

From: [James Kreft](#)
To: [Madison Landmarks Commission](#)
Cc: [Evers, Tag](#)
Subject: 92802- Support ADU at 1722 Regent
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2026 8:23:03 AM

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

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

Dear Landmarks Commission-

I am writing to register my support of the ADU application at 1722 Regent. As noted in the staff analysis, the request meets the historic district standards, while adding much-needed additional housing. Speaking of history, I want to bring up a little more of it. Many of the public comments reference the single family nature of the neighborhood- and that is by design. The area of University Heights is, historically, part of the [Madison Compromise](#), an agreement that split the city east and west, with the west side of the city focused on wealthy single family housing and the east side for factories and working class housing. We don't have to keep up the exclusionist policies of the past that continue to be expressed in different planning documents. We can allow different kinds of housing, in all of our neighborhoods. This ADU is just the kind of thickening up that this area needs to build a vibrant city for everyone.

Thank you,

Jim Kreft
Fish Hatchery Rd

From: [Michael Varda](#)
To: [Madison Landmarks Commission](#)
Cc: [Michael Varda](#); [Vidaver, Regina](#)
Subject: Agenda of May 4 Item 92802 1722 Regent St. ADU application
Date: Monday, May 4, 2026 8:13:12 PM

You don't often get email from vardam-33@uwalumni.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear Commission Members;

Dave Schroeder has submitted lengthy and legally accurate comments in opposition to the above-identified application for an ADU. In fact, the staff approval recommendation is wholly inadequate and egregiously in error in light of his numerous specific citations of non-conformity with ch. 41 Historic District ordinance regulations.

Is the City interested in having another lawsuit similar to the one where the City failed to apply its own ordinance requirements to a new apartment development on Speedway, opposite the Glen Golf Park?

Please reject or disapprove the application to prevent the ADU application.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Michael Varda
1724 Hoyt St. Madison.

From: [Allison Meyer](#)
To: [Madison Landmarks Commission](#)
Subject: Concern about 10 bedroom 2 unit apt building slated for approval in historic university heights
Date: Monday, May 4, 2026 6:05:42 PM

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

Hello!

I was unable to make the meeting today regarding the approval for a new 10 bedroom two unit apartment accessory dwelling unit in the historic University Heights area and wanted to express my concern in writing regarding approval of the structure.

As a homeowner in the district, maintaining the historic integrity of the homes is something important to me.

Approval of this accessory dwelling unit Is more than just an extension on a single-family home or even adding a small ADU to a property, it is a fundamentally different type of building from the typical historic structures in the neighborhood. It sets a precedent to pave the way for other large landlord type scenarios that would fundamentally change the nature of the neighborhood.

Thank you for hearing my concerns and considering that into any decisions along with the concerns of my neighbors.

I have also included some notes below comparing the ordinances with the new structure below for reference where I see concerns regarding approval.

Best,
Allison

Ordinances which the Landmarks Commission is obligated to enforce: 41.27(1)(b)(1) requires that accessory structures "comply with requirements for new primary structures with other historic accessory structures serving as comparables," but only primary structures are used as comparables. The staff report says, "The new accessory structure blends being both architecturally compatible with the historic house on the property and the simple accessory structures found on properties in this historic district."

^^This is a huge, 10 bedroom 2-unit apartment building, not remotely comparable in size, appearance, or function to the simple accessory structures found on properties in this historic district. 41.27(1)(b)(2) requires that the accessory structure be "minimally visible from the developed public right-of-way."

^^ "minimally" means "to the smallest amount, extent, or degree possible," and it is definitely visible, and not anything I'd characterize as minimally. (And while not addressed in statute, it is massively visible to the neighbors on Regent, and all of the neighbors on Chadbourne behind it.) 41.27(1)(b)(3) -- the requirement that any Accessory Structure "clearly be secondary to the primary structure" is not addressed

at all. This is not just an issue for just this one property. If this project is approved with the current deficiencies in meeting anything in MGO 41.27, it will set a precedent to put a 10-bedroom, 2-unit apartment building in the backyard or side yard of any property that goes on the market where a landlord deems the math makes sense.

From: [Gregory Reed](#)
To: [Bailey, Heather](#)
Cc: [Madison Landmarks Commission](#); [Evers, Tag](#); [Vidaver, Regina](#)
Subject: Re: 1722 Regent Street
Date: Monday, May 4, 2026 4:52:14 PM

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

Thanks Heather.

While the ordinance may not explicitly state that, the volume of traffic and parking definitely changes the character of the neighborhood.

Greg

On Mon, May 4, 2026 at 4:07 PM Bailey, Heather <HBailey@cityofmadison.com> wrote:

Gregory,

I'm sorry that you did not receive your post card. We did mail them and your property was one of the addresses we mailed notices to. I've attached the PDF of the post card addresses we sent.

I do want to clarify that the historic preservation ordinance does not regulate street parking or traffic. It would not be a legally sound finding for a denial.



Heather L. Bailey, Ph.D. *(she/her)*

Preservation Planner

Neighborhood Planning, Preservation + Design Section

Department of Planning + Community + Economic Development

Planning Division

[215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.: Suite 017](#)

PO Box 2985

Madison WI 53701-2985

Email: hbailey@cityofmadison.com Phone: 608.266.6552

From: Gregory Reed <gregoryr.reed@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2026 2:12 PM
To: Madison Landmarks Commission <landmarkscommission@cityofmadison.com>; Bailey, Heather <HBailey@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: Evers, Tag <district13@cityofmadison.com>; Vidaver, Regina <district5@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: 1722 Regent Street

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

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

Dear Members of the City of Madison's Landmark Commission,

We are writing in opposition to the proposed ADU at [1722 Regent Street](#). We would also like to note that we failed to receive any notices other than Alder Vidavar's weekly email update even though we live within 200 feet of the proposed ADU.

We oppose this proposed ADU for the following reasons:

- The proposal fails MGO § 41.27(1)(b)(1) because no historic accessory structures have been used as comparables - only nearby primary structures/residences (including our primary structure, not our detached garage). Other residents of this neighborhood were required to provide documentation of other accessory units within the University Heights Historic District to secure Landmark Commission approvals for their recently approved ADU. If this ADU proposal is approved based on primary structures/residences and not accessory units, it would not only set a double standard within months of a prior Landmarks Commission approval but also set a dangerous precedent for future ADU applications - especially in this neighborhood.
- The proposed ADU is larger than the existing structure which runs counter to the primary structure standard required by 41.27(1)(b)(3);
- Section 41.18(1)(d) bars approval of any work that “will...frustrate the public interest expressed in this ordinance for protecting, promoting, conserving, and using the City’s historic resources”. According to City of Madison property records, the existing single family home with four bedrooms is shown to have one off-street parking space. The addition of two units with five bedrooms each will result in additional parking demand on adjacent streets for up to 10 additional residents, increasing street congestion in an already congested area that is within half a block of Randall Elementary School. This ADU would also exacerbate the current on street parking challenges existing residents experience (contractors, repair work, visitors, and guests), not to mention on street parking consistently blocking access to resident's driveways (Parking Enforcement could readily attest to the number of citations issued and cars towed in this immediate area).
- We support the broad concept of ADU's as a tool to help resolve Madison's housing

crisis but believe this application is flawed for the reasons cited above.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,

Greg Reed and Michael Zorich

[1718 Chadbourne Avenue](#)

Madison, WI 53726

From: [Sara Ryan](#)
To: [Madison Landmarks Commission](#)
Cc: [Derekmryan](#)
Subject: Opposition for ADU at 1722 Regent Street
Date: Monday, May 4, 2026 4:10:06 PM

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

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

Landmarks Commission,

I am writing in strong opposition to the proposed duplex accessory dwelling unit (ADU) at 1722 Regent Street in the University Heights Historic District.

