

Presentation to City Plan Commission
Public Hearing
December 1, 2008
RE: LD #12778 Conditional Use Application – 2002 Waunona Way

Good evening, I am JoAnn Tiedemann. I am the owner and resident of 1910 Waunona Way, the property immediately to the east of the applicants' (see the aerial photo, p. 2 of the Maps&Plans.) You will see that lakeside additions to all three houses to the west (left) and one to the east (right) have already extended them closer to the lakeshore than mine.

(Please also note, the materials provided publicly as part of this packet include incorrect data: the architect's Project Summary, p. 5, and both levels' new construction Floor Plans, p.11-12.)

I have two concerns regarding the proposed Major Alteration to Conditional Use:

As noted in the city staff report, the house was built in 1963. At that time it had a walk-out ground floor (the "basement") under an open deck, see the straight north/lakeside interior walls on both the first and second floor Demolition Plans (p. 9-10). In subsequent increments and owners, made obvious by the now differing-extent walls along the north/lakeside on both levels, the lower level was enclosed, and upper level areas were screened, enclosed, and partially covered by a curved glass sunroof. The result of this is the structure Kohns bought, one which is out of compliance with setback requirements for the side yards and lakeside as it currently stands.

I cannot support any construction which continues encroachment on lakeside setback. Not "only on the upper floor," and it does also include a pillar extending to the ground, not "only XX inches," and not "so little compared to the "blue roof house." Interestingly, the residents of 2008 Waunona Way (two houses to the west of the Kohns) applied last June for a Zoning variance to build 25% closer to the lake than setback average, that application was of concern to the Kohns at that time. Following ZBA denial, a Major Alteration to a Conditional Use for 2008 appears in tonight's agenda under "Upcoming Matters." My concern is for the domino effect from a precedent possibly set tonight.

My other concern regarding this construction is the re-orientation of rooflines and the increased ridge height. It unfortunately is not shown in any of the elevation drawings I have seen presented, but the Kohn's lot lies between two and three feet higher than mine. Currently my property receives partial runoff from their street side roof face, that which flows around the east side through my yard (lower than Kohns') and on down to the lake, as well as the portions of the lake side roof faceS which drain toward the east and north. Those faces drain onto an impervious brick patio in Kohns' yard and then pool in my lakeside yard until absorbed and drained.

During the past two "rainy seasons" (June 2008 and August 2007), I have had constant seepage into my basement, though my foundation is protected by drain tile, on the west

(Kohns') side and floor. In October I had professional restoration performed to clean up the basement floor from this damage.

The Kohns' change to an increased north-south roof orientation for portions of their construction (will also block additional sun from the west), the even greater side-yard variance granted along the east (10' 2" required, 4' 4" proposed), along with the 1-2" increased height, increases the amount and force of the water which will be directed at my property, with the danger of continued structural and erosion damage.

I appreciate your hearing and consideration of these concerns. Thank you.

JoAnn Tiedemann
1910 Waunona Way
Madison, WI 53713-1614
(608) 222-1630

November 30, 2008

Kevin J. Firchow
Planning Division
Dept. of Planning & Community
& Economic Development
Room LL100 MMB
215 Martin Luther King JR. Blvd
Madison, WI 53701- 2985

Re: 2002 Waunona Way, Major Alteration to Conditional Use to
Allow Addition to Single Family Home

Dear Mr. Firchow:

The Waunona Neighborhood Association (WNA) Board has withdrawn its opposition to the land use application made for 2002 Waunona Way encompassing an addition and renovation to the existing home.

Upon further evaluation, it has been determined that the property to the west of the Kohn residence obstructs the capitol view of both the Kohn's and the property that adjoins to the east. It does not appear the Kohn's property will obstruct the neighbor to the east's view to the west. The possible obstruction was the reason for the original opposition to the building plan.

The roof drainage is addressed with documentation from the street department and the plans submitted by the Kohn's.

