

From: [Andrew Cusick](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Cc: [Evers, Tag](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [DMNA President](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Figueroa Cole, Yannette](#); [darrin.wasniewski@gmail.com](#); [nicole.solheim@gmail.com](#); [pwheck@gmail.com](#); [srsande608@gmail.com](#)
Subject: Subject: #93508 Conditional Use - 2219 Monroe St - EHS Stadium - Public Comment
Date: Friday, July 10, 2026 1:15:25 PM

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

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

Andrew Cusick
836 Woodrow Street
Madison, WI 53711
608-577-4464

July 10, 2026

Alder Tag Evers, District 13
Members of the City of Madison Plan Commission
City Staff, Department of Planning and Development
DMNA Officers

Re: File #93508, Edgewood High School Goodman Athletics Facilities Complex
Conditional Use, Plan Commission Public Hearing July 13, 2026

Dear Alder Evers, Members of the Plan Commission, City Staff, and DMNA
Officers,

I am writing as the owner of 836 Woodrow Street, directly across from the southwest corner of the Edgewood campus where the proposed 30 by 72 foot storage building would sit. I am opposed to File #93508, and I ask the Plan Commission to deny the application. Please include my letter in the Legistar.

I want to be candid with the Commission about my standing to make this request. Several years ago I applied to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance to build an Accessory Dwelling Unit at 836 Woodrow. The proposed structure was a residential ADU costing approximately \$350,000, designed to fit the character of the neighborhood. Two adjacent neighbors, whose sight lines would have been affected, objected on the grounds that a new building would materially affect the enjoyment of their properties. The ZBA denied the application on that record. I accepted the decision. Madison has since revised its ADU ordinance, and I understand I could likely build that ADU today under current rules. That reform reinforces the point I want to make here. The City has chosen to relax substantial-impairment scrutiny for residential accessory dwellings in residential

neighborhoods, a use category it now affirmatively welcomes. It has NOT chosen to relax scrutiny for institutional-scale athletic facilities in residential neighborhoods, because that is a different category with different neighborhood consequences. If a residential ADU visible to two households was a substantial impairment under a standard the City has since found appropriate to relax for residential uses, then a 30 by 72 by 17 foot pre-engineered corrugated metal storage building at the southwest corner of Edgewood facing Woodrow, together with a 1,200 seat stadium and an outdoor amplified sound system is not a marginal case. It is that same standard applied consistently, to a use category the City has not moved to welcome in residential neighborhoods.

Three findings the applicant asks this Commission to make deserve close scrutiny.

On CUP Standard 3, the applicant asserts the project is "consistent with other High Schools in the area." That comparison does not hold. Memorial High School is next to an industrial and commercial corridor. West is on the corner of two major boulevards, Madison East High is next to Madison's busiest commercial corridors. None of Madison's high schools are sited in a residential and park-adjacent neighborhood the way Edgewood is. The applicant's own comparison, on examination, undercuts the finding it asks this Commission to make.

Also on Standard 3, the applicant's response rests on collaboration with the Dudgeon Monroe and Vilas Neighborhood Associations. Collaboration is a process. Standard 3 is a substantive finding about impairment. A 1,200 seat stadium with a public address system audible during every event, adjacent to Lake Wingra parkland, is a categorical incompatibility with the surrounding use. The compromises reached in conversation reduce the frequency of that incompatibility. They do not cure it.

On CUP Standard 9, the applicant has answered "Not applicable." Standard 9 governs any new construction of a building or addition to an existing building, and it authorizes this Commission to require the applicant to submit plans to the Urban Design Commission for comment and recommendation. This application is new construction of at least four structures with lighting, including the corrugated metal storage building visible from Woodrow Street. Standard 9 plainly applies. I respectfully request that the Commission decline to accept the "Not applicable" answer and require Urban Design Commission review before any approval is considered.

The applicant on File #93508 is Edgewood High School of the Sacred Heart, one of three separately incorporated institutions that occupy this 53-acre parcel as a shared institutional complex. Wisconsin Conditional Use Permits run with the land, but that principle only works if the record clearly identifies the fee owner. Before this

Commission approves conditions on a facility of this scale, I ask that the fee owner of record be identified in the file, required to co-sign the application, and named as a co-permittee jointly and severally liable for all conditions of approval.

