live on Old Sauk and are already concerned about the amount of traffic on the 2 land segment of the road. We also do not feel adequate parking is being provided for the proposed site.

Thank you.

Patty Schultz
6305 Old Sauk Rd.

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Joe Sokal <jwseer@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 2:13 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: Common Council meeting / Changes to LMR land use

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

We are writing to comment on an item which is on the agenda for the 11/21/2023 Common Council meeting. Item 4 proposes changes to the city's Comprehensive Plan regarding the Low-Medium Residential (LMR) category and, in particular, the LMR "escalator clause". It appears that these changes would broadly affect LMR areas, significantly increasing density under certain "select conditions" which do not seem to be defined. The community needs to be given time and opportunity to understand and comment on the implications of these changes.

Escalating the density of low-medium residential in this way leads developers to build more profitable, higher density projects and discourages development of the "missing middle" (LMR, including starter homes) which Madison sorely needs.

We ask you to please defer Item 4 and allow time for meaningful community input.

*Joseph W. Sokal & Ellen E. Roney
13 E. Spyglass Ct., District 19
Madison*

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Diane Sorensen <dianesorensen1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 9:54 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: Item 4. Opposing adoption of proposed escalator language in the Comprehensive Plan
Attachments: Common Council Comment.pages

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

Dear Common Council members,

I have attached our comments opposing the Council's adoption of the factors defining the "select conditions" that permit escalation of development in LMR properties. Thank you for your attention to this important issue.

I intend to register to speak tonight. I hope to open a dialogue on these important plan decisions.

Regards,
Diane Sorensen.

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Kathleen stark <strk79automatic@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 12:12 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: Undefined Escalator clause Old Sauk Road
Attachments: To Comon Council.docx

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

My husband and I recently bought a home on Old Sauk Trail, a lovely, wooded neighborhood. Now we learn that a housing project is to be constructed.

We are sympathetic to the need for mid-range housing in Madison and do not object to having such housing in our neighborhood. What we do strongly object to is increased population density and the consequences of that, which we assume are well known.

Of particular concern is item #4, Adopting an Amendment...” proposed by the Planning Commission which suggests allowing “re-zoning in select conditions.” The “select conditions” are not specified, and frankly we do not trust the building contractors to do anything but expand housing construction as much as they can persuade city council members to approve.

We experienced this in our condo building on West Washington Avenue. The builder made promises that did not materialize. That is what we fear will happen with this project, especially with the open permission that “re-zoning” and “specified conditions” allow.

Successful governance requires more transparency than that.

Sincerely,
Tom and Kathleen Stark
809 Sauk Ridge Trail

To: Members of the Common Council, Madison, Wisconsin

My husband and I recently bought a home on Old Sauk Trail, a lovely, wooded neighborhood. Now we learn that a housing project is to be constructed.

We are sympathetic to the need for mid-range housing in Madison and do not object to having such housing in our neighborhood. What we do strongly object to is increased population density and the consequences of that, which we assume are well known.

Of particular concern is item #4, Adopting an Amendment..." proposed by the Planning Commission which suggests allowing "re-zoning in select conditions." The "select conditions" are not specified, and frankly we do not trust the building contractors to do anything but expand housing construction as much as they can persuade city council members to approve.

We experienced this in our condo building on West Washington Avenue. The builder made promises that did not materialize. That is what we fear will happen with this project, especially with the open permission that "re-zoning" and "specified conditions" allow.

Successful governance requires more transparency than that.

Sincerely,
Tom and Kathleen Stark
809 Sauk Ridge Trail

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Bob Charter <rtaylor01@charter.net>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 9:39 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: Old Sauk Road Development

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

As a long time Madison resident of Parkwood Hills I feel compelled to comment on the proposed development on Old Sauk Road. I believe this needs full discussion, not a technical change in zoning requirements that few understand.

