

From: Caroline Gilles [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, June 21, 2018 3:05 PM
To: Punt, Colin
Cc: Greg Gilles
Subject: Planning Commission Meeting on 7/2/18. Opposition to proposed permit - 836 Woodrow Street

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Collin-

This is a follow up to our phone conversation on 6/13/18. We are writing to you in advance of the Planning Commission meeting on July 2, 2018 at 5:45pm where our neighbor, Andrew Cusick (836 Woodrow St., 53711), has applied for a "conditional use for an accessory dwelling unit." We are extremely concerned about the unintended consequences that may occur should he be given permission to build such a structure. In addition to our grave concerns about devaluing our property, we do not think granting this accessory dwelling unit is permissible within TRC 2. Specifically, zoning ordinance 28.043 states:

Except in the case of multifamily complexes and planned multi-use sites within the Mixed-Use Center District, **no more than one (1) principal detached** residential building shall be located on a zoning lot, nor shall a principal detached residential building be located on the same zoning lot with any other nonresidential principal building or use.

Mr. Cusick's application for a conditional use accessory dwelling unit is in clear violation of this zoning ordinance. Pursuant to 28.137, which we understand that to allow only one residential building in the zone in which we inhabit, our neighbor is deciding to build an additional, **if not third**, residential dwelling, in a TC 2 zoned lot. Mr. Cusick already has a detached accessory unit that he uses as a living room, complete with couches, lamps, and tables. He also uses the roof as a patio. This third proposed accessory dwelling is to also include full sewage hook up along with gas, electric, water and other utilities, and we are concerned that this will negatively impact the enjoyment of our property, specifically our backyard. Additionally, there may be unintended environmental consequences given the size and density of our residential lots.

Not only do we think he would be in clear violation of zoning ordinance 28.137, but we also think zoning ordinance 27.02 applies as well. Instead of repairing and preserving his historic early 1900s bungalow, he is considering building an accessory dwelling unit in his backyard so as to avoid preserving and promoting the general welfare of our neighborhood environment. Quite honestly, his main dwelling is in need of serious repair and is quickly becoming an eye sore. We are concerned that should this permit go through, no one will be enforcing the

minimum housing and property maintenance standards necessary to preserve and promote private and public interest.

We pay an inordinate amount of taxes to live in the neighborhood we do. If for some reason, the planning commission feels he meets the zoning requirements, my question would be, "Just because he might meet the basic zoning requirements, **does that mean granting a permit for an accessory dwelling is the right thing to do?**" Mr. Cusick is a recent addition to the neighborhood....Most of our neighbors have been here for 10+ years, how can one person move into a neighborhood and single-handedly change the spirit of the neighborhood – not to mention reduce property values. We have other concerns that come with renting out one of his units – the need for increased security and parking. Parking is at a premium on our street, and Mr. Cusick has 3 cars, none of which are ever parked in his driveway or garage due to the fact that he inhabits the "garage" as an accessory dwelling unit. This already means there is a lack of parking on our street. With renting to others and possible use of AirBnB (which the city (you per our phone conversation on 6/13/18) has already told us they would not enforce even though it is not permitted in TRC2), we will have to significantly monitor our safety due to unknown inhabitants.

We urge you NOT to approve this permit.

Please let us know if you have any questions or concerns.

Greg and Caroline Gilles

████ Woodrow Street

████████████████████

From: Stouder, Heather
Sent: Monday, June 25, 2018 8:33 AM
To: Punt, Colin; Firchow, Kevin
Subject: Fw: Proposed Cusick Development

Fyi

From: Eskrich, Sara
Sent: Saturday, June 23, 2018 1:17:19 PM
To: Bill Rattunde
Cc: Maria Rattunde; Fiona McTavish; Caroline Gilles; [REDACTED]; Tucker, Matthew; Stouder, Heather
Subject: Re: Proposed Cusick Development

Hi Bill,

Thanks for bringing this to my attention - I appreciate your concerns about the current property.

I'm CCing city staff, as I have not touched-base with them yet on this proposal. I will do so next week and we'll be in-touch.

Best,
Sara

Sara Eskrich
DISTRICT 13 ALDER
CITY OF MADISON
(608) 669-6979
district13@cityofmadison.com

Subscribe to District 13 updates at www.cityofmadison.com/council/district13/

From: Bill Rattunde [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, June 21, 2018 8:20 PM
To: Eskrich, Sara
Cc: Maria Rattunde; Fiona McTavish; Caroline Gilles; [REDACTED]
Subject: Proposed Cusick Development

Sara,

I am writing to express the opposition that my wife and I have to the proposed accessory residence at 836 Woodrow Street. [https://www.cityofmadison.com/dpced/planning/documents/836ws_site\(2\).pdf](https://www.cityofmadison.com/dpced/planning/documents/836ws_site(2).pdf)

Our concerns are with the current use and condition of the existing house and how this is heightened by this proposal. The occupants use the driveway that abuts ours as an outdoor living room and park their three cars in the street. As you know, this is limited and valued space on our street. With the addition (and rental) of another residence, we will be further deprived of the ability to have guests at our house. The existing garage is furnished as a hang-out and is not used for vehicles. The condition of the garage and front porch is a concern and detracts from our enjoyment of our property. They are making no effort to make repairs to these existing structures. The proposed residence faces directly into our back yard requiring us to fence it off if

we want privacy. The proposed accessory residence will negatively affect our use and enjoyment of our property, and we oppose it. What recourse do we have. What advice can you provide.

