

**From:** [Sue Hunt](#)  
**To:** [All Alders](#)  
**Subject:** Balance the Budget  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 21, 2024 10:03:19 AM

---

Some people who received this message don't often get email from susankayhunt@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Please cut unnecessary positions and ineffective programs to balance our budget.

Please stop development at any cost. And please listen to neighborhood concerns including stopping housing on Old Sauk Road to a density inappropriate for the location.

Sue Hunt

**From:** [Mark Alan Kraft](#)  
**To:** [All Alders](#)  
**Cc:** [Old Sauk](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed Rezoning - Old Sauk Road proposed development  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 21, 2024 8:15:08 AM

---

Some people who received this message don't often get email from makraft66@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

I am expressing herewith my concerns relative to the **rezoning** request to accommodate the proposed “**stone house**” development on Old Sauk Rd.

Specifically;

The character, design, scale, diversity and density of the proposed development is not consistent with, or compatible with the neighborhoods contiguous to the site.

Additionally, the traffic pattern serving the proposed development serves to effectively create a barrier between the development and adjacent properties to the north and east.

I also find it interesting that the developer's submission does not include any images of properties contiguous to the site.

Thank you for reviewing my concerns!  
Mark Alan Kraft AIA, Retired

**Mark Alan Kraft**  
23 Stonefield Ter  
Madison, WI 53717

--

**An apology is a good way to have the last word!**

**58,271 - 1,160**

From: Grace Kwon  
To: [holter@cmfmadison.com](mailto:holter@cmfmadison.com)  
Cc: [concernedcitizens@madison.com](mailto:concernedcitizens@madison.com); [@Guadalupe\\_Johny\\_Fashling\\_Williams\\_Davis\\_Timothy](mailto:Guadalupe_Johny_Fashling_Williams_Davis_Timothy); [all@cityofmadison.com](mailto:all@cityofmadison.com); [quayle@cmfmadison.com](mailto:quayle@cmfmadison.com)  
Subject: Opposition to the Stone House Development for 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road Plan Commission Meeting on June 10, 2024. Legislar Nos. 82950, 82952, 82979.  
Date: Thursday, May 9, 2024 11:32:57 PM  
Attachments: [Site-Access-Statement-of-the-Stone-House-Prop.pdf](#)  
[1681710089\\_7a77a848f64a0871a13105a1816a7c4181d46466f68e1661798a7f98b1a487c-d.pdf](#)

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [gkwon22@gmail.com](mailto:gkwon22@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear Plan Commission Chair Zellers and the City of Madison,

While I support reasonable, common sense development of the Old Sauk Road parcels, I am adamantly opposed to Stone House's unreasonable proposal, lacking any foundation in common sense. Major objections to the project:

- The project would increase the risk of substantial flooding to neighborhood homes and yards.
- It would effectively establish a wall, 40 feet in height and extending down Old Sauk Road to a size 19 times larger than the apartment building next door with a length significantly longer than a football field.
- The project would require the neighborhood to suffer from noise, air, and light pollution, seriously aggravated by the Stone House plan for a recreation area featuring a swimming pool, hot tub, sauna, fire pit, and bocce court.
- Please give this your most serious consideration and include it on all three Registrar files shown above.

**POINT 1. This is not gentle rezoning or gentle densification - it's rezoning on steroids.**

- A. The Stone House proposal is 19.6 times the density of the nearest multi-family residence, the Settler's Woods.
- B. The average density of surrounding parcels is 7.9 units per acre; The Stone House density is 36.6 units per acre.

**POINT 4. This apartment complex cannot be integrated into the neighborhood.**

- A. The profile of the proposed project relative to the current community is too extreme.
- B. 100% of the residential buildings on Old Sauk are less than 3 stories tall; 49% of the single unit residences are less than 2 stories tall 40% of the multi-family residences are less than 2 stories tall; the closest 3-story residential building that can be viewed from Old Sauk Road is located 1.5 miles west of Gammon Rd (Attic Angels Place); the closest 3-story multi-family building to Old Sauk Road is Yorktown Apartments. The closes TR-U2 area is 2.3 miles away from the site.