Almost unanimity exists (rare in Madison) that the proposed development is not in the best interests of Madison's west side. Yes, the property will be redeveloped from the farm it is today. Yes, it is likely not going to be single family homes given the price of the land. WHAT WE DON'T NEED IS MAMMOTH APARTMENT BUILDING THAT WILL FOREVER CHANGE THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

Bob Taylor 210 Everglade Drive

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Jessica Wartenweiler <jessicawartenweiler@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2023 3:01 PM
To: Plan Commission Comments; council
Subject: Do not down zone development along arterial roads

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

Greetings,

I'm writing to express my opposition to the Future Land Use map amendment targeting density reduction of low-medium residential along arterial roads. As the mayor was quoted at a recent forum, the housing crisis is the biggest issue facing our region currently. The proposed limitation on building much needed housing units only exacerbates this issue and drives up the cost of housing.

Jessica Wartenweiler

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Kathy Western <kwestern@tds.net>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 12:40 PM
To: All Alders; council
Cc: Slack, Kristen
Subject: <No Subject>

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

Dear Members of the Common Council,

As you focus on addressing an issue realize the possibilities of detrimental consequences that could be far reaching. Thoughtful, wise guiding of Madison into the future while retaining the characteristics that maintain a Quality of Life worth living, for all ages and abilities is imperative. With the "escalator clause" being looked at and the ambiguous ramifications of LMR density being increased in "select conditions", it's important that this discussion be paused until there is a clear understanding of exactly what is being proposed and opportunities for resident input.

A quick feel-good fix isn't necessarily the right solution for present and long term livability of an area. Increasing height limits and density undermines the quiet, peaceful, safe neighborhoods that were chosen for those very same life quality reasons to live, raise families and retire in. High density high-rises adding hundreds of residents, equaling the population of some entire towns in Wisconsin, but without the solid foundation to support the population needs. First Responder staffing necessary for safety is just one example.

The higher the height, the more people needing help...a perfect storm.

Imagine trying to evacuate hundreds of people, of all ages and some with mental or physical challenges from a high-rise. In the case of fire, elevators are prohibited, making crowded stairs the only way out. With fire comes poor visibility, toxic smoke, oppressive heat and most likely panic. It's usually the toxic smoke that will kill before the actual flames. If the fire originated in the underground parking, where electric cars are very likely to be housed, the fire is not easily or quickly extinguished.

WI DOT decided against having underground parking when building the most recent transportation facility on Sheboygan Ave. for safety and security reasons, changing their initial plans.

An Abstract of ... Intelligent Solution for Cities and Mobility of the Future, p. 72-81
Malgorzata and Aleksander Król:

"Electric vehicles are increasingly appearing in underground garages. They pose a significant risk when a fire breaks out. Risks to the building structure and to the people's safety increase. It is very difficult to extinguish an electric vehicle fire, and in addition, large amounts of hydrogen fluoride are

released when the lithium-ion battery is burning. Substances released during an electric vehicle fire pose a threat to rescue teams, contaminate garage surfaces and contaminate the extinguishing water. The article presents numerical analyzes of the spread of hydrogen fluoride and temperature distribution during a fire of a small electric vehicle in a ten-car underground garage. The calculations used the Fire Dynamics Simulator program, which is very often applied to analyze the conditions during a fire in a confined space. Calculations show that even a fire of a small lithium-ion battery produces an amount of hydrogen fluoride that is hazardous to the health of people which could be near the fire."

BUSINESS INSIDER, [11/9/2023](#) ... Firefighters Still Learning How To Fight EV Fires

"Car fires have always been dangerous and difficult for firefighters, but highly combustible chemicals in electric car batteries are posing new challenges. Not unlike the gasoline tanks in internal-combustion engines, the enormous lithium-ion batteries used to power electric cars pose some significant fire risks. But there are some key differences that make these fires harder to combat.

One major difference is the possibility of what's referred to as a 'thermal runaway,' in which an EV battery falls into a cycle of overheating and over-pressurizing, causing fires and sometimes explosions. These powerful fires are plaguing ships carrying EVs causing extensive damage to parking garages, and even leading to widespread recalls in some cases.

