



1000 Friends of Wisconsin supports the City of Madison’s new Transit Oriented Development (TOD) overlay with the inclusion of historic districts. The United Nation’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) estimates that in order to prevent irreversible and catastrophic climate change, we must keep warming to less than 1.5 degrees Celsius. Transportation is the [largest contributor of carbon emissions in the United States](#), accounting for about 27% of all emissions and since land use and transportation are so closely linked, a TOD overlay is one of the best policy tools available to meaningfully make Madison a more sustainable community.

Madison has a growing population and a desperate need to increase the amount of housing available in an equitable manner. If we are going to grow in a responsible and sustainable way, we need to increase development intensity in the areas of the city with quality transit access. The city’s comprehensive plan already supports this strategy of infill development around transit-rich areas (Imagine Madison – Land Use and Transportation, Strategy 5 – Action A, amongst others).

As an organization that opposes sprawling, monolithic suburban development, 1000 Friends of Wisconsin is acutely aware of the need to preserve the spaces that make Wisconsin communities unique. However, a specific carve out for historic districts is unnecessary. The proposed TOD overlay is modest and not a threat to the character of our historic districts. The need to equitably address climate change and our existing housing challenges should be our top priority. The proposed TOD overlay will allow Madison to meaningfully address both. 1000 Friends of Wisconsin proudly supports the adoption of a TOD overlay, without a historic district carve out.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Gregg May".

Gregg May
Transportation Policy Director
1000 Friends of Wisconsin

Heiser-Ertel, Lauren

Subject: FW: Opposition to TOD Zoning Changes

From: Lutz <tklutz@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Monday, January 16, 2023 11:51 AM

To: Bannon, Katherine J <KBannon@cityofmadison.com>

Subject: Opposition to TOD Zoning Changes

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

Ms. Bannon,

We are writing to share our concerns regarding the zoning changes proposed in the Transit Overlay District. First, we feel there has been little transparency in communicating the implications of these changes with the neighborhoods that are most impacted by these zoning changes. We believe that these changes benefit developers at the expense of single family homeowners. We bought our modest home on Baltzell St. in the Dudgeon Monroe neighborhood because we wanted to live in an urban neighborhood of single family homes. We live on a close knit street where neighbors look after neighbors. By allowing developers to change single family homes into duplexes and renting to students, you are opening the doors that may displace permanent residents for a transient student population. **Increasing** the number of neighborhoods with stable, single-family homes should be the ultimate goal of the city. The zoning changes proposed for the Transit Overlay District risk destroying the aesthetic of some of Madison's neighborhoods. For many, the appeal to living in Madison is its unique urban neighborhoods. In your single-focused approach to adding additional housing, don't overlook the implications of how your decisions impact the urban aesthetic of Madison.

Please consider maintaining the current occupancy limits in the Dudgeon Monroe neighborhood to support a stable neighborhood with relatively high density single-family housing.

Thank you for your consideration,

Tammy Klaproth and Tim Lutz
730 Baltzell St.
Madison

From: [Gary Gruenisen](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: TOD?
Date: Monday, January 16, 2023 7:41:58 AM

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

Why should a "historic designation" preclude higher density development under this program.

The idea is bad in the first place, for all of us, whether we live in 100 year old homes or 60 year old homes.

This is unintended consequences toward an unachievable goal at it's worst.

By allowing tiny houses, duplexes, etc. in SF neighborhoods, people will continue to look elsewhere, outside the city, where affluent people already are flowing. How does this help mass transit.

Put this whole crazy idea in the trash, build more parking, and quit making it harder to live and drive in this city.

Express busses? Express trains? We won't use either, but will move out of the city.

Gary Gruenisen
Wisconsin Certified General Appraiser #55-10
Benchmark Appraisal Services Ltd.
5810 Piping Rock Road
Madison, WI 53711
Phone: (608) 445-4855
email (preferred): gruenisen@gmail.com

Heiser-Ertel, Lauren

Subject: FW: Please postpone vote, oppose stealth rezoning via BRT overlay, redefining 5 unrelated adults as family

From: Bottari, Mary <MBottari@cityofmadison.com>

Sent: Sunday, January 15, 2023 12:25 PM

To: Lynch, Thomas <TLynch@cityofmadison.com>; Stuehrenberg, Justin <JStuehrenberg@cityofmadison.com>; Sanon, Reuben A <RSanon@cityofmadison.com>; Stouder, Heather <HStouder@cityofmadison.com>