I also ask this Commission to require a campus master plan before further institutional expansion is approved on this parcel. My understanding is that Edgewood Campus School is now planning its own expansion, with additional traffic impact on the residential streets already burdened by three schools converging twice daily. Alder Evers's own 2019 ordinance requiring conditional-use review for stadiums, lights, and amplified sound at schools without a master plan was written to address exactly this coordination gap. A parcel this size, with three separately incorporated institutions expanding independently, needs a master plan before further ad hoc approvals.

The applicant's own history on this parcel is instructive. In 2015, according to public comment in this file, then-EHS President Mike Elliot said the facility was being built to provide the school's athletes with the best practice surfaces possible, noting that both neighborhood associations were "vehemently opposed to us having lights or playing games here." Eleven years later, that same field is the subject of an application to construct a 1,200 seat stadium with a permanent amplified sound system. This is not an argument about how infrastructure might be used in the future. It is a record of how the applicant has changed its representations about this same field.

No decision-maker considering this parcel on the land-use merits alone would consider a 1,200 seat stadium with an outdoor amplified sound system in this neighborhood. This application is on the Commission's calendar because the applicant has resources, patience, and litigation history that the residential neighborhood does not, and has spent a decade converting attrition into approval. The Commission has watched two federal RLUIPA lawsuits, both lost by the applicant, most recently in the Seventh Circuit in 2024. Over that same period the neighborhood associations have moved from opposition to a joint statement. What has changed since 2015 is not the parcel, or the neighborhood, or the impact. *What has changed is the accumulated political cost of continuing to say no.* That cost is not a finding under Chapter 28. It is not a substitute for the substantial impairment analysis this Commission is required to perform. The conditions on Woodrow have actually gotten worse, not better, because the gate on the West entrance was often locked per old agreements. The cost of saying no is a heavy cost borne by a whole residential side street who has been consistent in its argument against competitive athletic field use.

I close where I began. The City's land-use process held me to a strict reading of substantial impairment when two neighbors objected to a residential ADU. I

accepted that standard. The City has since decided that residential accessory dwellings in residential neighborhoods deserve a lighter regulatory hand. It has made no such determination about institutional-scale stadiums with amplified public address systems in residential neighborhoods. I ask this Commission to apply the substantial-impairment standard to this application with at least the seriousness the ZBA applied to mine. Deny the application. If approval is contemplated, condition it on identification of the fee owner and joinder as co-permittee jointly and severally liable, on adoption of a campus master plan before any further institutional expansion is approved on this parcel, on the permanent closure of the campus's west entrance, on substantive mitigation of the campus's daily impact on the surrounding residential neighborhood, on enforceable use limits, and on elimination of or substantial redesign of both the corrugated metal storage building and the amplified PA system.

Thank you for your service and for your consideration. I would welcome the chance to discuss this further.

Sincerely,

Andrew Cusick
836 Woodrow Street
Madison, WI 53711

From: [Peter Tan & Rachel Durfee](#)
To: [Evers, Tag](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Planning](#); [Darrin S. Wasniewski](#); [Field, Derek](#); [Emily R. Gnam](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Nicole A. Solheim](#); [Patrick W. Heck](#); [Sara R. Sanders](#); [Figueroa Cole, Yannette](#); [DMNA President Marc Gartler](#); [DMNA VP Marie Trest](#); [DMNA Secretary Catherine Jagoe](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: #93508 Cond Use - 2219 Monroe St - EHS Stadium - Large Metal Storage Building
Date: Thursday, July 9, 2026 11:00:48 AM

You don't often get email from redandtan87@sbcglobal.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Alder Evers, Members of the City of Madison Plan Commission, City Staff, DMNA officers.

Our names are Peter Tan and Rachel Durfee. We are neighbors who live at 848 Woodrow Street, on the eastern edge of the Edgewood Campus.

In addition to our concerns for the use of the facility as well as the acoustic and lighting considerations that have been addressed by the Joint Statement by EHS, DMNA and VNA, we would like to express our concern and opposition to the proposed exterior material palette of the **large 72'L x 30'W x 17'H Storage Building** at the southwest corner of the site, right next to Woodrow Street. What is proposed is essentially a **pre-engineered metal building that is clad with corrugated metal and exposed fasteners, which is typically used in industrial settings**. The use of corrugated metal and exposed fasteners on a building of this scale is unprecedented on the Edgewood Campus, and is incompatible aesthetically with the existing campus and the neighborhood. Hence, the exterior material palette of this building will be detrimental to the uses, values and enjoyment of the neighboring properties adjacent to the Edgewood Campus.