'Even after an EV battery fire appears to be extinguished, lingering energy stored in the battery can cause these dangerous runaways. Even when it looks like pretty much a plastic tank on the ground, those batteries are made up of thousands of these small battery cells, and all it takes is one of them to reignite the fire,' said Brian O'Connor, a technical services engineer for the National Fire Protection Association."

Higher building height and higher density create a variety of negative consequences.

No one has ever suggested the health benefits of spending time in or living near densely populated high-rises that block the sun and sky, atop expanses of concrete near heavy traffic...no one. With our burgeoning mental health crisis and a serious shortage of mental health professionals, we have far too many people suffering with anxiety, depression and other mental health conditions that can cause anger, aggressive behaviors and increased crime. Our suicide rate is tragic. As they try to calm their insides with prescription meds, and self-medicating with alcohol and other drugs; the stress and chaos in their environment only add to their challenges. Children are not immune; we are raising a community of anxious and depressed children, replicating what we are seeing nationwide. According to Mayo Clinic there are Drs. writing "park prescriptions"; the Japanese promote shinrin-yoku, "bathing in the forest atmosphere" to boost health and lower stress. According to the National Park Services, it has been shown that being in nature reduces stress, anger, anxiety and depression, while promoting a sense of well-being and fulfillment.

Children in densely populated high-rises next to high traffic areas with concrete parking lots and massive underground parking with many moving vehicles bring a constant danger to their wellbeing. They have no control over their environment. Where will they play...ride their bikes...breathe?

Please take the time to plan carefully, quality of life is not to be taken lightly. Madison should be a place where one can continue to live a peaceful, quiet life. A place where increasing the quality of life is an actual goal; not a city that grew so quickly without thoughtful restraint that Madison is unrecognizable. First do no harm.

Sincerely,
Kathy Western
25 St. Andrews Circle
Madison, WI

Sent from my iPad

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Barney White <barneywhite700@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 2:01 PM
To: All Alders
Cc: Lynette Fons
Subject: Escalator Clause Discussion On Tonight's Agenda

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

Honorable Members of the Madison Common Council:

I am writing on behalf of my wife, Lynette Fons, and myself to ask that the Common Council table Item 4 on tonight's agenda: the "escalator" clause as it applies to property designated Low Medium Residential (LMR) on the Generalized Future Land Use Plan (GFLU) in "select conditions". This would allow time for needed discussion and public input.

The term "selective conditions" is vague and should have input from a wide audience to ensure changes to land use consider human safety, environmental sustainability, and the ability to support a dramatic increase in the demand for utilities and city services.

This certainly applies to the proposed development of two parcels on old Sauk Road which are being considered for a 170-unit apartment complex. This proposed project is only a few blocks from our home in the Parkwood Hills subdivision. As I understand it, this project requires passage of the escalator clause.

Increased traffic on Old Sauk Road and through our neighborhoods as well as an apparent lack of adequate parking on the property are among our concerns. In addition, the high density housing this would establish would be out of step with the neighborhood. Current zoning allows condos, entry-level homes, and duplexes which are more in keeping with the area.

Given the profound impact this proposed amendment could have, we urge the Members of the Common Council not to rush into making this change to the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bernard White
Ozark Trail
Madison

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Bianca Whitney <biancawhitney.m@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 10:49 AM
To: All Alders
Subject: Increase Brayton Height & Support Comp Plan Amendment

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

Hi,

I would like to share my strong support for increasing the height limit on the Brayton Lot to 10 stories as proposed in File 80307. We desperately need more housing in Madison and increasing the limit from 4 to 10 stories will allow more homes –many of them affordable -- to get built on this great location. The Brayton Lot is a golden opportunity for the City to shape development to fit our public needs. By allowing 10 stories, we will get more proposals for housing on the lot, and those proposals can be more creative in meeting our goals for affordable housing. We should allow the maximum creativity (up to 10 stories) in the proposal process and use the RFP process to ensure that any proposal – regardless of how many stories it is – includes deeply affordable and workforce housing. Please don't settle for four stories of downtown housing – increase the height limit to 10 stories and create more, affordable homes for Madison.