Subject: Fw: Please postpone vote, oppose stealth rezoning via BRT overlay, redefining 5 unrelated adults as family

From: Janet Schuresko <janet.schuresko@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, January 15, 2023 10:18 AM

To: All Alders

Cc: Bottari, Mary; Baumel, Christie; Vakunta, Linda

Subject: Please postpone vote, oppose stealth rezoning via BRT overlay, redefining 5 unrelated adults as family

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

Please oppose the zoning changes outlined by planning staff last Thursday night (Jan. 12), The public presentation was made a mere two business days before the vote. I urgently request this vote be postponed to allow more risk benefit analysis, examination of alternative proposals, and more public input. Last night's proposal would allow houses in single family districts within 1/4 mile of BRT routes to be converted to duplexes with an ADU without applying for special permitting, changing the character of neighborhoods, while driving up rents and housing prices, and driving single parent families, working families, middle class people, families with disabled members, and minorities out of the city, decreasing equity while increasing traffic and commuting which contribute to climate change. The changes would not significantly ameliorate the housing shortage predicted in the coming years, but would reduce the charm of older walkable neighborhoods that make the city so attractive to residents and visitors alike.

I also oppose the planning commission's attempt in December to redefine family for purposes of single family zoning to include up to five unrelated adults in all parts of the city. (Unfortunately, planning staff *forgot* to record the presentation at the start of the public meeting, so I am relying on notes about the justifications given. See my discussion of these justifications in my last paragraph. Please ask planning staff to present their justifications again, this time in a recorded public meeting.)

Together these proposals would potentially allow properties currently zoned as single family residences to be rented to 10-15 unrelated adults. This would make them attractive as student housing and a potential target for speculation and big absentee landlords. As you are aware, UW Madison has approximately 44,000 students but only 8000 dormitory beds (plus apartments housing an additional 2000 grad students and students with families). Planning staff reassured citizens in the December meeting that there would be no student pressure in single family neighborhoods because a few thousand new apartment units with amenities that might be attractive to students have been built lately. Can you help me understand these numbers?

Dorm rooms cost an average of \$740/ month. Students wanting single rooms might be prepared to pay more. Many of the houses located within the transportation corridor are actually closer to the UW campus than many dorms are. This means that a single family unit could potentially generate \$10,000-\$15,000/ month in rental income. Many well heeled parents have done the math and decide to buy a house for their student who then sublets to other students to cover mortgage costs, and sells at a profit after the student graduates, so even if the economics did not make sense for traditional slumlords, well heeled parents give their child a chance to practice being a property manager while avoiding dorm costs and becoming an absentee landlord after graduation. How could a single parent family, a minority family, an immigrant family, a family with dependent children, or a disabled dependent member, a family with a normal wage job, or a retired individual or couple compete in such a housing market?

This is not just an issue for officially designated historic districts. Less expensive housing areas to the west of the historic district near University Avenue will be especially attractive to students and hence to potential landlords. Most UW students living off campus have cars and drive them -- the bus routes will not solve traffic problems, but will contribute to parking problems and pressure to pave yards (or park on dirt if paving is regulated)

Many of the houses being de facto rezoned as duplexes are over 70 years old. Maintaining these houses requires constant attention and care, something not likely to be supplied by a landlord. Given that the law favors landlords over tenant rights, this is a dangerous situation since tenants who complain too loudly may not be allowed to renew their leases. In fact, many of the more modest houses west of the historic district had been used and abused as rentals before being rezoned as single family homes and being gradually restored by people of modest means who could not afford to buy in the official historic districts..

Rezoning single family homes as duplexes will not solve either the housing shortage or climate change, so citing these worthy goals as a way to cut off discussion is reprehensible.

One of the planning staff justified increasing family definition from 2 to 5 unrelated individuals by saying people were weaponizing zoning by only complaining about zoning violations when the violators caused noise or trash problems. Increasing the allowable number of residents would not solve this problem. For example, if five unrelated people rented a single family house and then several of them acquired live-in romantic partners, they would be violating zoning, and still subject to the theoretical 'weaponizing' if they created noise or trash problems. Generally neighbors mind their own business unless the house creates a problem with excessive late night noise, trash, cars blocking driveways, or similar common effects of overcrowded housing--this is not 'weaponizing' zoning, as zoning staff stated. A planning staff member said that the proper remedy was calling police, rather than relying on zoning I beg to differ: police have other priorities than trash in yards or loud parties, and repeatedly calling police would make for a hostile neighborhood atmosphere, and a potentially dangerous situation if neighbors first spoke directly to the problem renters before calling the police when the situation did not improve.