Please be aware that the landscaping that screens this building from Woodrow Street consists of White Pines and deciduous vegetation. As these white pines mature, they get increasingly open at their base, and during the winter months, the deciduous vegetation sheds its leaves, further exposing the view of this large, industrial looking pre-engineered metal building.

I respectfully request that the Plan Commission requires the following as **Conditions of Approval of this Conditional Use Application**:

- 1. The exterior material of the Storage Building be brick to match the material palette of the rest of the campus.**
- 2. The landscape screening south and west of the building be protected and preserved during the construction of the building.**

Please publish this comment in Legistar as soon as possible.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Sincerely,
Peter Tan and Rachel Durfee

From: [Ethan Brodsky](#)
To: [Evers, Tag](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Planning](#); [Darrin S. Wasniewski](#); [Field, Derek](#); [Emily R. Gnam](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Nicole A. Solheim](#); [Patrick W. Heck](#); [Sara R. Sanders](#); [Figueroa Cole, Yannette](#); [DMNA President Marc Gartler](#); [DMNA VP Marie Trest](#); [DMNA Secretary Catherine Jagoe](#)
Subject: Second Comment on #93508: Conditional Use at 2219 Monroe Street (Edgewood HS Stadium)
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2026 8:46:45 PM

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

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

Alder Evers, City Staff, Members of the Plan Commission, DMNA officers:

[Note: I was unable to find email addresses for PC members Anjali Bhasin and Scott Chehak - please pass this on to them]

This is a follow-up to my previous comment regarding Legistar #93508, the Application for "2219 Monroe Street (District 13): Consideration of a conditional use in a Campus-Institutional (CI) District without a campus master plan to modify existing athletic fields to construct a stadium with 1200-capacity seating building, concession stand, and storage buildings at the Goodman Athletic Complex on the Edgewood Campus", scheduled for hearing at the Plan Commission on July 13.

<https://madison.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=8061524&GUID=371CBB0C-A8B5-4727-9C54-43F457D7CC60&Options=ID|Text|&Search=93508>

Please publish this comment in Legistar as soon as possible. This document was written entirely by a human with no use of AI.

Subsequently to my letter on Monday, July 6, I recieved a copy of a "sound map", titled "Pages from EASE Google Overlay Note 80 dBAs.pdf", that had been shared by Edgewood High School President Kevin Rea with neighborhood associations, and that subsequently appeared on Legistar in what was previously page 1 of this document:

<https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=15559978&GUID=DC7BF54D-70C7-43C1-9CA4-BB53C2CE01F1>

but is now, as of a few hours ago, page 5.

This document showed a map of sound levels predicted by Edgewood. It indicated the sound level at the bleachers as "80 +/- 3 SPL dBA maximum". Subsequent conversations between DMNA and Mr. Rea indicated that the intended units of this measurement were dBA(fast), that is with a 0.125 s averaging period, which is also stated in updated documentation provided by the city.

I started writing this letter to state that I was ready to personally support this proposal as long as the loudspeaker arrangement and limit of "amplified sound levels shall be limited to 80 +/- 3 dBA(fast) in the front row of the bleachers / ~ 50 ft from the source" were written as a condition of approval.

Unfortunately, it appears that as of 3:02 PM today (7/8), Edgewood submitted another document with sound levels of 90 dBA instead (p6 - the map shows 90 dbA in the bleachers but the legend shows 80 dBA in the

bleachers). Each predicted sound level was increased by 10 dB. This level I cannot support. Currently the application includes both maps and does not indicate which one is the intended limit.

Again, if Edgewood is willing to include a condition stating "sound levels at the front row of the bleachers will never exceed a SPL of 80 +/- 3 dBA(fast)", or if the city is willing to impose such a limit, then I am prepared to support this application with no limitation.

If the city is willing to impose such a condition, I am also willing to support this application.

I would also be agreeable to a condition that instead sets the limit at neighboring property lines, with the 22 dBA reduction that Edgewood's sound consultant modeled and which I generally agree.