**POINT 2. The aesthetic of the proposed project is not consistent with the current community**

- A. Ten architectural styles are represented in the housing on Old Sauk Road
- B. A majority of the residences are NOT characterized as modern or contemporary
- C. 97% of the residences have roofs that are NOT flat (flat roofs at 5702 and 6605 Old Sauk)
- D. Chapter 28 states that zoning exists to "create a sense of place." This development has no sense of place. The overall look is not homey; like the Lake View Sanatorium, it is institutional.



**POINT 3. I support a development that increases density and is in turn with the surrounding residences.**

- A. I support rezoning that allows gently denser development that would keep similar setbacks, be 3 stories or less and have comparably sized units, duplexes, triplexes and small apartment buildings, with green spaces in between, like those nearby.
- B. In contrast TR-U2, Traditional Residential, refers to URBAN high density development. It permits multi-family units on smaller lots, with smaller setbacks, i.e., front yard setback is 15 feet , permitted coverage up to 75 % of the lot (80% conditional use of the lot) Urban high density gives the complex a much larger footprint.
- C. The draft West Area Plan identifies a Missing Middle housing priority. We agree with the City on the desirability of this type of housing: duplexes, triplexes, quads, row houses and other smaller multi-unit residential buildings. This type of housing is compatible with existing housing in the neighborhoods. LMR if not escalated, supports Missing Middle-type housing.
- D. The draft West Area Plan points to LMR property near transit, schools and parks for Missing Middle development. The Old Sauk site is LMR property near transit, schools and parks. SR-V zoning invites Missing Middle type housing.

**POINT 4: Escalation is wrong for these parcels because it causes irreparable harm.**

- A. One and two story residences adjoin the property on 3 sides. Because of this unique setting, with no street, alley or other space separating the Old Sauk site and surrounding homes. Escalated development imposes extreme hardships on these homeowners. The proposed escalated development increases the risk of storm flooding and so threatens the integrity of these homes. It will pollute these adjoining homes with its noises, smells, traffic, surface parking, trash pickup, building shadows. It deprives home owners of their privacy, tranquility and enjoyment of their yards. Home is supposed to be a sanctuary; this development invades adjacent homeowners' sanctuaries.
- B. The entire surrounding area is suburban. The proposed development is urban high density. These districts have different rhythms, lifestyles and purposes. They appeal to different people. They are not compatible with each other. Approval of this high density project unjustly imposes an urban lifestyle on people who don't want it.
- C. The nearest TR-U2 district is on Sheboygan Avenue, 2.3 miles from the Old Sauk site. Sheboygan Avenue is walking distance to Whole Foods, Hilldale and other shops. This is a mix of commercial properties, tall and short apartments and taller condos. This is where urban high density buildings fit in.
- D. The proposed development would create traffic dangers and worsen congestion. Old Sauk road is not a major arterial road. There are no stop lights east of Gammon Road. It is dangerously congested at peak times. There is no sidewalk on much of the northside. The proposed development will make a bad situation much worse.

Grace Kwon

District 19

Sincerely,

**Parking and Site Access Statement:**

There was much concern by residents on site access and parking following the October 2023 Old Sauk Proposal Presentation. Stone House stated that it was just a concept and a more refined plan would be developed, incorporating comments heard from the proposal feedback. This was not the case, as five months later the revised proposal did not address any of the previous site access or parking concerns, instead it was made worse.

**-Proposal Concept Concerns:**

The revised plan eliminated one of the two access points into the underground parking, and relocated the one and only access to the back rear of the facility. This change creates confusion, congestion, safety concerns and traffic issues for those coming into and out of the facility, including the added congestion with deliveries being made in a tight area on the access road behind the building. In addition, 21 parking spaces were added with headlights facing directly into our bedroom windows at the back of our home on Saint Andrews Circle and with all deliveries being made to the facility directly behind our home. These parked vehicles are 20' to 30' from my home and deck resulting in unwanted 24X7 noise and chaos. All of the natural buffers that were in the October Proposal were eliminated in the March Proposal as the parking stalls were moved much closer to our fence line and relocated to face my house directly, 4'-6' from my fence. As such this proposal impacts my home greater than other adjacent property with traffic, parking activity, deliveries, etc. creating traffic and parking noise 24 hours a day, every day.