As proposed, this project does not meet the requirements of MGO 41.27. Most notably, the ordinance requires that an accessory structure be *clearly secondary* to the principal structure. That standard is not meaningfully addressed in the staff report—likely because the proposed structure clearly fails to meet it. In addition, the requirement to evaluate proposed accessory structures against other *accessory* structures, rather than primary residences, was not followed. This omission is telling, as there are no comparable accessory structures of this scale in the district.

Under MGO § 41.27(1)(b)(3), although the plans obscure the total interior square footage, the applicant's submittal reveals approximately 2,800 square feet of finished interior space. This is nearly 1,000 square feet—or roughly 50 percent—larger than the principal residence on the lot, which measures 1,828 square feet.

Each of the two units within the ADU also contains more bedrooms and full bathrooms than the entire principal residence. Taken together, the ADU more than doubles the number of bedrooms, bathrooms, and kitchens found in the primary structure. These facts alone demonstrate that the proposed building cannot reasonably be characterized as “clearly secondary” to the existing residence, as required by MGO 41.27(1)(b)(3).

If this parcel were three or four times its current size, and if the principal structure were substantially larger, such a proposal might arguably function as subordinate—though it would still raise concerns for neighboring properties. On this lot, however, and in relation to this primary structure, the proposal is entirely incompatible—not simply as a matter of preference, but as a matter of ordinance.

MGO 41.18 provides that a Certificate of Approval may be granted *only* if the proposed project complies with Chapter 41. Specifically, MGO § 41.18(1)(d) requires that exterior construction not frustrate the public interest in protecting, promoting, conserving, and using the City's historic resources.

University Heights is a designated local historic district precisely because of its early twentieth-century residential character: a cohesive pattern of substantial principal homes supported by modest, clearly subordinate outbuildings. Approving a nearly 3,000-square-foot, two-unit, ten-bedroom building as an “accessory structure”—particularly one designed using primary residences as its comparables—would neither protect nor conserve that character.

Such an approval would replace a historic pattern of modest accessory structures with a precedent that

effectively permits full-scale duplex buildings in the backyards of University Heights. That precedent would not be limited to this property. Future applicants would understandably cite this approval as the new baseline for what qualifies as “secondary” and “compatible” within the district.

The cumulative effect would be the gradual erosion of the spatial relationships and architectural hierarchy between principal residences and their accessory buildings—relationships that are fundamental to the district’s historic significance. The Landmarks Commission is charged with enforcing the standards set forth in MGO Chapter 41, and those standards do not support approval of this proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Derek & Sara Ryan
2111 Van Hise Ave

From: vschroeder@gmail.com
To: [Madison Landmarks Commission](#)
Subject: Opposition to 1722 "ADU" - 98202
Date: Monday, May 4, 2026 3:38:31 PM

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

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

To the Members of the Landmarks Commission,

I am writing to convey my strong opposition to the proposed ADU outlined in file 98202.

I do not believe that the conditions contained in Madison General Ordinance 41.27(1)(b) (3) have been met as the building is not 'clearly secondary' to the principal residence. The principal residence is a 3 (per the listing) or 4 (per the assessor) bedroom house with approximately 1,800 square feet. The proposal is a 10 bedroom duplex, with 3 levels and a footprint of 1,000 square feet. The proposal does not indicate clearly the square footage of the "accessory" unit, but it is reasonable to assume that it exceeds the principal residence – my estimate is 2,800 square feet. The burden of **clearly secondary** implies that the mass of the secondary building needs to be substantially smaller than the principal residence, not merely slightly smaller. The proposed duplex is just 5 feet shorter than the principal residence, and with 750 square feet of front facing wall area, it is clearly not secondary to the principal house (nor other adjacent properties). With the information provided, I can't conclude that it is even secondary to the principal house!

Madison General Ordinance 41.27(1)(b)(2) requires that the accessory structure be **minimally visible** from the developed public right-of-way. Staff's analysis and conclusion indicates that it would be minimally visible – while this is certainly a matter of judgment, based on the pictures provided in the proposal, please understand that a majority of those who have visually inspected this property while looking at the proposed plans disagree with this judgment. I certainly do not support the judgment that it will be minimally visible and encourage the commissioners to carefully consider this requirement.

Further, it does not appear that the requirement in Madison General Ordinance 41.27(1) (b)(1) requiring **comparables of other accessory structures** within 200 feet has been provided. The comparable properties were primary residences. No comparables of accessory structures were provided. This requirement simply has not been met.

Last, Madison General Ordinance 41.18(1)(d) disallows proposals that "frustrate the

public interest expressed in this ordinance for protecting, promoting, conserving, and using the City's historic resources." The public is frustrated. Please strongly consider the feedback on this proposal received. We all understand the need for housing. Building duplexes in backyards changes the nature of this neighborhood. The lot involved simply does not have the space for this size ADU to be added. While not under the purview of Landmarks Commission, additional issues with this proposal include parking (10 additional cars in a school zone?!?), lack of greenspace, and the poor residents packed like sardines into this housing on this lot size (6,100 square feet).

- This block already has lot sizes that are smaller than minimums prescribed by MGO 28.043. 1723 and 1725 Chadbourne, 5 and 11 N Spooner, 8, 10, and 12 Lathrop all have lot sizes under 4,500 square feet. We know that housing is needed, but this block of single family homes is already very built upon.
- It appears that a 4,500 square foot minimum lot size is required for a detached single-family, or for a two-family home. This proposal would result in a single family detached plus a two family together, which should require 9,000 square feet – a number significantly higher than the 6,000 square foot lot size.

In summary: Not clearly secondary + Not minimally visible + No accessory comparables provided = Frustrated public. VOTE NO!

Thank you for your consideration,
Valerie Schroeder
1723 Chadbourne

From: [Tim Mathison](#)
To: [Madison Landmarks Commission](#)
Subject: Item 92803 - New Construction in University Heights
Date: Monday, May 4, 2026 3:21:30 PM

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

Dear Members of the Landmarks Commission,

We are writing in opposition to the proposed building of two noncompliant accessory buildings on the property known as 1722 Regent Street. The proposed plan is not in keeping with the intent of the historic district or the letter of the Historic Preservation Ordinance. The Commission's decision today will impact whether University Heights will retain its integrity and vitality as a designated local and national historic district. The subject property lies within both districts. The designation is crucial to the ability of property owners in The Heights to utilize historic preservation tax credits to keep the original structures in historically accurate form and good condition. The application should be denied for the reasons stated herein.