Respectfully,
Bill Rattunde

Sent from Bill Rattunde's iPhone

From: Karen Tardrew [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, June 30, 2018 12:53 PM
To: Firchow, Kevin <KFirchow@cityofmadison.com>; Punt, Colin <CPunt@cityofmadison.com>; Eskrich, Sara <district13@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Planning commission meeting on July 2
Importance: High

To the Planning Commission,

We are writing to you in advance of the Planning Commission meeting on July 2, 2018 at 5:45pm in regards to our neighbor, Andrew Cusick's ([836 Woodrow St., 53711](#)), permit application for a **conditional use for an accessory dwelling unit**. Given the holiday we will be out of town and unable to attend in person.

We are opposed to issuing a permit for conditional use for an accessory dwelling unit at 836 Woodrow Street for several reasons. First, we have concerns how this would impact our community. No plans or discussions related to such ADUs have been discussed as a neighborhood. This seems like a first step in actually being permitted to build an ADU. Second, should he use this for rental property, it would lead to increased parking and safety issues. Our street and neighborhood is already dense, why add more congestion? Third, we are concerned about the condition and appearance of his main dwelling. Lack of upkeep for the main dwelling makes us concerned about what will happen should Mr. Cusick be allowed to build an ADU and forget about primary obligation to the main house. Fourth, we are concerned about infringing on the already limited green space on our street and lots in general thus making it harder for drainage and runoff to be absorbed. We already have sewer backup issues despite repeated attempts at fixing these street issues. Adding a third building to his property does not seem like a viable solution or an environmentally sound proposition. All this said, building an ADU may be permissible according to zoning ordinances, but we do not think his proposed plan for an ADU is right for our neighborhood.

We appreciate your consideration of our concerns, and urge you not to issue a permit at this time.

Thank you,

Karen and Steve Tardrew

[REDACTED] Woodrow Street
Madison WI 53711

[REDACTED]
Karen Tardrew
[REDACTED]

From: Yael Gen [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, June 29, 2018 11:34 AM
To: Firchow, Kevin <KFirchow@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Fwd: Planning Commission Meeting on 7/2/18 Opposition to proposed permit 836 Woodrow Street INCREASED FLOODING RISK

Hi Kevin,

We understood that Colin Punt would be representing the Woodrow Street neighbors at this hearing but it looks like he will be out of town. To whom should we address our concerns? I'm not in the habit of opposing any neighbor's effort to do what they wish with their property but this seems like it may have sustainability impacts that extend beyond Woodrow Street. Additionally, it does nothing to improve the quality of the existing street-facing house which seems to be in need of some repair.

Let me know. Many thanks, Yael

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

From: Yael Gen [REDACTED]
Date: Fri, Jun 29, 2018 at 11:23 AM
Subject: Planning Commission Meeting on 7/2/18 Opposition to proposed permit 836 Woodrow Street INCREASED FLOODING RISK
To: cpunt@cityofmadison.com
Cc: "Eskrich, Sara" <district13@cityofmadison.com>

To the Planning Commission,

We are writing to you in advance of the Planning Commission meeting on July 2, 2018 at 5:45pm in regards to our neighbor, Andrew Cusick's ([836 Woodrow St., 53711](#)), permit application for a **conditional use for an accessory dwelling unit**. We have another commitment and cannot attend the meeting.

We are concerned about the cumulative impacts of increasing impervious surfaces in our neighborhood that has seen basement flooding and sewage overflows despite recent drainage improvements.

In mid-June, despite new sewer pipes and rain gardens, many people on our street—including residents at the top of the hill, had water in their basements as a result of the heavy rains. Additionally, sewage from the arboretum side of the [Lake Wingra overflowed](#) into the lake during that event. The argument that this "one" house may not make a significant difference leads to a literal slippery slope. If everyone on Woodrow and Terry streets were permitted to build free-standing income units on their property, how would we mitigate flooding issues? Not just additional sewage and power but the problem of losing land that can absorb water during a rain event. The plans indicate conventional plumbing and electric. The house will occupy most of his yard with very little drainage between it, the street-facing house, the garage and the impervious driveway. This does not appear to be an environmentally sustainable proposition.

[Green infrastructure solutions](#) could be implemented but they are a complex issue and are not addressed in the current plans. Should this structure be considered, we want to be assured that future environmental and engineering impacts for ALL of the structures on a property are taken into consideration by the zoning and planning committees.

Thank you,

Yael Gen and Jeffrey Jerred

■ Woodrow Street
Madison WI 53711