Without such a condition, or with a limit of 90 dBA at the bleachers instead, there is no way I can support this application without a time limit after which the outdoor amplified sound approval expires.

While city staff has indicated that they do not want to enforce any sort of quantitative limit on sound, it is clear that Madison General Ordinances obligate them to have the ability to do so.

MGO 24.08 states that "The Building Inspection Division of the Department of Planning and Community and Economic Development (hereinafter the "Building Inspection Division") is the primary agency responsible for the enforcement of this ordinance Sec. 24.08 of the Madison General Ordinances unless otherwise noted herein." and that "The Director of the Building Inspection Division (hereinafter the "Director") is responsible for: ... "Ensuring that a sufficient number of their staff are trained and knowledgeable in the current techniques and principles of sound measurement equipment and instrumentation." This ordinance sets limits on sound levels using the scales and standards that Edgewood is proposing in their application and which could be measured using the same instrumentation, techniques, and training as used to enforce MGO 24.08.

https://library.municode.com/wi/madison/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=COORMAWIVOIICH20-31_CH24OFAGPEQU_24.08NOCORE

There is also precedent for including such limits written into MGO 28.151 "Supplemental Regulations" which states:

"Supplemental regulations are established to address the unique characteristics of certain land uses. The standards and conditions listed for land uses in this chapter are applicable to both permitted uses and uses permitted by ***conditional use permit***, as specified for each zoning district, unless otherwise noted....
Outdoor Recreation.

...

(c)The site shall be designed in such a way as to minimize the effects of lighting and noise on surrounding properties. ***Hours of operation may be restricted and noise and lighting limits imposed as part of the conditional use approval.***"

https://library.municode.com/wi/madison/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=COORMAWIVOIICH20-31_CH28ZOCOR_SUBCHAPTER_28JSURE_28.151AP

(Emphasis mine)

This "Supplemental Regulation" ordinance is the same basis by which supplemental regulations are imposed on outdoor amplified sound in Outdoor Eating Areas. Outdoor eating areas aren't allowed to have amplified sound without a CUP in districts other than MXC, CC, and RMX; and Outdoor Recreation sites "shall be designed in such a way as to minimize the effects of lighting and noise on surrounding properties", with the "hours of operation ... restricted and noise and lighting limits imposed as part of the conditional use approval."

Either quantitative limits on sound levels or a time-limited period of approval for outdoor amplified sound are essential to limit the impact this development might have on the use, value, and enjoyment of neighboring properties. Without quantitative limits on level and time, there will be no way to control or limit the harm.

I urge City Staff to recommend and the Plan Commission to adopt such limits.

Ethan Brodsky

From: ibradboyce@gmail.com
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Cc: [Evers, Tag](#); kevin.rea@edgewoodhs.org; president@dmna.org; president@VNA.org; [Marc Gartler](#)
Subject: Cond Use - 2219 Monroe St - Edgewood HS Stadium
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2026 10:15:49 AM

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

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

Plan Commission,

I am writing regarding the [City of Madison - File #: 93508](#) Cond Use - 2219 Monroe St - Edgewood HS Stadium

I'm very concerned about the potential for the increase of noise generated by the improvements to the Edgewood HS Stadium and how the changes will impact the use, value, and enjoyment of neighboring properties.

It is clear that the intention of the improvement is to increase the usage of the facility in terms of frequency and magnitude. I think it is reasonable to be cautious with the approval of the expansion.

As an engineer with experience in the design of sound level control for construction, agricultural, and consumer products I have some insight into how difficult it can be to produce an effective solution to sound emission design goals. I have reviewed the plans put forward by Edgewood HS and I'm skeptical that they will be able to get the results they intend on the first iteration of the installation of the sound system design. Therefore, I think it reasonable to call for some post-installation review of the effectiveness and acceptability of their design. And I think there needs to be an expectation on the part of Edgewood HS and the neighborhood that if a mistake in design, or implementation is made, that there will be an opportunity to make some changes.

The most reasonable idea I have heard suggested to ensure the cooperation between Edgewood HS and the neighborhood continues, is to provide a trial period with an evaluation after a complete year of use. Key to this is the expectation that there will be tweaks or even major changes needed to meet the design goals.