I. Conflicts with City Code and Historic Preservation Plan

The Commission should resolve the troubling conflicts between the ordinance enabling ADUs and the Historic Preservation Ordinance and Plan in a manner that allows historic preservation to prevail. Other neighbors have correctly pointed out that the proposed buildings are not clearly secondary to the original structure (MGO §41.27(1)(b), issues with the height, and other non-conformities that should be fatal to the application.

One of the primary reasons that the historic district was created in the 1980's was to preserve the sense of cohesiveness and aesthetics of the district. Massing and spatial harmony are important parts of the continued cohesiveness of the district. The character of the property and the site and setting are also relevant and are mentioned repeatedly in City documents and code. "Character" is a defined term within the Ordinance:

Character (of a Building and a Historic District) means the sum of all physical attributes in a historic place which can include setting, property types, form, proportion, architectural style, construction methods, and materials. (MGO §41.02).

Further, the City defines "Historic District" in its 2020 Historic Preservation Plan as follows:

HISTORIC DISTRICT A geographically definable area with a significant concentration of buildings, structures, sites, spaces, and/or objects unified by past events, physical development, design, setting, materials, workmanship, *sense of cohesiveness, or related historical or aesthetic associations that is recognized with a local, state, or national designation* (see "Local Historic District" and "National Register of Historic Places") and may be protected legally through enactment of a local ordinance administered by a historical commission. (*Emphasis added*).

Issuing a Certificate of Approval for the accessory buildings in this instance would fly in the face of the City's own definitions of what preservation and historic district designation mean. For these reasons, the Certificate should be denied.

II. Conflicts with National Standards for Historic Properties

The property is also in the portion of the Heights that lies within the National Register of Historic Places. The Secretary of the Interior's [Standard for the Treatment of Historic Properties](#) sets out extremely strict standards for a rehabilitation of a historic property, including its setting. These standards include:

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.
4. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

The proposal before the Commission today violates all four of the guidelines above. It destroys spatial relationships, alters the historic use of the property, and creates a false sense of history by simply copying the design of a historic house one block away.

The [national standards](#) also state:

Taken together, size, scale and massing are critical elements for ensuring that a new addition is subordinate to the historic building, thus preserving the historic character of a historic property. Typically, a compatible addition should be smaller than the historic building in both height and footprint.

That is the requirement simply for an addition. The guidelines do not contemplate such a thing as an ADU, much less two of them. The federal guidance, in addition to the Ordinance, should be respected in this situation.

III. University Heights NRHP Qualification

In the 1984 University Heights historic district [nomination form](#) to the Department of the Interior, the spatial aspects and intactness of the proposed University Heights district are called out repeatedly, as follows:

- a. Other factors contributing to the sense of time and place felt in the Heights are the relatively early date by which the Heights was completed which had the effect of minimizing modern intrusions. Purely architectural considerations include the aforementioned similarity of size and scale which gives an overall visual identity to the Heights.
- b. The overwhelming majority of buildings are used for the purpose for which they were originally built. As a result the Heights presents an appearance today remarkably like the one it presented 50 years ago.

Notably, several blocks of University Avenue were left out of the nomination form as the redevelopments of those blocks left the buildings unable to “conform to the prevailing historic scale and usage of the district, [and] so altered this area that all sense of the original has been lost.” That kind of loss is precisely what approval of the Certificate would

achieve for Regent Street and University Heights as a whole.

I care deeply about this neighborhood and its mix of residents. As a recent UW grad, I rented a flat with friends on University Avenue in the district from 2005-2006. I marveled then at the neighborhood's intact state and dreamed that one day I would own a home here. In 2014, I returned to Madison with my husband, a newly minted UW professor, and purchased 112 Lathrop Street, where we lived for seven years. We then moved to 138 N. Prospect Avenue, where we reside today. Having lived in the Heights as a young adult renter and as a homeowner, I can safely say that at any age, the appeal of the district lies equally in its architecture and its sense of space.

IV. Conclusion

We urge the Commission to deny this request for a Certificate of Approval due to non-compliance with the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance, the City's Historic Preservation Plan, and the Secretary of the Interior's Standard for Treatment of Historic Properties. Doing so will prevent permanent damage to the University Heights historic district that could never be undone.

Sincerely,

Tim Mathison and Dan O'Connell

138 N. Prospect Avenue

From: [Lisa Goldman](#)
To: [Madison Landmarks Commission](#)
Subject: 1722 Regent
Date: Monday, May 4, 2026 3:04:57 PM

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

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

Dear Members of the Landmarks Commission

I would like to add my remarks to those already registered in opposition to the proposed “ADU” at 1722 Regent.

Are you nuts? This proposal dwarfs the existing single family home. If this passes and others have to spend months trying to get a replacement window approved than the proverbial tail is wagging the dog and your commission is a sham. Full Stop!

--

Lisa C. Goldman

From: todd.barnettarchitecture.com
To: [Madison Landmarks Commission](#)
Subject: Agenda 92802 1722 Regent Street
Date: Monday, May 4, 2026 2:12:48 PM

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

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

Members of the Landmarks Commission-

For items which are under your direct purview and from my perspective, the bulk of the proposed structure twin and whether it is truly being secondary are front and center. From reading the ordinance and the insight of others it seems that this project as proposed is, at the bare minimum, challenging the intent and, perhaps, in violation.

I highly encourage members to stronger consider the as any decision will become a benchmark or precedent for future projects across the city.

For other features of the general architecture, it seems workable with minor adjustments.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,

Todd

Todd Barnett ALA Architect
Barnett Architecture LLC
118 N. Breese Terrace Suite I
Madison, WI 53726
608-233-4538
todd@barnettarchitecture.com
barnettarchitecture.com

From: [Gregory Reed](#)
To: [Madison Landmarks Commission](#); [Bailey, Heather](#)
Cc: [Evers, Tag](#); [Vidaver, Regina](#)
Subject: 1722 Regent Street
Date: Monday, May 4, 2026 2:12:00 PM

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

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

Dear Members of the City of Madison's Landmark Commission,

We are writing in opposition to the proposed ADU at 1722 Regent Street. We would also like to note that we failed to receive any notices other than Alder Vidavar's weekly email update even though we live within 200 feet of the proposed ADU.