Additionally, I hope you pass Item 80281 as approved by the Plan Commission. This amendment to the Comprehensive Plan would allow increased density near Campus and Regent Street, eliminate references to maintaining house-like character in certain areas in favor of something more missing-middle friendly, and allow incremental infill on arterial streets in some circumstances. This is a step in the right direction and any attempts to water it down should be resisted.

Thank you,

Bianca Whitney

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Jane Nelson Worel <jnelsonworel@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 2:05 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: West side plan development and the use of Escalator Clause to rezone residential property

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

Dear Alders of the City of Madison,

Thank you for this opportunity to communicate our concerns regarding the West side development plan and use of the “Escalator Clause” to rezone residential property.

Our names are Jane and Don Worel. We have lived in the Woodland Hills neighborhood (North of Old Sauk and East of Gammon) for approximately 38 years. We have a specific concern around the rezoning of the 3.8 acre plot of land on Old Sauk Rd. being considered for development into a high density, 4-story apartment complex adjacent to our single family neighborhood.

We learned today, that there is a Common Council Meeting scheduled tonight that may impact future development in our neighborhood and throughout the city. We agree with Joe Hanauer, Lynn Green and several of our neighbors In regard to the meeting tonight:

We oppose the application of the undefined escalator clause. We oppose any action to define the escalator clause without first providing for homeowner and other stakeholder input.

We are asking the Madison City Council to table all action on the “escalator” clause as it applies to property designated Low Medium Residential (LMR) on the Generalized Future Land Use Plan GFLU) in “select conditions” until there is meaningful stakeholder input. There are 3 reasons why the City should table this action.

- 1, The term “select conditions” used to justify escalating property density is undefined. Because it is undefined, citizens do not know when they face the risk that the density of an LMR property could be escalated. There is no transparency around this clause. Due process is completely lacking.
2. If the term “select conditions” justifying the use of the escalator clause is to be defined, homeowners and other stakeholders must be given the opportunity to participate in this process. Citizen input is absolutely critical whenever the City proposes a huge change in density.
3. Today’s meeting agenda does not include an item that clearly notifies the public that the Council will address any issue involving the escalator clause, therefore, such action would be contrary to the Open Meetings Law.

In closing, the present undefined escalator clause should not be used by the City because it does not give citizens fair notice of the conditions that would justify its application. Consistent with the City’s policy of providing for citizen input, if the term “select conditions” is to be defined, homeowners and stakeholders must be given an opportunity to provide input. Therefore, the City should defer action on this provision and provide for citizen input. This matter should be tabled for however long it takes to give citizens a chance to participate in this important matter.

Thank you,

Jane and Don Worel
Madison, Wi, District 19

Matthias, Isaac L

From: John Benson <john@aprettygoodhandyman.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 4:14 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: Common Council meeting / Changes to LMR land use

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

For the Common Council:

I've lived at 29 Blue Ridge Ct since 2018 in the Parkwood Hills neighborhood. My name is John Benson and this letter echoes my insightful neighbors' input.

Please table Item 4 and allow us a voice.

You know more than 150 people attended the recent on-line meeting presenting the plan for the Old Sauk Road development – just one specific example of a project impacted by this clause - so it is clear that there are many voices that would like an opportunity to be heard.

Again, do the right thing - table item 4.

With respect
JB

Matthias, Isaac L

From: Kim Bunke <kmbunke@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 4:17 PM
To: All Alders
Subject: Old Sauk Road development

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

As a resident of the Woodland Hills neighborhood, I suggest you visit Saint Andrews Circle, locate the Pierstorf barn, and then try to picture the proposed four story/sixty-foot tall apartment building in its place. Use your x-ray vision to place the "underground" parking level. Then imagine living at the foot of such a building. If you've only viewed the site from Old Sauk Road, and picture a tasteful building hidden among trees, you have no idea of the impact such a structure would have on our neighborhood.

Kim Bunke