Both Edgewood HS and their neighbors have been aching for a way to work with each other to find solutions and compromises. Please use your tools to impose a set of conditions that can allow a continued dialog and cooperation between Edgewood HS and their neighbors.

Respectfully,
Brad Boyce
938 Woodrow St

Madison, WI 53711
608 628 8496

From: [Ethan Brodsky](#)
To: [Evers, Tag](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Planning](#); [Darrin S. Wasniewski](#); [Field, Derek](#); [Emily R. Gnam](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Nicole A. Solheim](#); [Patrick W. Heck](#); [Sara R. Sanders](#); [Figueroa Cole, Yannette](#)
Cc: [DMNA President Marc Gartler](#); [DMNA VP Marie Trest](#); [DMNA Secretary Catherine Jagoe](#)
Subject: Comment on #93508: Conditional Use at 2219 Monroe Street (Edgewood HS Stadium)
Date: Monday, July 6, 2026 12:54:20 PM

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

Alder Evers, City Staff, Members of the Plan Commission, DMNA officers:

[Note: I was unable to find email addresses for PC members Anjali Bhasin and Scott Chehak - please pass this on to them]

I am writing regarding Legistar #93508, the Application for "2219 Monroe Street (District 13): Consideration of a conditional use in a Campus-Institutional (CI) District without a campus master plan to modify existing athletic fields to construct a stadium with 1200-capacity seating building, concession stand, and storage buildings at the Goodman Athletic Complex on the Edgewood Campus", scheduled for hearing at the Plan Commission on July 13.

<https://madison.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=8061524&GUID=371CBB0C-A8B5-4727-9C54-43F457D7CC60&Options=ID|Text|&Search=93508>

Please publish this comment in Legistar as soon as possible. This document was written entirely by a human with no use of AI.

I am writing to express my deep concerns with the application in its current form. This is not the letter I had hoped to write, as I have been following the current round of conversations between neighborhood organizations and Edgewood High School on this issue since they began almost a year ago, and they seemed promising at times, but unfortunately we are now a week away from the the Plan Commission hearing at which it will be considered, and the application is still dangerously vague about the two topics that matter most to the neighborhood - noise and light.

I am a professional engineer with a PhD in electrical engineering who has worked in the field of signal processing and acoustical analysis for many years.

Everyone involved is aware that the neighborhood has serious concerns about the impact that outdoor amplified sound will have on the use, value, and enjoyment of nearby homes. The proposed outdoor amplified sound system will be one of the most significant and potentially disruptive that the city has reviewed as a Conditional Use in recent history. It will be capable of projecting sound over areas far larger than the systems typically reviewed for outdoor dining areas. If such a system is permanently approved, the city and neighbors will lose all ability to limit this disruption.... potentially forever.

Noise was an enormous topic of contention during Edgewood's previous attempt to build a football stadium. Concern over this issue in 2019 prompted Edgewood to contract with a sound consultant to prepare a (deeply flawed) 23-page noise analysis [1] and for the neighbors to contract another sound consultant to prepare 17-page noise analysis [2] of the proposal. Both of these studies found that noise would be at levels that would be very disruptive inside neighboring

properties.

Noise is still a huge concern for the neighbors, and the current application devotes a total of 115 words to it, in the "Letter of Intent" [3], with some vague non-committal statements about "standards and priorities" and "expectations" as to the sound level on neighboring properties.

The only commitment made regarding sound in the entire application is that there will be five loudspeakers of a particular model. Their "Sound System Information" attachment [4] shows the intent to install 5 loudspeakers, but their "Project Plans" document [5] does not include any information as to where or how they will be installed.

On June 28, I was shown a document titled "Edgewood HS FB - Loudspeaker Layout.pdf" (not yet in Legistar) that had been recently provided by Kevin Rea of Edgewood, indicating that the five loudspeakers would be mounted at the "top" of the bleachers, with the outside four mounted on the "rear of the bleacher structure" and the center one mounted "above the center of the press box", with each loudspeaker being 42 feet above field level. The loudspeakers would be pointed west, towards the crowd, and towards Woodrow Street, and also "down". This is all the written information we have at this time. The specific loudspeaker installation plan, with speakers mounted on tall poles and pointing directly towards Woodrow Street, is potentially a worst-case scenario for residences on Woodrow Street and was only disclosed two weeks prior to the hearing - previous to this, the expectation was that the loudspeakers would be installed at the front of the bleachers and pointed towards the interior of the Edgewood property. Edgewood has assured the neighborhood associations that the loudspeakers would be "pointed downwards" and are "highly directional", but simple analysis of the bleacher geometry and the "Vertical Off-Axis Response" diagram for the loudspeaker proposed in the application [4, page 7] strongly suggests that noise levels in the neighborhoods surrounding Edgewood will still be substantial and disruptive.