We oppose this proposed ADU for the following reasons:

- The proposal fails MGO § 41.27(1)(b)(1) because no historic accessory structures have been used as comparables - only nearby primary structures/residences (including our primary structure, not our detached garage). Other residents of this neighborhood were required to provide documentation of other accessory units within the University Heights Historic District to secure Landmark Commission approvals for their recently approved ADU. If this ADU proposal is approved based on primary structures/residences and not accessory units, it would not only set a double standard within months of a prior Landmarks Commission approval but also set a dangerous precedent for future ADU applications - especially in this neighborhood.
- The proposed ADU is larger than the existing structure which runs counter to the primary structure standard required by 41.27(1)(b)(3);
- Section 41.18(1)(d) bars approval of any work that "will...frustrate the public interest expressed in this ordinance for protecting, promoting, conserving, and using the City's historic resources". According to City of Madison property records, the existing single family home with four bedrooms is shown to have one off-street parking space. The addition of two units with five bedrooms each will result in additional parking demand on adjacent streets for up to 10 additional residents, increasing street congestion in an already congested area that is within half a block of Randall Elementary School. This ADU would also exacerbate the current on street parking challenges existing residents experience (contractors, repair work, visitors, and guests), not to mention on street parking consistently blocking access to resident's driveways (Parking Enforcement could readily attest to the number of citations issued and cars towed in this immediate area).
- We support the broad concept of ADU's as a tool to help resolve Madison's housing crisis but believe this application is flawed for the reasons cited above.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,

Greg Reed and Michael Zorich
1718 Chadbourne Avenue
Madison, WI 53726

From: [fdl commerce](#)
To: [Madison Landmarks Commission](#)
Subject: ADU @1722 Regent St
Date: Monday, May 4, 2026 1:50:26 PM

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

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

Dear Commission members,

I am a resident in University Heights and was a resident before the Heights received Landmark status.

I have followed the online discussion on the RNA list regarding the proposed ADU at 1722 Regent St.

I am strongly opposed to this ADU.

This proposed structure dwarfs the existing structure and makes a mockery of the attempt to preserve the character of the Historic District.

Apart from the general argument about infill, this specific ADU proposal does not seem to conform to several provisions of the guidelines for ADUs. These concerns are elucidated well by Dave Schroeder and I will not repeat them here.

Please say "NO" to this ADU application. To do otherwise sets the stage for a precedent that will rapidly unravel the character of University Heights. And those concerns are well within the purview of what the landmarks commission is supposed to do.

Best,
Erik Schoff

From: [Jeff Henriques](#)
To: [Madison Landmarks Commission](#)
Subject: Proposed "ADU" at 1722 Regent
Date: Monday, May 4, 2026 1:14:27 PM

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

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

Dear Members of the Landmarks Commission;

My wife and I wish to add our comments to those already submitted in opposition to the proposed accessory dwelling unit (ADU) at 1722 Regent Street.

As proposed by the developer, Mr. Mack, this project would further accelerate the decline of a historically single-family, landmarked area of the City. It would significantly alter the character of the neighborhood we believed we were buying into—and one we understood was meant to be preserved.

We have lived in this historic district at 205 Lathrop Street for the past 21 years. Our block of Lathrop is currently the only block on the street that is still predominantly owner-occupied, although that is steadily changing. If the 1722 Regent project is approved, similar development pressures will almost certainly follow for nearby properties and beyond. The result would be a housing market increasingly driven by competing developers rather than homeowners, ultimately eroding the very "landmarked" qualities this Commission is charged with protecting and preserving.

For the benefit of this landmarked neighborhood, and of the City as a whole, we respectfully urge the Commission to deny the ADU request for 1722 Regent Street.

Thank you,

Jeff Henriques and Laurie Frost

205 Lathrop Street
Madison, WI 53726
jbhstats@gmail.com

From: maribeth.malnor
To: [Madison Landmarks Commission](#)
Subject: ADU on Regent Street
Date: Monday, May 4, 2026 12:11:10 PM

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

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

I have lived on Rugby Row, approximately 6 blocks from this location for 30+ years. We live in the "only ranch house" on the street which itself is below 1000 sq. ft. I object to this build on several points. The block and neighborhood are already challenged with residents and guests needing on street parking. The density of the project is also a concern seeming to allow 15 unrelated individuals in one city lot with no owner occupancy. I have not seen evidence presented that these additional buildings have or will provide more affordable housing. Instead, what I have seen as a decades long volunteer assisting people with housing, food and other resources, is an increase in expensive housing with little to no change in affordable housing.

I feel like this sets a dangerous precedent for developers monetizing neighborhoods near campus.

Maribeth Malnor
2306 Rugby Row

From: [David Wood](#)
To: [Madison Landmarks Commission](#)
Cc: [Jane Doughty](#)
Subject: ADU at 1722 Regent Street — OPPOSE
Date: Monday, May 4, 2026 12:03:17 PM

You don't often get email from david@wood-doughty.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear Landmarks Commission,

As 36-year residents of University Heights, we are writing to **strongly oppose** the proposed duplex accessory building (ADU) at 1722 Regent Street.

The proposed project clearly **does not meet the spirit** of the zoning ordinance § 41.27, which we and many of our neighbors supported in allowing *historically appropriate* ADUs to be built in this historic neighborhood to increase housing density. However, the only "historic ADU" in University Heights that we are aware of is at 113 Bascom Place, which was converted in 1932 from its original use as the Bradley House's carriage house to a separate dwelling unit (now on its own lot). In no way is the proposed project comparable to this historic ADU.

More importantly, the proposed project clearly **does not meet the letter** of this ordinance. We strongly support Dave Schroeder's detailed analysis that spells out the many ways that this project is not in compliance with § 41.27. It is particularly obvious to us that this proposed project does not meet the "clearly secondary to the primary structure" standard required by 41.27(1)(b)(3). In addition, the staff analysis does NOT compare the project to (we think) the only historic ADU in the neighborhood (113 Bascom Place).

For these reasons, we **strongly oppose** approval of this project.

Sincerely,

David A. Wood
david@wood-doughty.net

Jane Doughty
jane@wood-doughty.net

2115 Bascom Street
Madison, WI 53726

From: [Kay Phillips](#)
To: [Madison Landmarks Commission](#); [Vidaver, Regina](#)
Subject: Proposed ADU in University Heights Neighborhood
Date: Monday, May 4, 2026 11:46:44 AM

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

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

Dear Landmarks Commission,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the approval of the proposed ADU to be constructed on the property at 1722 Regent Street in the University Heights neighborhood.

I have viewed the schematics for this project. I do not see how this plan conforms in any way to the historic character of the neighborhood. I also do not believe that it conforms to the spirit of the city of Madison's approval of ADU units. This proposed building is a duplex. It appears to be at least as large as the primary residence on this lot. Comparables are given, but they are not ADUs. They are primary residences within the neighborhood -- not valid comparables.

In my opinion, the developer, Mr. Mark, is building an apartment building in the neighborhood and calling it an ADU. I believe that approval of the structure would set a very dangerous precedent. The historic character of this neighborhood would be severely eroded as additional similar developments are proposed with the developers pointing to this approval as support.

The city of Madison has recently loosened the ADU rules and broadened the definition of family. These changes in no way diminish the Landmark Commissions historic preservation standards in this neighborhood..