Based on the above, the Waunona Neighborhood Association withdraws its opposition to the land use application for 2002 Waunona Way.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Tschumper
President
Waunona Neighborhood Association

Cc: Tim Bruer, 14th District
George & Sandy Kohn
Steven Connor

Firchow, Kevin

From: Sandy Kohn [sjkohn@wisc.edu]
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2008 9:29 AM
To: Firchow, Kevin; Murphy, Brad
Subject: documents re 2002 Waunona Way for Planning Commission tonight

Kevin and Brad: George and I just wanted to be sure you had the latest documents for tonight which should address the concerns you note in your 12/1 report. The report gives reference to a letter of opposition by the Waunona Neighborhood Association and concerns of a neighbor (1910 Waunona Way) regarding view and storm water runoff. Since then, you should have received an 11/30 letter from Phyllis Tschumper in which the Association withdraws its opposition. Also, I will forward the Engineering documents that address a concern about storm water runoff. You also sent a 11/25 email to the Plan Commission which notes that the neighbor (1910 Waunona Way) DOES NOT oppose the plan. She had told us (and the zoning board and staff) that she does not oppose it since before the zoning board meetings so whomever reported to the Neighborhood Association that she was opposed was incorrect. Below are some additional details.

Waunona Neighborhood Association--visited our home on 11/25 and viewed the plans with George, Bob Bouril and me. An observation was also made from the 1910 property and it was determined that the 14 inch cantilier (which we need for alignment with existing structure and to prevent ice damage etc.) and the supporting pillar DO NOT obstruct the view from 1910 or any neighbors to the east of us.

Also, during the Association's 11/25 visit, Bob Bouril (the architect who designed the project) explained how he would do the water collection and dispersal (as Engineering had indicated in the emails) and we gave the Association a copy of the Engineering documents. Brad, I believe that Greg Fries sent these to you but I will send them as well. In summary, wanting to be a responsible neighbor, I had contacted City Engineering before the 10/9 zoning board meeting to ask if they thought our project presented a water runoff problem for 1910 and if so, what our responsibility would be. Attached correspondence documents that "Engineering does not believe there are significant drainage issues for this development." Greg Fries and Tim Troester confirm in the 11/25 email what they told me in early October: the problems 1910 experiences are "due to a lack of a good storm system in the upper areas of the watershed". He noted that our responsibility would be basically to point our droughs etc. toward the back (which we would certainly do) and not to the side.

We have worked hard to try to design a project that meets our needs and complies with the City's process. We have 15 signatures of approval representing over a dozen homes. We contacted Tim Bruer and we met in late summer with Phyllis Tschumper and again, on 11/25. Our neighbors, even 1910, have commented that they really like the design (although it was altered during the zoning board process) and that it is very compatible for the neighborhood. We have met with the 1910 resident at least five times on any issues she has had. These include one time (8/3) when she said she was relieved about the roof pitch because it was not what she had recalled. We also put her directly in touch with Bob Bouril and, on August 4th, she wrote him thanking him for his prompt response to her concerns regarding water runoff. As prior noted, she does not oppose the project.

We are hoping that the Planning Commission will approve a conditional use permit for our project. If there is more we need to do before tonight, please let us know.

Respectfully,

Sandy (and George) Kohn, (cell, 608-239-7571)

Firchow, Kevin

From: George Kohn [salsifyman@charter.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 26, 2008 8:19 AM
To: Firchow, Kevin; Murphy, Brad; Bruer, Tim; 'Bob R. Bouril'; 'Steve Connor'
Subject: 2002 Waunona Way Conditional Use Application - Response to Planning Division Report

Reference ID #12778
LTR Dated December 1, 2008

Under "RECOMMENDATIONS" the following conditions were noted that should be addressed:

2. "That the applicant's final plans confirm that the screen porch is screened and open, per the conditions established for variance approval."

Response: The screened porch will be screened and open as indicated on our plans.

3. "That the applicant confirms on final site or landscape plans that no more than 30% of the lake frontage will be cleared of trees and shrubbery."

Response: We confirm that no more than 30% of the lake frontage will be cleared of trees and shrubbery.

George Kohn
Sandra Kohn
2002 Waunona Way
Madison, WI 53713

FOR PC

Murphy, Brad

From: Fries, Greg
Sent: Tuesday, November 25, 2008 2:01 PM
To: Martin, Al
Cc: 'Sandy Kohn'; Murphy, Brad; Troester, Tim
Subject: RE: verification of discussion with you re: our project and Tiedemann concern work on Waunona Way

Al,

Not sure if you are doing this one for the Plan Commission but after I sent this I picked up a voice message from the resident requesting the plan approval that it is coming before the PC.