I could write pages on this topic (I already have), but I'll summarize this by pointing out that the grandstand geometry suggests that the loudspeakers will be aimed down no more than 30-45 degrees, and the loudspeaker's off-axis response diagram shows less than 1 dB of attenuation from center to 40 degrees off axis below 300 Hz (middle C on a piano), 5 dB of attenuation at 30 degrees off-axis at 1000 Hz, and doesn't reach 10 dB of attenuation at 30 degrees off-axis until >3000 Hz. So, if the loudspeakers are "aimed 30 degrees below horizontal", then towards homes on Woodrow and Terry that are at the same elevation as the loudspeaker, there's basically no reduction in noise for the "lows", roughly 5 dB for mids, and up to around 10 dB for highs. While the speakers could be aimed down more steeply, this would further amplify the non-uniformity of the sound pattern within the bleachers, causing very high levels in the back rows, and there are physical limits to how acutely they could be aimed down. These loudspeakers are mounted 42' above ground level and will be direct line of sight to homes with only thin tree cover in between. If this were to be approved, noise levels exceeding 80 dB would be almost certain for homes on Woodrow Street, Terry Place, Monroe Street, Leonard Street, and West Lawn Avenue. This would be very disruptive and interfere with the use, value, and enjoyment of these properties.

In order to do a more thorough analysis of the sound, the exact

installation locations and aiming "down angles" for the loudspeakers must be known. This information should have been disclosed a long time ago, yet we are now a week away from the Plan Commission hearing and do not have this critical information. With this information and a specification of the "instantaneous" and "time-averaged" sound levels that will be permitted and targeted for any particular location in the grandstands, on the field, and at the visitor's bench area, then the noise levels in the neighborhood could be calculated. Unfortunately, the proposal is currently dangerously vague on this topic and should not be approved.

I personally do not believe that there is any way to achieve sound levels for spectators in the bleachers that would be satisfactory to Edgewood without also leading to noise levels for residents in surrounding neighborhoods that would be disruptive to the point of interfering with the use, value, and enjoyment of their homes. Many people involved also recognize this, but are willing to make an explicit trade-off where these noise levels are formally permitted for a limited number of events each year, in exchange for not having as much noise at other times.

Unfortunately at this point nobody knows what those noise levels will be - whether it'll be at levels that merely disrupt conversations within homes, levels that are louder than running a vacuum cleaner in the same room, or levels so loud as to rattle windows. This is the kind of question that is very easy to analyze given proper data - the sound studies from 2018-2019 do this - and I would've expected a sound study to accompany this application. It doesn't. I would be thrilled if a sound study were to come out at some point between now and the hearing, but there realistically is not enough time to adequately analyze it at this point.

Approving this application as it currently is, with vague non-commitments as to sound levels, would give Edgewood carte blanche to generate disruptive sound levels... potentially forever. The Madison Police department has already been unwilling to enforce noise violations against Edgewood under MGO 24.04 (Prohibition of Noises Disturbing the Public Peace), and the city's Building Inspection Department has been unwilling to enforce 24.08 (Noise Control Regulation) against them. Considering Edgewood's recent history of lawsuits against the city and the city's own behavior during the period of open Master Plan Violations, it is impossible for neighbors to trust that city would conduct any kind of enforcement under its "continuing jurisdiction" if this Conditional Use Permit is approved. It is arguable whether the city would even be allowed to conduct MGO 24.08 enforcement due to the exemption in 24.08(3)(d)[6]. If this disruptive use is permitted, it will be extremely hard to take it away, dial it down, or control it in any way.