The purported justification for this change was that that defining family as people not related by blood or marriage would help single parent families afford housing (how? these families are already related to each other), help low income families (how when they would have to compete for rental housing with groups potentially having five to fifteen incomes) and increase racial diversity (how, when these properties would likely be rented by UW students, whose demographics are even less diverse than the city as a whole), and is needed because we are not living in the 1950's (obviously true--marriage equality laws are now in place now, making the change from 2 to 5 less needed than ever). All of this seems disingenuous. Whenever the stated reasons for a change appear to have little relation to the facts, it is time to pull back and gather more information.

Sincerely,
Janet Schuresko

From: [Steve](#)
To: [Tishler, Bill](#)
Cc: [Planning](#)
Subject: Transit Oriented Development Overlay yes!
Date: Saturday, January 14, 2023 9:53:06 AM

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

Alder Tischler,

I write to strongly support the adoption of the TOD overlay district with inclusion of historic districts, and hope you'll vote for it this Tuesday January 17th. This is a sensible way to channel long-term growth within a brilliantly planned transit corridor, and advances so many City projects and goals on a solid, slow-rebuild basis - BRT, accessibility, environmental goals/paved acreage reduction, tax base sustainability & more customers for local businesses, infrastructure funding. This part of Madison is reaching a tipping point of real walkability, and I'm proud every day to see denser unit increases like recently at Old Middleton/Whitney Way, or Mineral Point/Whitney Way a few years ago, absorbing at least some of the sprawl eating up fields 45 min+ from downtown. This is the right way to make it happen! It would be great to see duplexes start filtering into the neighborhood... and as a plus for those opposed, that will be a long and slow process of decades.

Thank you,
Steve Samuel
9 N Rosa Rd

To: allalders@cityofmadison.com

From: George Hall

RE: Legistar 74703, TOD Overlay District proposal

Date: 1/12/2023

This legislative packet is a complex assembly of proposed actions embodying several implementation strategies intended to assure enhanced usage of Madison's bus system investments, while expanding affordable housing availability and accommodating expected city population growth over the coming decades.

I reside in the Regent Neighborhood, in Madison Aldermanic District 5. While I support the overall intent of fostering increased housing accessibility and affordability, I do have some comments regarding how to achieve it. On behalf of my neighborhood I've been involved with activities such as the formation of the Joint West Campus Committee, triggering the R-2 zoning rewrite that preceded the adoption of the most recent city zoning code, and as a state employee responsible for the development and implementation of the state statute that led to wholesale land transfers to the City of Madison from the towns of Madison, Middleton, Burke, and Blooming Grove. In this instance, I am only speaking for myself, but like many city residents, I care about how the city looks, functions, and serves its residents.

Over time, how the transportation overlay district (TOD) proposal affects the existing TR-C2/C3 (traditional residential) zones ought to be a consideration.

But first, a technical suggestion: "Map 4: Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Overlay Zoning" illustrates that in the Regent Neighborhood the overlay district mostly includes parcels facing one another across a street. To minimize spillover TOD overlay effects, particularly in the affected portions of the TR-C2/C3 zones that cover the bulk of the neighborhood, I would suggest removing from the overlay boundary those parcels facing the 2600 block of Mason, those facing the 2700 block of Van Hise, and those facing the 2200 block of Chadbourne. Map 4 omits the historic district (also a subject for inclusion as an amendment). The other city TOD maps exhibit the same issue, where parcels on one side of the street are sometimes included at the periphery of the TOD overlay boundary, while those opposite are not included.

Why ought this to be of concern? Within the TOD boundary, removal of required minimum parking and useable lot area open space requirements, coupled with allowing construction of additional dwelling units or duplexes by adding a story to existing single-story structures, and/or permitting a second structure on a lot, etc., are going to have considerable spillover effects across the street for parcels that are not included within the proposed TOD, but nevertheless have the same TR-C2/C3 zoning designation. In brief, the TOD overlay proposal, if implemented, would replace the thinking and aesthetic design currently embedded in the TR-C2/C3 zoning requirements. If adoption is contemplated, at least reduce the potential for spillover effects.