I do not live in the University Heights neighborhood. I live slightly west of the neighborhood. However, I have a friend who does live in the neighborhood. A few years ago she wanted to re-shingle her home. In order to do that, and preserve the historic status of her home within the definitions of the Landmarks Commission, she found she had only three options for shingles to put on her home. How could it possibly be that a neighborhood resident who strives to preserve the historic status of the neighborhood is seriously restricted when re-shingling her home yet development like this can even be considered by the Landmarks Commission. Approval of this plan would be a serious mistake. I urge you to reject it.

Thank you for your consideration,

Susan Kay Phillips

--

There are many great minds on earth and not all are human.

- Anthony Douglas Williams

From: [Milda Aksamitauskas](#)
To: [Madison Landmarks Commission](#)
Subject: comments on the proposed ADU unit at the University Heights neighborhood
Date: Monday, May 4, 2026 10:22:13 AM

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

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

Dear Members of the Landmarks Commission:

I am writing in **opposition** to the proposed accessory structure at 1722 Regent Street within the University Heights Historic District. I am an owner of a historic property in the University Heights neighborhood. I like the concept of the ADU units (I am myself thinking about a tiny unit on top of our garage), but this proposal does not meet the spirit nor the look/feel of history we are preserving in the neighborhood.

On the record before the Commission, the application cannot satisfy the standards in MGO §§ 41.18 and 41.27, and the Certificate of Approval should be denied, or, at a minimum, the application should be required to undergo substantial revision before approval.

1. The proposal is mischaracterized as an “ADU” and must be evaluated for what it actually is: a two-unit apartment building in a backyard.

The compatibility analysis under § 41.27 turns on what the structure *actually is*: its massing, form, function, and visual character. The accessory-structure standards in § 41.27(1)(b) presuppose a structure that is functionally and visually *subsidiary* to the principal building. A side-by-side, two-front-door, two-unit residential building, sized to the maximum height and footprint and equipped with a full basement, is not such a structure. The plans themselves confirm this: each “unit” is a five-bedroom dwelling (two bedrooms in the basement, three on the second floor), for ten bedrooms total in this so-called “accessory” building. That is incompatible with the historic character of accessory structures in University Heights and incompatible with the framing the staff report relies upon.

2. The proposal fails MGO § 41.27(1)(b)(1) because no historic accessory structures have been used as comparables.

Section 41.27(1)(b)(1) is unambiguous: new accessory structures must “[c]omply with requirements for new primary structures *with other historic accessory structures serving as comparables*.” The application contains no comparables that satisfy this requirement. Every comparable submitted -- 1716, 1718, 1722, 1725, and 1726 Chadbourne Avenue, and 1728 Regent Street -- is a principal residence. The applicant has used the historic principal residences in the vicinity as the design reference for an “accessory” structure. That inverts the analysis the code requires.

Designing an “accessory” structure to look like the principal residences nearby is not how compatibility is determined for accessory structures under § 41.27(1)(b)(1). It is, in fact, a near-textbook way of producing a structure that fails the “**clearly secondary**” test in § 41.27(1)(b)(3). The historic accessory structures in University Heights are modest, simple, and visually recessive: small gabled garages and ancillary outbuildings. None of those structures appear anywhere in the application as comparables, and the staff report does not flag this defect. On its face, the proposal cannot be approved under § 41.27(1)(b)(1).

3. The proposal fails MGO § 41.27(1)(b)(3) because the building is not “clearly secondary” to the principal residence.

As stated above, the accessory-structure standard requires that a new accessory structure “[c]learly be secondary to the primary structure.” The proposed building does not meet this standard:

- It is a residential building with two independent dwelling units, two front doors, and a symmetrical front façade -- the form of a duplex or twin home, which throughout Madison reads as a principal residential structure, not an accessory building.
- It rises to 25 feet at the ridge, only 5 feet shorter than the principal residence. Combined with a full basement and a wide shed-style dormer running across the front roofline, the visual mass approaches or exceeds that of the principal residence rather than receding from it.
- Its footprint sits at the maximum of what is allowed for an ADU on any lot. But on this parcel, that footprint approaches the footprint of the principal residence itself — hardly subordinate nor "clearly secondary".
- The front (south) elevation displays a covered porch stoop, two formal entries, and full first-floor and dormer-level fenestration. These are features that signal a principal residence to the eye. They are not features of historic carriage houses, garages, outbuildings, or accessory structures in this district.

A reasonable observer encountering this building from the shared driveway would not perceive it as subordinate to the front house. They would see it for what it is: a duplex behind a house on one lot. That is precisely the visual outcome that § 41.27(1)(b)(3) is designed to prevent.

4. The Visual Size analysis under MGO § 41.27(1)(a)(3) is incomplete and does not support the staff conclusion.

Section 41.27(1)(a)(3) requires the Commission to consider “factors such as massing, building height in feet and stories, the gross area of the front elevation (i.e., all walls facing the street), street presence, and the dominant proportion of width to height in the façade.” The staff report addresses only two of these factors: height in feet and number of stories. It does not address:

- **Gross area of the front elevation.** The proposed south elevation is approximately 30 feet wide and 25 feet tall, producing roughly 750 square feet of front-facing wall area. This is comparable to or exceeds to the gross front elevation of smaller historic primary residences nearby. It is not comparable to any historic accessory structure in the district.
- **Street presence.** Although the structure sits behind the principal residence, the lot’s shared driveway provides a direct, unobstructed sightline from Regent Street into the rear yard. The applicant’s own rendering on Sheet A 9.1 confirms this: the proposed structure is plainly visible from the public right-of-way alongside the principal residence. The “minimally visible” claim, repeated in both the application narrative and the staff report, is not supported by the applicant’s own materials.
- **Dominant proportion of width to height.** The wide, full-width dormer combined with the long horizontal eave creates a façade dominated by horizontal mass — again, the proportion of a principal residential building, not a carriage house or garage.

A complete analysis of these factors does not support the staff conclusion that the structure is visually compatible as an accessory structure in this district.

5. The proposal frustrates the public interest under MGO § 41.18(1)(d).

Section 41.18(1)(d) bars approval of any work that “**will...frustrate the public interest expressed in this ordinance for protecting, promoting, conserving, and using the City’s historic resources.**” University Heights is a designated local historic district precisely because of its early 20th-century residential character: a coherent landscape of substantial principal residences served by modest, subordinate outbuildings.

Approving a nearly 3000-square-foot, two-unit, ten-bedroom apartment building as an “accessory structure” -- designed using primary residences as its comparables -- would neither protect nor conserve that character. It would replace a modest historic accessory pattern with a precedent permitting full-scale duplex-form buildings in the backyards of University Heights. That precedent, once set, will not be confined to this lot. Subsequent applicants will, with justification, point to this approval as the new baseline for what counts as “compatible” and “secondary” in the district.

The cumulative effect would be the gradual erosion of the very spatial relationships and hierarchies between principal residences and their outbuildings that earned this district its protected status in the first place. The Landmarks Commission is charged to enforce the standards in MGO Chapter 41.