For other recent Conditional Use Permit (CUP) applications for outdoor amplified sound, the city has limited the approval period to a definite amount of time, ensuring that it retains authority and has a process already in place to rein in overly disruptive uses. In the recent (June 29) staff report for the Conditional Use Permit for outdoor amplified sound at Zuzu's Cafe at 1336 Drake Street, staff recommended that the approval be for a limited period of time, noting that "There is precedent for this type of condition: recently, the Plan Commission approved a similar conditional use for Friends Applaud for one year (Legislative ID 92235). Prior approvals at the Essen House (506-518 E Wilson Street and 134-148 S Blair Street) were limited to one year, but the most recent February 2, 2026 approval was extended for a two year period (Legistar ID 91287). If this

request is approved and the applicant returns for re-approval, the Plan Commission could consider another one-year approval, an approval with a longer term, or a standard approval without expiration other than that defined in the Zoning code." [7] (I understand that in this case, the PC did not include such a condition in the approval, due to Zuzu's long history of compliance with relevant ordinances and approvals, but for other applications, such a condition was imposed).

I strongly support a condition along these lines. If such a condition were included, e.g. "the structures are permitted forever, but the outdoor amplified sound is only permitted until December 31, 2027. The applicant can return to the Plan Commission with an application to extend the outdoor amplified sound permit at any time after the outdoor amplified sound has been in use for twelve months (including at least one fall and one spring season), at which time the Plan Commission could consider another one-year approval, an approval with a longer term, or approval without expiration other than that defined in the Zoning code", then I believe I could be able to support this application.

I also want to touch briefly upon lighting. My concerns with respect to lighting are minor compared to my concerns about the field lighting proposed last time around, but there are some important ambiguities that need to be clarified. As currently published in Legistar, there is no mention at all of outdoor lighting at all, but obviously there will be some lights on and/or under the bleachers.

On June 29, Edgewood sent "lighting plans" to DMNA and VNA, and those plans (titled "Edgewood HS Athletic Complex Modernization Calcs (1).pdf") have been shared with me. They include a drawing for ground-level lighting on the "back" and "sides" of the bleacher structure, as well as ground-level lighting for the "tunnel" underneath the bleachers, using lighting fixtures on the outside walls and ceiling of the structure.

I have no major (but some minor) concerns with that proposal, as long as these lights are only on when the facility is in use and not all night every night. If this is the only lighting being proposed for the project, then it would be acceptable, but I have concerns that there is also going to be yet-to-be-disclosed lighting on the bleacher seating area and aisle area that this may involve lighting fixtures mounted at the top rear of the bleachers. This would be much more troublesome and I am concerned that it has not yet been ruled out.

The city's "Application for Outdoor Lighting Review Plan" [8] requires "Photometric plan(s)- one plan for ground level, and one plan for each level above ground with exterior lighting (for example, a roof top amenity area with lighting for a pool or patio)", so it is clear that any lighting of the bleacher seating/aisle area must be documented, but we are currently a week away from the hearing and I have not seen any documentation of this or ruling it out.

That form also requires a diagram with "Property line shown and labeled, foot-candles at 10 beyond the property line (4 above grade) is labeled", to ensure that the lighting complies with the "Light Trespass" regulation in MGO 29.36(3)(a)(1), and this is currently lacking.

I also have concerns about any light proposed for the "Storage Facility" structures, which we currently have no documentation of.

Assuming there is no yet-to-be-disclosed lighting planned for the seating area on the bleacher area and the installed lighting complies with city ordinances and the lights are only when the facility is in use and not all night, I trust that I could find a way to support it with a few more rounds of design review and conversation, but we are currently a week away from the hearing and large amounts of essential information are absent.

My understanding is that this proposal has been in the works since August 2025, so there has been plenty of time for Edgewood and the surrounding neighborhoods to discuss their goals and plan and come to a mutually agreeable proposal, with specifics that have been reviewed and accepted by all parties. My observation was that this process had been going well, and it wasn't until Edgewood's application and plan appeared on Legistar in early June that I realized how incomplete their application was, and how dangerous the vagueness when it comes to the impact that noise and lights would be for the neighborhoods.

We can't even know how this proposal would impact the use, value, and enjoyment of neighboring properties because it has major ambiguities in some of its most important aspects. I do not know if this ambiguity was intentional on the part of Edgewood or if they were just not prepared to submit a completed proposal at the time of the application or hearing, but one week out from the hearing is too late to fill in these essential details and give interested parties adequate time to analyze them, understand their impact, and provide useful feedback.