**-Underground Parking Concerns:**

Underground parking for a facility of this type has many complexities with special structural requirement needs, made more complex due to the sandy soil on this Old Sauk property. The parking structure must support the building above it and attention must be given to the groundwater forces flowing freely through the sand, pushing against the walls of the parking structure. As sand can't support itself, additional shoring and structural support members will be necessary not only during construction, but also to permanently strengthen the completed facility. Throughout the life of the building there are required continued inspections, maintenance and proper care, all necessary to ensure the structural integrity and safety of the parking structure and the above large apartment complex.

Vehicle collisions in the underground facility could cause significant damage to the structure if vehicles hit the pillars, undermining the structural integrity, especially true with EV vehicles as they are much heavier than gas powered vehicles, and therefore capable of more significant structural damage. Following a collision, vehicle fire and toxic smoke is a real possibility made even more dangerous with EV vehicles. The developer must include protective measures such as adding bollards, protective covering and adding fire protection around pillars and columns, to ensure structural integrity. If EV vehicles and EV chargers are allowed, how is the developer going to develop a safe environment to prevent lithium battery fires, that are well known to be very difficult to extinguish?

Water damage is a major concern in underground parking garages. Special waterproofing is needed to minimize leaks which is especially necessary in sandy soils, like on the proposed Old Sauk property. Water flows unencumbered through sand like water through a sieve, and right into the underground parking area, in absence of proper barrier construction and maintenance. Without proper construction, maintenance and continued inspection, the longevity and safety of the entire structure is reduced.

An underground parking facility with a large square footprint, such as proposed, creates security and life vulnerabilities that must be addressed. Emergencies can range from vehicle fires to natural disasters like flash floods. Egress plans and strategies are mandatory for both human and vehicle evacuation and foot or vehicle exit. Emergency response planning is critical with vehicle and occupant entrances and exits properly located. This proposal ignores these critical considerations and never mentioned in the presentation or proposal drawings.

Security threats and resident's personal safety issues are also of great concern in underground parking and need to be taken seriously: fires, access control for vehicles and people entering/leaving the building, unauthorized individuals, surveillance issues, vehicle thefts and emergency response must be acknowledged. Key threats: explosives in vehicles, chemical releases, escape routes (both persons and vehicles) as well as, a threat to the building's main support structure are all problematic. Because all of the support columns are exposed, a few strategically placed explosives would bring the entire structure down. A proactive approach is essential to ensure the safety and security of the tenants and the surrounding neighbors.

**-Parking and Site Access Summary:**

The current proposal is not workable as there are major parking and access issues with a disregard for safety and security. Emergency response and recovery need to be of primary concern in the design of this facility, but have not been considered or addressed. The single point of access at the rear of the building is not adequate for a facility of this size. Surface parking spaces in the rear of the facility are ill placed causing noise and disruption to close neighbors. Underground parking is extremely challenging on this site as construction in sandy soil requires special shoring, water protection and continuous inspection and maintenance.

**-Watershed Statement**

From the presentation it appears the developer is proposing holding a less than 200-year flood event on the property, without any discharge off of the property. If this is the case, what is the developers' plan for a 500-year event, as we had in 2018? The proposed development property's discharge, combined with the City's flash flooding issues, (City of Madison/Flash Flooding Resilience Study/ Watershed Flood Risk Map), shows we have a significant chance of flooding in this area that could lead to substantial flooding of property and homes.

The engineer's approach of using volumetric distribution controls is not realistic because the basin area is too small to accommodate the system proposed. I would be very surprised if the City engineers would be supportive of such an approach on this property.