6. The City’s recent policy reforms do not supersede this Commission’s standards.

The Common Council's recent loosening of ADU rules -- removal of the owner-occupancy requirement, expansion of eligible lots, and the broadened “family” definition under § 28.211 -- does not amend or diminish MGO Chapter 41, and does not relax the compatibility standards this Commission applies. The Historic Preservation Ordinance and the standards in § 41.27 remain in full force in University Heights. An ADU policy framework, removing requirements for owner occupancy, or redefining “family” does not rewrite preservation standards. On those preservation standards, this proposal does not qualify, regardless of what is permitted by zoning.

7. Recommendation.

For the reasons above, the proposal cannot be approved on this record under MGO §§ 41.18(1)(c), 41.18(1)(d), 41.27(1)(a)(3), 41.27(1)(b)(1), 41.27(1)(b)(2), and 41.27(1)(b)(3). I respectfully request that the Commission either:

1. **Deny the Certificate of Approval, or**
2. **Require substantial revision** before approval, including: (a) reduction to a size consistent with an *accessory* structure appropriate to the property, regardless of its designation as an ADU; (b) reduction in height, footprint, and front-façade mass to clearly subordinate proportions; (c) a single front entry consistent with accessory-structure form; and (d) re-submission with a complete and correct comparables analysis using historic accessory structures within 200 feet, as § 41.27(1)(b)(1) expressly requires.

Thank you for your consideration.

Milda Aksamitauskas
2125 Chamberlain Ave.

From: [Ben Noffke](#)
To: [Madison Landmarks Commission](#)
Cc: [Vidaver, Regina](#)
Subject: Support for 92802
Date: Monday, May 4, 2026 10:12:34 AM

You don't often get email from bnoffke3790@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Hello Landmarks Commission,

I'm writing to indicate my support for the proposed ADU at 1722 Regent St. I'm not a resident of this neighborhood, but I live on the near west side and I visit businesses in this area. If this were proposed in my neighborhood, I would be ecstatic about the increased customer base that can support walkable local business.

This looks like the type of infill development we want to see in the city. This scale certainly seems more in line with what residents want, especially when comparing the scale of 5 story apartment buildings that draw controversy. The building style and finishings seem compatible with the original house and surrounding properties.

I'm a firm believer that no neighborhood should experience radical change, but no neighborhood is exempt from some change. I would classify this ADU as "some change", not radical change.

Thanks for your consideration,
Ben Noffke

From: [Ron Rosner](#)
To: [Madison Landmarks Commission](#)
Subject: 1722 Regent
Date: Monday, May 4, 2026 9:55:09 AM

[You don't often get email from rosner7@charter.net. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

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

Dear Members of the Landmarks Commission

We wish to add our remarks to those already registered in opposition to the proposed “ADU” at 1722 Regent.

We find it difficult to believe that within a 6-month time window, from purchase of the property to drawing up architectural drawings and making application, a developer has the potential to totally disrupt the fabric of what is considered a single-family, landmark section of the City. It appears that Mr. Mack, the developer, has out-smarted the City, turning what ostensibly was a modest City effort at increasing infill, into a neighborhood-busting project, which will leave all of us feeling we're living on tenterhooks, not knowing if and when a similar proposal could be approved in our own back- or side-yard, thereby radically altering the environment we thought we had bought into, and would be preserved.

My wife and I lived in a home that bounded the proposed project for 15 years, —The Johnson House at 1713 Chadbourne, recognized by the City, and this Commission, for “its simplicity and geometric emphasis that characterized much Prairie School design”. During that time we observed all the properties on North Lathrop converted from single-family use to absentee-owned rental properties. If the 1722 Regent project is allowed to pass, a similar future awaits other nearby properties, and many others. In consequence, the immediate housing market will become one of competing developers, not homeowners, which will ultimately lead to the loss of the “landmarked” quality this Commission is pledged to protect and preserve.

In the best interests of the landmarked neighborhood, and the City in general, we ask that the Commission deny the “ADU” request for 1722 Regent.

respectfully,

Ron Rosner and Ronnie Hess

From: [Dave Schroeder](#)
To: [Madison Landmarks Commission](#); [Bailey, Heather](#)
Subject: Re: Opposition to file 98202 - 1722 Regent Street - New Construction in the University Heights Historic District (District 5)
Date: Monday, May 4, 2026 9:16:44 AM

You don't often get email from dave.schroeder@wisc.edu. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear Members of the Landmarks Commission:

There is one other item I would like to note about this property in consideration under MGO § 41.27(1)(b)(3). While the plans obscure the total interior square footage, the submittal reveals a finished interior space of approximately 2,800 sq. ft., nearly 1,000 sq. ft., or 50%, *more* than the principal structure's 1,828 sq. ft.

Each of the two units in the ADU also includes 1 more bedroom and 1 more full bathroom than the entire principal residence, with the ADU as a whole more than doubling the number of bedrooms, bathrooms, and kitchens than are present in the principal structure.

These facts, when considered, also do not meet the "clearly secondary to the primary structure" standard required by 41.27(1)(b)(3), in addition to the considerations below.

Regards,

Dave Schroeder
1723 Chadbourne Ave

From: Dave Schroeder
Sent: Sunday, May 3, 2026 8:19 PM
To: landmarkscommission@cityofmadison.com; Bailey, Heather
Subject: Opposition to file 98202 - 1722 Regent Street - New Construction in the University Heights Historic District (District 5)

Dear Members of the Landmarks Commission:

I am writing in opposition to the proposed accessory structure at 1722 Regent Street within the University Heights Historic District. On the record before the Commission, the application cannot satisfy the standards in MGO §§ 41.18 and 41.27, and the Certificate of Approval should be denied, or, at a minimum, the application should be required to undergo substantial revision before approval.

1. The proposal is mischaracterized as an “ADU” and must be evaluated for what it actually is: a two-unit apartment building in a backyard.

The compatibility analysis under § 41.27 turns on what the structure *actually is*: its massing, form, function, and visual character. The accessory-structure standards in § 41.27(1)(b) presuppose a structure that is functionally and visually *subsidiary* to the principal building. A side-by-side, two-front-door, two-unit residential building, sized to the maximum height and footprint and equipped with a full basement, is not such a structure. The plans themselves confirm this: each “unit” is a five-bedroom dwelling (two bedrooms in the basement, three on the second floor), for ten bedrooms total in this so-called “accessory” building. That is incompatible with the historic character of accessory structures in University Heights and incompatible with the framing the staff report relies upon.

2. The proposal fails MGO § 41.27(1)(b)(1) because no historic accessory structures have been used as comparables.

Section 41.27(1)(b)(1) is unambiguous: new accessory structures must “[c]omply with requirements for new primary structures *with other historic accessory structures serving as comparables*.” The application contains no comparables that satisfy this requirement. Every comparable submitted -- 1716, 1718, 1722, 1725, and 1726 Chadbourne Avenue, and 1728 Regent Street -- is a principal residence. The applicant has used the historic principal residences in the vicinity as the design reference for an “accessory” structure. That inverts the analysis the code requires.