I understand that Edgewood is under time constraints to start construction, but would urge referral until these important details are clarified and a complete application is available for review, with specifics in the important areas of sound and lighting.

If Edgewood and the city are determined to make a final ruling on this application at the July 13 Plan Commission Hearing, either in its current vague state or with a bunch of last-minute clarifications that are published too late for adequate review, then I would strongly urge that a condition is included limiting the time duration of the approval for outdoor amplified sound to 12-18 months from the approval or start of construction.

While I understand that this would require Edgewood to spend \$600 on a second Conditional Use Permit application later, this is the only way to ensure that the city is not permanently harming the use, value, and enjoyment of neighboring homes.

The proposed outdoor amplified sound would be far more impactful to far more properties than anything the city has seen in a Conditional Use Permit application recently, and the potential for harm here is enormous.

Limiting the temporal scope of the approval gives some incentive for the applicant to respect their neighbors, and gives the city an opportunity to force Edgewood to "turn the volume down" or "adjust the aiming of the loudspeakers" in the future if it proves to be more disruptive than promised. Permitting this forever eliminates all of the realistic ways to regulate this.

I am sure I will have further comments as the hearing approaches.

Thank you for reading,

Ethan Brodsky

[1]

<https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=6968376&GUID=293A6B63-C00B-4F1F-A2C7-98AA2137C2D3>

[2]

<https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7773379&GUID=A6285BC6-027C-4AF2-BFCC-233D981AD951>

[3]

<https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=15559976&GUID=5724568F-A2D9-41ED-BF5C-3F7B9D1F31B6>

[4]

<https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=15559978&GUID=DC7BF54D-70C7-43C1-9CA4-BB53C2CE01F1>

[5]

<https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=15581958&GUID=29075D7D-A930-4129-8CE5-CDCB55F1E1AA>

[6]

https://library.municode.com/wi/madison/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=COORMAWIVOIICH20-31_CH24OFAGPEQU_24.08NOCORE

[7]

<https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=15654316&GUID=6E005FF9-4F69-4E1B-861E-47BCAAB32475>

[8]

<https://www.cityofmadison.com/development-services-center/documents/lighting-plan-app.pdf>

[9]

https://library.municode.com/wi/madison/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=COORMAWIVOIICH20-31_CH29BUCO_OULI_29.36OULI

From: [Sue Statz](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Edgewood's Proposed Stadium Renovation
Date: Saturday, July 4, 2026 4:34:46 PM

You don't often get email from statz810@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

I respectfully oppose Edgewood High School's application for a Conditional Use Permit to construct a 1,200-seat stadium.

My husband and I have lived directly across from the practice field and existing bleachers for more than 30 years. Both of us, as well as many of our neighbors, work remotely from home. Although our son proudly attended Edgewood from third grade through high school, we cannot support a proposal that would permanently alter the residential neighborhood we have called home for more than three decades. Our concern is not with Edgewood itself, but with the scale and intensity of this proposed expansion.

Tripling the permanent seating and adding stadium amenities will fundamentally change the character of the facility, increasing noise, traffic, and disruption to the surrounding neighborhood. Once built, these impacts cannot easily be undone.

I do not believe the application demonstrates that this project meets the City's Conditional Use standards, particularly the requirement that neighboring properties will not be substantially impaired.

I respectfully ask the Planning Commission to **deny** this application.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sue Statz
810 Woodrow St
Madison, WI 53711

From: [Paul Guilbault](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Edgewood Practice Field Additions
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2026 9:05:26 PM

You don't often get email from pgilbo1@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

I am opposed to any additions to the Edgewood High School "Practice Field". The neighborhood was told in 2015 that this was only to be a practice field and that no games would be played there.

Mike Elliot the president of Edgewood High School stated "We're ... building this to be able to give our athletes the practice facilities that provide the best surfaces possible." "We're between two neighborhood associations. They have been **vehemently opposed to us having lights or playing games here.** So they lied about playing games there until the field was completed. I do not support the improvement of their "Practice Field" and believe they should build a "stadium" off campus like Edgewood College has for it's sports teams.

Thank you,

Paul Guilbault
877 Terry Place
Madison WI 53711

Edgewood College Graduate in Nursing 1997