Did not want you going into the meeting without this information. Generally, Engineering does not believe there are significant drainage issues for this improvement. As in the past, if needed the PC could request a drainage plan, a very brief discussion of which we have had with the owner over a month ago.

I would expect this drainage plan to show a buried downspout taking the roof drainage away from the adjacent property, and that would be as we discussed and I believe sufficient for engineering to sign off. I am not advocating this merely stating I think what the applicant is proposing would be approved by us with no significant changes.

The applicant is copied.

Greg

-----Original Message-----

From: Sandy Kohn [mailto:sjkohn@wisc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, November 25, 2008 1:53 PM
To: Fries, Greg
Subject: Re: verification of discussion with you re: our project and Tiedemann concern

Greg, this is greatly appreciated. Thank you for your prompt reply.

Sandy Kohn

Fries, Greg wrote, On 11/25/2008 1:45 PM:

- > Sandy,
- >
- > I do remember you coming in to discuss your concerns, and checked with
- > Tim Troester (the other engineer who has been doing most of the work
- > out here). Our recollection is generally as you describe but I will
- > elaborate a bit.
- >
- > City Engineering completed a project in 2007 that provides as much
- > storm capacity to the system as reasonably possible without extension
- > of the storm main up into other areas of the neighborhood (that are
- > currently uninmproved)and improvement of the street with those storm extensions.
- > The problems that your neighbor has experienced have been (in our
- > opinion) primarily due to the lack of a good storm system in the upper
- > areas of the watershed, resulting in excessive water running down to
- > the low point in front of your homes and the inability of the storm
- > system to handle it at that location. This has resulted in overflows
- > down the property line damaging your neighbors property. City
- > Engineering completed the 2007 project to address those issues.
- >
- > Your proposed modification to your roof should not have any
- > significant impact on your neighbors home provided you:
- >
- > 1) direct as much flow via downspouts away from your neighbors
- > property and buildings

> 2) provide an air gap between your downspout and the pipe directing
> water around your building (this will prevent freezing on your roof if
> for some reason the discharge end of the pipe becomes plugged.
>
> Hope this helps.
>
> Greg
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Sandy Kohn [mailto:sjkohn@wisc.edu]
> Sent: Monday, November 24, 2008 9:01 AM
> To: Fries, Greg
> Subject: verification of discussion with you re: our project and
> Tiedemann concern
>
> TO: Greg Fries, Principal Engineer, Sanitary & Storm Sewer
>
> Date: 11/24/08
>
> Greg, I am hoping you remember me. My name is Sandy Kohn and I came
> to the Engineering Office sometime before 10/9 (I can't recall which day).
> It was near the end of the day and Larry Nelson was just leaving but
> he had you speak with me and you also had another person with you.
>
> You may recall that I said I was there to see you because we were
> pending repair/remodeling work on our house and that JoAnn Tiedemann
> had expressed concerns that the roof (A frame on back part of our
> house) would result in water running into her yard and then basement
> during heavy rains. This part is actually in front of the back of her
> house so not really directly adjacent. In any case, she is concerned.
> I said to you and/or Larry that we wanted to do whatever we would be
> responsible to do. I do recall before Larry Nelson left that there was
> some discussion that the City had done all that they can to help her.
>
> I think I had a drawing along or drew what we were doing and noted we
> would have eaves d roughs/gutters. You explained how we can prevent
> ice jams for our house by having the opening where the side eaves
> drough/gutter meets the ground one. You stated that our
> responsibility
> re: the Tiedemann property was to be sure we did not point a ground
> section of the eaves drough toward her property (which, of course, we
> would never do).
>
> If you would be so kind to respond to this email verify the visit with
> you and the conversation, I would most appreciate it given Ms.
> Tiedemann continues to bring this issue up in the process. If I have
> not captured the essence of our discussion, please feel free to state
> what, if anything, is not correct.
>
> In appreciation,
>
> Sandy Kohn