Another practical problem associated with these policy changes is the absence of guidance in the TOD overlay proposal addressing how limited street parking will be allocated for the residents residing, or expected to reside, at each parcel (especially if the "family" designation, currently up for amendment, is changed). This is an issue for all streets included within the TOD boundary, as well as those streets bordering it. But implementing the TOD boundary using front lot lines for the blocks mentioned in the preceding paragraph, where only one block face is within the overlay zone, effectively means that the zone of transition becomes the entire street scape, so that any externalities, such as increased on-street vehicle parking demand

coming from those parcels within the TOD zone will be felt by the occupants of the houses across the street, that are not legally part of the zone.

A better solution is to consistently locate the TOD overlay zone boundary at the rear lot line wherever possible, at least partially reducing the potential regulatory headache, while softening the visual zone of transition. This is one of the more obvious unexplained challenges involving the TOD corridor design.

Yet another issue is the need to adequately define and clarify the placement and size of the allowable building footprint for each parcel with the district, especially as an additional dwelling unit with its own permitted footprint may be built on the same parcel as the existing dwelling. I suspect the fire department may have something to contribute here about clearances and access.

Despite the presence of the underlying TR-C2/C3 zoning, what is the perceived allowable count of persons expected to reside on an up-zoned parcel within the TOD boundary? Examples of permitted additional dwellings, and the redevelopment/remodeling of existing dwelling units on small and large lots would be helpful, if residents and voters are to fully understand what is being proposed, especially as on-site parking and minimum open space requirements are removed.

Candidly this is tantamount to rezoning residential districts through the back door. Why not remove the TR-C2/C3 zones from the proposed TOD overlay until objectives and implementation details for increasing affordable housing city-wide can be sorted out? What is proposed for the TR-C2/C3 on its face realistically requires lots to be combined if necessary housing supply scale is to be achieved any time soon. Is this the ultimate intent? If so, the overlay is not really the way to achieve it.

But inclusion of TR-C2/C3 zones begs the question of whether, in order to truly affect housing supply, and afford choice across a broad range of housing type, tenure, and price options, why not treat all residential zones in the City of Madison equally? Rather than affect a few neighborhoods in their entirety or by slicing them in half, why not consider similar zoning and housing density changes for all residential zones within the city? As currently designed, the residential component will take decades to have any substantial effect due to individual owners' vision, tolerance for risk, availability of capital (currently at 6.6%), etc. If Minneapolis and other cities that exist within a larger metropolitan area can face up to challenges like this and remove restrictive residential zoning (regardless of what the surrounding jurisdictions allow), and do city-wide what is narrowly proposed by the current TOD corridor overlay proposal, why not Madison? Here in Wisconsin, the City of De Pere is but one example of a municipality that effectively accomplished city-wide what Madison is only purporting to do in the TOD overlay zone. This is a better, more inclusive, equitable, and effective way to address a housing crisis, if that is the intent.

Thank you for reading!

From: [Karolyn Beebe](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Tonight's meeting on TOD overlay . . .
Date: Thursday, January 12, 2023 5:23:04 PM

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

as noted on here: [Transit-Oriented Development - Planning - DPCED - City of Madison, Wisconsin](#)

Dear Planners,

Madison Metro has taken me where I need to go and home again for 40+ years. My only wish has been for bus stops in the shade of canopy trees, cooling the roads, parked cars, and rooftops. They turn a bus stop into a wonderfully cool place to be, most of a Madison year. I usually find needed coolness and welcome shade provided by trees on private lands, -- the source of most of Madison's canopy.

At stops with limited tree space, imagine trellises of vines, their roots in beds cut into the concrete. Even wild grape vines would offer a wonderfully shady solution! And lately, I've also wished for a bench at every stop. That's what I consider a "pedestrian friendly" Madison Metro experience.

Many trees and land that supports them would be lost to development under the proposed Transit Oriented Development Overlay. (TOD Overlay).

At least 7 big trees would be lost if the owner of 222 Merry and 2 adjacent properties on Winnebago, carried out his development plans.

My backyard is already a 'raingarden' for much of his land, and flooding is increasing in the area as more runoff is forced into the Yahara river from hard surfaces elsewhere. So I also appreciate how big trees are able to suck up and transpire tons of water. The proposed TOD overlay invites chainsaws and more hard surfaces.

Please plan in favor of a healthy canopy over Madison.

Thank you
karolyn Beebe
220 Merry Street, 53704