Designing an “accessory” structure to look like the principal residences nearby is not how compatibility is determined for accessory structures under § 41.27(1)(b)(1). It is, in fact, a near-textbook way of producing a structure that fails the “**clearly secondary**” test in § 41.27(1)(b)(3). The historic accessory structures in University Heights are modest, simple, and visually recessive: small gabled garages and ancillary outbuildings. None of those structures appear anywhere in the application as comparables, and the staff report does not flag this defect. On its face, the proposal cannot be approved under § 41.27(1)(b)(1).

3. The proposal fails MGO § 41.27(1)(b)(3) because the building is not “clearly secondary” to the principal residence.

As stated above, the accessory-structure standard requires that a new accessory structure “[c]learly be secondary to the primary structure.” The proposed building does not meet this standard:

- It is a residential building with two independent dwelling units, two front doors, and a symmetrical front façade -- the form of a duplex or twin home, which throughout Madison reads as a principal residential structure, not an accessory building.
- It rises to 25 feet at the ridge, only 5 feet shorter than the principal residence. Combined with a full basement and a wide shed-style dormer running across the front roofline, the visual mass approaches or exceeds that of the principal residence rather than receding from it.
- Its footprint sits at the maximum of what is allowed for an ADU on any lot. But on this parcel, that footprint approaches the footprint of the principal residence itself — hardly subordinate nor “clearly secondary”.
- The front (south) elevation displays a covered porch stoop, two formal entries, and full first-floor and dormer-level fenestration. These are features that signal a principal residence to the eye. They are not features of historic carriage houses, garages, outbuildings, or accessory structures in this district.

A reasonable observer encountering this building from the shared driveway would not perceive it as subordinate to the front house. They would see it for what it is: a duplex behind a house on one lot. That is precisely the visual outcome that § 41.27(1)(b)(3) is designed to prevent.

4. The Visual Size analysis under MGO § 41.27(1)(a)(3) is incomplete and does not support the staff conclusion.

Section 41.27(1)(a)(3) requires the Commission to consider “factors such as massing, building height in feet and stories, the gross area of the front elevation (i.e., all walls facing the street), street presence, and the dominant proportion of width to height in the façade.” The staff report addresses only two of these factors: height in feet and number of stories. It does not address:

- **Gross area of the front elevation.** The proposed south elevation is approximately 30 feet wide and 25 feet tall, producing roughly 750 square feet of front-facing wall area. This is comparable to or exceeds to the gross front elevation of smaller historic primary residences nearby. It is not comparable to any historic accessory structure in the district.
- **Street presence.** Although the structure sits behind the principal residence, the lot’s shared driveway provides a direct, unobstructed sightline from Regent Street into the rear yard. The applicant’s own rendering on Sheet A 9.1 confirms this: the proposed structure is plainly visible from the public right-of-way alongside the principal residence. The “minimally visible” claim, repeated in both the application narrative and the staff report, is not supported by the applicant’s own materials.
- **Dominant proportion of width to height.** The wide, full-width dormer combined with the long horizontal eave creates a façade dominated by horizontal mass — again, the proportion of a principal residential building, not a carriage house or garage.

A complete analysis of these factors does not support the staff conclusion that the structure is visually compatible as an accessory structure in this district.

5. The proposal frustrates the public interest under MGO § 41.18(1)(d).

Section 41.18(1)(d) bars approval of any work that “**will...frustrate the public interest expressed in this ordinance for protecting, promoting, conserving, and using the City’s historic resources.**” University Heights is a designated local historic district precisely because of its early 20th-century residential character: a coherent landscape of substantial principal residences served by modest, subordinate outbuildings.

Approving a nearly 3000-square-foot, two-unit, ten-bedroom apartment building as an “accessory structure” -- designed using primary residences as its comparables -- would neither protect nor conserve that character. It would replace a modest historic accessory pattern with a precedent permitting full-scale duplex-form buildings in the backyards of University Heights. That precedent, once set, will not be confined to this lot. Subsequent applicants will, with justification, point to this approval as the new baseline for what counts as “compatible” and “secondary” in the district.

The cumulative effect would be the gradual erosion of the very spatial relationships and hierarchies between principal residences and their outbuildings that earned this district its protected status in the first place. The Landmarks Commission is charged to enforce the standards in MGO Chapter 41.

6. The City’s recent policy reforms do not supersede this Commission’s standards.

The Common Council’s recent loosening of ADU rules -- removal of the owner-occupancy requirement, expansion of eligible lots, and the broadened “family” definition under § 28.211 -- does not amend or diminish MGO Chapter 41, and does not relax the compatibility standards this Commission applies. The Historic Preservation Ordinance and the standards in § 41.27 remain in full force in University Heights. An ADU policy framework, removing requirements for owner occupancy, or redefining “family” does not rewrite preservation standards. On those preservation standards, this proposal does not qualify, regardless of what is permitted by zoning.

7. Recommendation.

For the reasons above, the proposal cannot be approved on this record under MGO §§ 41.18(1)(c), 41.18(1)(d), 41.27(1)(a)(3), 41.27(1)(b)(1), 41.27(1)(b)(2), and 41.27(1)(b)(3). I respectfully request that the Commission either:

1. **Deny the Certificate of Approval**, or
2. **Require substantial revision** before approval, including: (a) reduction to a size consistent with an *accessory* structure appropriate to the property, regardless of its designation as an ADU; (b) reduction in height, footprint, and front-façade mass to clearly subordinate proportions; (c) a single front entry consistent with accessory-structure form; and (d) re-submission with a complete and correct comparables analysis using historic accessory structures within 200 feet, as § 41.27(1)(b)(1) expressly requires.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Dave Schroeder
1723 Chadbourne Ave

From: [Barbara STREIBEL](#)
To: [Madison Landmarks Commission](#)
Subject: proposed accessory structure at 1722 Regent Street
Date: Sunday, May 3, 2026 10:02:57 PM

You don't often get email from bstreibel1@aol.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear Landmarks Commission Members,

I am writing in strong opposition to the proposed accessory structure at 1722 Regent Street within the University Heights Historic District.

I've looked at the proposal online. It looks to me like a large building for the backyard of the main house. While it may meet the city's new zoning code (which I have asked the City Council to review and revise now that I have seen this example of what it allows), I am hopeful that this large rental unit does NOT meet the requirements for a subsidiary structure in an historic Madison neighborhood.

If you decide this proposal does meet the requirements for designated historic neighborhoods, then I don't see the point of having designated historic neighborhoods. What are we preserving if large apartments fill the backyards?