#### -North Watershed Areas

The developer states they are discharging water to the north and east similar to existing conditions. This is not correct, as snow in the winter months will be plowed/placed along the fence on the north, in the Dog Park area on the north east and the Stormwater detention area on the north west. Because the soil in these areas is sand, the melt off will result in high water flow and hydrostatic water pressure through the sand; resulting in flooding of basements for properties on Saint Andrews Circle, Torrey Pines Court and Sauk Woods Court. With the spring rains and melting snow, basements in the area have water issues. This also occurs with heavy rain, such as the 500-year rainfall event in 2018 that caused excess flooding in the area. One unique example is with heavy rains and snow melt on the higher elevation of the proposed development property, where water flows through the sandy soil percolating up through the floor of a parking area of a nearby apartment building. As the soil is sand, water runs through the soil almost as quickly as it does overground. The developer needs to confine all rain and snow event stormwater on the development site. The developer's statement that they are maintaining a similar runoff as exiting is not factual, instead they are actually creating a flooding situation for neighbors surrounding the development. The developer needs to maintain all storm events, water and snow, on areas that do not negatively impact their neighbors.

#### -North West Stormwater Basin

The North West Stormwater Detention Basin is also of major concern. With the snow melt and spring rain or a heavy rain and the basin filling up, hydrostatic water pressure flowing through the sandy soil will flood existing homeowners' basements and lower levels on Torrey Pines Court, Saint Andrews Circle as well as Spyglass Court. I mentioned this in my earlier comments on the October SH Proposal but these comments were not addressed. If water is going to be held on site in this area, an additional subsurface stormwater basin will need to be considered in lieu of the Stormwater Detention Basin.

#### -Primary Stormwater Detention Basin

The Primary Stormwater Detention Basin to the west is of major concern. It is surprising that it is not a Retention Basin. I believe by ordinance, (Chapter 37 – Stormwater Management – Municode Library), it must be. In the event of a major rain event (greater than 200-year event) when the basin fills up, where does the stormwater go? It appears the stormwater works its way on the surface to Spyglass Court flowing over adjacent properties. This stormwater, complicated by the City's current watershed issues in this area and combined with a 500-year flood event, will significantly impact those home owners on Spyglass Court. When Subsurface Basins are full, typically there is a release of stormwater into a city owned stormwater system, this is not the case here. This proposal, if approved will flood adjacent homes and properties.

I am surprised the Engineer on Record for this project is not solving the entire Watershed issue within this project. A workable solution would be for the detention/retention basin to overflow into the to the City's existing stormwater systems on both Old Sauk Road and Spyglass Court, a realistic and appropriate design for stormwater control for this property.

This is the ethical design for the engineer to do. The current watershed basin design proposal does not protect adjacent homeowners. Registered Professional Engineers have an ethical responsibility to all entities related to a project, and as a result are required to take many hours of ethics training.

#### -North Underground Basins

The construction of the basin along the north fence is also of major concern. As the soil in that area is sand, standard excavation is not possible as the sand will collapse back into the excavation. How are the basins going to be constructed? It appears sheet piling is going to have to be driven along the total length of the basin to hold back the sand, in order to be able to construct the basins. Standard backfill excavation is not appropriate for this basin placement. If piling is used, both my home and property will be damaged: piling location is about 15'-20' from my 7' high stone wall and about 30'-40' from my house. The installation of piling will displace the stone wall and potentially cause structural damage to my home.

#### -Watershed Summary

The developer needs to reassess the watershed strategy for this proposed development as the current proposal has many issues and concerns. The Watershed Plan needs to be constructed connecting into the City's existing Stormwater System; the Northwest Detention Basins will flood neighbors' basements; the Underground Basins will be a difficult installation, if not impossible to construct in the sandy soils; and the West Detention Area must be a retention basin with connection into the City's stormwater system. Most importantly, the Watershed System must be designed and constructed in an ethical and responsible manner to protect the residents of this community. It's the engineer's, developer's and City's responsibility to do so.


Jeffrey L. Western, PE, SE



Slow Down Satya!  
vimeo.com




2 SOUTH ELEVATION  
 A201 1/16" = 1'-0"







2 SOUTH ELEVATION  
1/16" = 1'-0"











2 SOUTH ELEVATION  
A201 1/16" = 1'-0"







2 SOUTH ELEVATION  
1/16" = 1'-0"









—	HIGH ROOF	136' - 2"
—	ROOF	133' - 6"
—	THIRD FLOOR	122' - 4"
—	SECOND FLOOR	111' - 2"
—	FIRST FLOOR	100' - 0"
—	PARKING LEVEL	89' - 0"

