

To: City of Madison Plan Commission

From: Nancy Marshall Ellen Murdoch
 425 N Paterson St. 433 N Paterson St

 Jerry Norenberg and Dennis Martin
 Angela Vitcenda 428 Castle Place
 422 Castle Place

Re: File # 61672 Conditional Use for 429 N. Paterson St.

We are all of the adjoining property owners to 429 N. Paterson St. and we oppose granting a Conditional Use (CU) application for construction of a two-story, multi-use accessory structure in the back yard of that property. We respectfully request that the Plan Commission deny CU application.

The proposed structure is quite simply too large for the available space. 429 N. Paterson has a narrow lot and the proposed structure would be very close to and physically loom over the back yards of the properties to the NW and SE. The 28 ft. wide and 24 ft. high structure would sit on a lot that is only 43 ft. wide. Furthermore, it would create a solid wall across the rear yard of 422 Castle Place and a precipitous 9 ft. drop off behind 428 Castle Place. Most importantly, the placement of a second floor dwelling would diminish the already limited privacy and thereby further decrease our use and enjoyment of our back yards, most especially by the adjoining property owners at 425 and 433 N. Paterson.

We submit that the proposed project fails to meet Approval Standards for Conditional Use set forth in Zoning Code Sec. 28.183. Specifically, standard 3:

“The uses, values and enjoyment of other property in the neighborhood for purposes already established will not be substantially impaired or diminished in any foreseeable manner.”

Further, the proposed structure violates the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan’s design standards for maintaining a minimum amount of back yard green space in neighborhood blocks such as ours:

“Maintain large back yards on typical lots. (Most lots are about 130 feet deep; some are half that.) Maintaining the rear 40% of the yard in green space would preserve the existing character and feel of the deep lot portions of the neighborhood.” (TLN Plan, page 15)

While we can understand the desire to monetize the back yard of a property, in this case the cost to the neighbors’ properties and to the greater back yard environment is too high. We urge the Plan Commission to reject both Conditional Uses requested in the application.