I have seen many ADUs added throughout my near westside neighborhood recently. None of them are large. All are clearly subsidiary to the main house. I welcome these units. I do not welcome 2 story apartment buildings that fill the entire backyard and which do not need to meet any of the requirements for an apartment (eg: parking, set-back, green space, sprinklers, inspections, etc)

Thank you for your kind attention,
Barbara Streibel
Eton Ridge

Eric and Karla Schrader
1726 Regent St
Madison, WI, 53726
Schrader_eric.mark@yahoo.com
5/3/26

To: City of Madison Planning Commission / Landmarks Commission / Zoning Board

Re: Opposition to Proposed ADU Development at 1722 Regent St, Madison, WI

Dear Commissioners,

We are writing to formally oppose the proposed accessory dwelling unit (ADU) development at the above-referenced property, located within the University Heights Historic District.

While we support appropriately scaled housing solutions, this proposal raises substantial concerns regarding compliance with zoning intent, neighborhood compatibility, and long-term precedent.

1. Misalignment with the Intent of an ADU and Potential Non-Compliance

The proposed structure, given its size and number of bedrooms, does not appear to function as a true accessory dwelling unit. ADUs are intended to be subordinate, low-impact, and clearly secondary to the primary residence. This proposal instead resembles a high-occupancy, multi-tenant living arrangement more consistent with a rooming house. Approving such a project under ADU designation would undermine the purpose of existing zoning regulations. Based on the submitted plans, the proposed structure appears to exceed the City of Madison's approximate 1,000 square foot limitation for ADUs. In addition, concerns exist regarding overall massing, lot coverage, and proportionality relative to the primary structure and neighboring homes.

2. Precedent for Future Development and Compatibility with Historic District Standards.

Approval of a project of this scale under the ADU designation would set a very concerning precedent. It could encourage similar proposals that incrementally shift the neighborhood away from its intended historic character toward higher-density and investor-driven development that would exacerbate the current housing issues that the city is currently facing. As part of a designated historic district, new construction must be compatible in scale, massing, and overall character. The proposed development appears inconsistent with the established pattern of development and risks detracting from the historic integrity the district is intended to preserve.

3. Excessive Occupancy and Density with Potential Impacts on Public Safety

The scale of occupancy implied by the proposal is inconsistent with the surrounding single-family context. A significant increase in residents on a single parcel introduces a level of density that is not characteristic of this neighborhood and risks altering its established residential character. Additionally, the close proximity of this structure to surrounding homes would provide significant exposure risks and egress challenges in the event of a fire department response.

4. Quality of Life Impacts

A development of this size and occupancy level raises reasonable concerns regarding noise, privacy, and overall livability for adjacent residents. With no definitive plan in place for permanent occupancy, the increased turnover and intensity of use may further exacerbate these impacts over time. The anticipated number of occupants will also place considerable strain on already limited street parking and local infrastructure.

For these reasons, we respectfully request that this proposal be denied or substantially revised to align with the intent of ADU regulations, applicable zoning standards, and the preservation goals of the historic district.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,
Eric and Karla Schrader

From: [Nancy Johnson](#)
To: [Madison Landmarks Commission](#)
Cc: [Frank Pfefferkorn](#)
Subject: 1722 Regent St - Legistar File ID# 92802
Date: Sunday, May 3, 2026 8:56:52 PM

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

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

Frank Pfefferkorn & Nancy Johnson
1708 Regent Street
Madison, WI 53726

03 May 2026

Re: Legistar File ID# 92802 - Approval of New Construction of an Accessory Structure at 1722 Regent Street

Dear City of Madison Landmarks Commission:

As the owners of 1708 Regent Street, we are writing to express our opposition to the current proposal for a new accessory structure at 1722 Regent Street, which directly abuts our property to the west.

Our primary concern is the scale of the proposed accessory dwelling unit (ADU). The plans indicate a total of 10 bedrooms in the ADU, which is at least twice the number of bedrooms in the existing primary residence at 1722 Regent Street. Given its size and capacity, it is difficult to understand how this structure can reasonably be considered "accessory." The proposed building appears to be comparable in scale to a primary residence rather than subordinate to the existing house, which raises significant concerns about compatibility with the intent of ADU regulations and the surrounding neighborhood.

We are also concerned about parking impacts associated with the proposed development. The existing primary residence, combined with an ADU designed to house 10 or more residents, will generate parking demand far beyond what the site can accommodate. The submitted plans appear to allow parking for no more than two vehicles in the driveway. This shortfall will inevitably push additional vehicles onto surrounding streets, exacerbating an already challenging parking situation in the neighborhood. These concerns are particularly acute on Regent Street itself, where parking is prohibited on the odd-numbered side from 7:00 AM to 8:30 AM and on the even-numbered side from 4:00 PM to 5:30 PM. Given these constraints, it is unclear where residents and their visitors would realistically park without creating ongoing congestion and conflicts.

We respectfully request that the City of Madison Landmarks Commission deny the Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposal as currently submitted, or alternatively require substantial revisions that reduce the overall scale of the structure, provide adequate on-site parking, and clearly establish the building as subordinate in size and function to the existing primary residence.

Sincerely,

Frank Pfefferkorn & Nancy Johnson

Bailey, Heather

From: Laura McClure <lmcclore@wisc.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2026 3:55 PM
To: Madison Landmarks Commission
Subject: 1722 Regent Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

Categories: Heather

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

Dear Members of the Landmarks Commission,

We write as the owners of 1722 Chadbourne to express our strong opposition to the proposed accessory dwelling structure at 1722 Regent Street, which mentions our house as the inspiration for various design features in the application.

The Commission's charge is to ensure that new construction is compatible with the historic character of its surroundings, particularly in terms of massing, scale, and the established pattern of development. In this case, the proposed building does not meet those standards.

1. The proposed structure is not subordinate in massing or scale

Accessory buildings in historic residential settings are typically modest in size and clearly secondary to the primary structure. The proposed building, however, presents as a full-scale residential structure, with a broad footprint and multiple stories. Its size and volume approach that of a principal building, rather than a subordinate outbuilding. As a result, it would compete visually with the primary structure rather than defer to it.

2. The building disrupts the historic pattern of accessory structures

Historically, rear-yard buildings—such as carriage houses or garages—are smaller, simpler, and visually recessive (compare the unit recently approved by the Landmarks Commission at 1716 Chadbourne). The proposed design departs significantly from this pattern. Its width, height, and overall presence create a profile that is inconsistent with the traditional relationship between primary and accessory structures on similar lots.

3. The design reads as a primary structure rather than an accessory building

The symmetry, scale, and multi-level massing give the building the appearance of a principal residential structure placed at the rear of the lot. This undermines the established hierarchy that is a key characteristic of historic residential properties, where the primary building remains dominant and accessory structures are clearly secondary.

4. Approval would erode the standards governing compatible infill

If a structure of this size and intensity is considered compatible as an accessory building, it would set a precedent that weakens the Commission's ability to maintain the historic scale and character of similar properties. Over time, this could significantly alter the defining spatial relationships that the Commission is charged with preserving.

For these reasons, we respectfully urge the Commission to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness for this proposal, or require substantial revisions that reduce the building's massing and ensure it is clearly subordinate to the primary structure.

Thank you for your careful consideration.

Sincerely,

Laura McClure and Richard Heinemann
1722 Chadbourne Avenue
Madison, WI 53726
608-334-3108