2 SOUTH ELEVATION  
1/16" = 1'-0"





2 SOUTH ELEVATION  
1/16" = 1'-0"








- HIGH ROOF 136' - 2"
- ROOF 133' - 6"
- THIRD FLOOR 122' - 4"
- SECOND FLOOR 111' - 2"
- FIRST FLOOR 100' - 0"
- PARKING LEVEL 89' - 0"

2 SOUTH ELEVATION  
1/16" = 1'-0"





2  
A201


SOUTH ELEVATION

1/16" = 1'-0"





2 SOUTH ELEVATION  
A201 1/16" = 1'-0"





## Matthias, Isaac L

---

**From:** Grace Kwon <gskwon22@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 18, 2024 9:24 PM  
**To:** Wehelie, Nasra H; Rummel, Marsha; Knox Jr., Isadore; All Alders  
**Subject:** Traffic/Parking Issues for 6610 - 6706 Old Sauk Rd, Legistar 82950, 82972 and 82979, Please Post to Public Comments To All 3 Locations

Some people who received this message don't often get email from gskwon22@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

**From:** Grace Kwon <gskwon22@gmail.com>  
**Date:** May 18, 2024 at 9:15:24 PM CDT  
**To:** ledell.zellers@gmail.com, pccomments@cityofmadison.com, BFruhling@cityofmadison.com, Timothy Parks <tparks@cityofmadison.com>, lhorvath@cityofmadison.com, mayor@cityofmadison.com, streets@cityofmadison.com, Traffic@cityofmadison.com, parking@cityofmadison.com, parks@cityofmadison.com, Council@cityofmadison.com, district1@cityofmadison.com, district2@cityofmadison.com, district3@cityofmadison.com, district4@cityofmadison.com, district5@cityofmadison.com, district6@cityofmadison.cim, distict7@cityofmadison.com, district8@cityofmadison.com, district9@cityofmadison.com, District11@cityofmadison.com, district12@cityofmadison.com, district13@cityofmadison.com, distric14@cityofmadison.com, district15@cityofmadison.com, district16@cityofmadison.com, district17@cityofmadison.com, district18@cityofmadison.com, district19@cityofmadison.com, district20@cityofmadison.com, hstouder@cityofmadison.com, planning@cityofmadison.com  
**Subject:** Traffic/parking Issues for 6610 - 6706 Old Sauk Rd, Legistar 82950, 82972 and 82979, Please Post to Public Comments To All 3 Locations

Dear City of Madison,

Please see these traffic/parking photos today, Saturday, May 18th between the hours of 10am and 1pm on Old Sauk Rd(OSR)starting from Old Middleton Rd to Gammon Rd overflowing to the side streets, San Juan Trail, Sauk Ridge Trail, Blue Ridge Trail , Pebblebeach Dr, and Everglade Dr due to 2 events- Pierstoff auction and Crestwood elementary event.





Now imagine the traffic congestion during rush hour and school drop-offs 3x a day if Old Sauk Rd is lined with hundreds of parked cars from the proposed Stone House development and other future high density projects seeking to build on the OSR.

I oppose the proposed Stone House 138 Unit Apartment complex at 6610 - 6706 Old Sauk Rd for several reasons, including the potential increase in street parking and associated safety concerns for Old Sauk Rd and surrounding neighborhoods.

At the 3/13/24 Proposal Meeting, it was stated that renters would have to pay extra for parking spaces, leading to potential overflow onto the OSR and the side streets(Photo 1).



Similarly, San Juan Trail just across from the proposed project(Photo 2) would only allow one car to pass due to parked vehicles on both sides.





This could significantly narrow Old Sauk Rd, impacting visibility, its traffic flow and safety for buses, bicycles and cars. (Photo 3).







In the winter there is no alternative side parking on the OSR. Presently, that has never been an issue as there are very few occasions when cars park on-street overnight. Now, if you have persistent overnight parking, especially going into/through the winter that will cause its own “bottleneck” to road clearance and traffic. How will snow maintenance will cope with this case?

We urge city officials and all involved parties to carefully reconsider if this proposal is the right fit for this neighborhood.

Our goal is not opposition but rather to find a mutually beneficial solution that respects our community and safeguards its future.

Sincerely,  
Grace Kwon  
District 19