

May 30, 224

Dear Plan Commission Member,

I am writing to object to the proposed development at 6610-6706 Old Sauk. I understand that Madison has a housing crisis, and I do not object to the big apartment complexes that have gone up near Hilldale, in downtown Middleton or in other walkable neighborhoods. I object specifically to this project, which violates many principles of good urban design. Yes, we have a housing crisis. But we shouldn't be responding to it by permitting building that destroys the environment, isolates people in enclaves, and more or less forces people into cars. Madison is supposed to be a progressive city; we should be pushing for progressive, high-quality urban design.

Many of the other high-rise apartment complexes that have gone up in the past five years are sited on land that was already built up. The Old Sauk project is not. The site is fallow FARMLAND that includes a barn that predates the Civil War. Google Earth shows it has extensive tree cover. People often justify high-density housing on the grounds that we shouldn't destroy farmland with our urban sprawl. In this case, ironically, high-density housing will not spare such land; it will take more of it. I'm not saying the site will ever be farmed again. I am saying it could easily be an engaging city park if we chose the community's good over the developer's.

My next point is that the site is not one that will allow the apartment complex to be well integrated with the neighborhood. In fact, the plan calls for a tall fence around the building that will wall it off from its neighbors. No apartment dweller will come to

know any single family homeowner by talking over this fence. Nor will the apartment dwellers be able to walk out of their units to go to nearby grocery stores, shops or restaurants BECAUSE THERE ARE NONE IN WALKABLE DISTANCE. Again the contrast with other high-rise projects at Hilldale or central Middleton, which are close to shops, or even the huge one at old Westgate, which at least has a walkable grocery store, could hardly be starker. Because nothing is in walkable distance of this part of Old Sauk, people who move into this apartment complex are going to feel isolated from, not integrated into, the neighborhood. What will they do on the weekend? Get in the car and drive somewhere more walkable?

Given that many in favor of high-density housing are justifying density as environmentally responsible, I also want to object to the absence of environmentally friendly features in the proposed design. In the meetings I attended, the developers made one weak comment that they MIGHT put solar panels on the roof, although they emphasized they were under no obligation to do so. Nothing was said about using heat pumps instead of natural gas for heating and cooling. What about eV charging stations? What about green spaces in the complex? What about energy-efficient appliances? What about eco-friendly building materials. CRICKETS. Nothing was said.

Obviously building for the climate crisis would be more expensive and therefore bad for the developer. But it would be good for the community. Where is the city of Madison on the good of the community, and why isn't it backing environmentally sound planning?

One final objection, which I know you've heard before: the impact of the project on traffic. Old Sauk itself and the surrounding roads are not designed to gracefully absorb a big influx of cars from the hundreds of residents who will live in this high-density project. Cars from the project all have to come into and go out of the property

the same way. There are no alternative routes into or out of the complex to absorb at least some traffic, because the project, as I've said, is walled off from the neighborhood. There is no back way. It's difficult to imagine what will happen during rush hour when there is a big blurt of traffic from this spot into this already busy road. Grim as it is, I predict major disruption, traffic injuries and deaths, and ultimately, when everyone is sick of chaos, complete and wholesale road redesign.

Of course the city will pick up the cost for altering the road network and the developer will walk away with the money raised by creating this mess.

I close by repeating that I am not objecting to all high density housing projects in Madison. I am objecting only to the project at 6610-6706 Old Sauk because it is so badly sited, will destroy beautiful green space, strand people in an unwalkable neighborhood and doesn't even pretend to address environmental concerns. Please veto this project. Thank you.

Lifelong Madison Resident,

Diana Lutz

dilutz@tds.net

From: [Fun to Build](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Cc: Ledell.Zellers@gmail.com; [Guequierre, John](#); [Fruhling, William](#); [Parks, Timothy](#)
Subject: Re: Escalator Clause, Stone House Development Proposal for 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd
Date: Friday, May 31, 2024 9:39:32 AM

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

Please post to Public Comments for Legistar #82950, 82972, 83477 and 82979 and for 6610 - 6706 Old Sauk Rd.

On Thu, May 30, 2024 at 12:01 PM Fun to Build <foster07cn@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Chair Zellers, Alder Guequierre, Interim Planning Director Fruhling and Mr. Parks,

We are opposed to the use of the Escalator Clause for the Stone House Development proposal for 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd. We respectfully ask that you do not allow the Escalator Clause to be used.

We find it quite astonishing that the 2018 Comprehensive Plan includes an enormous Escalation Clause to densify housing that could allow up to 70 DU/ac for LMR designated locations on arterial roads vs. 30 DU/ac for non-arterial roads. This is not just a small density bump up, but a whopping 133% increase. We can only assume that the authors of this clause had one objective in mind and that was to maximize densification to the greatest extent possible, with no regard to its unintended consequences and the huge impacts it could place on the surrounding neighborhoods.

Last year it was stated that because this clause created uncertainty with developers and residents the Revised 2023 Comprehensive Plan (Amended December 5, 2023) now includes this language for the future land use category Low-Medium Residential (LMR):
**Appropriate in select conditions at up to 70 DU/ac and four stories. Factors to be considered include relationships between proposed buildings and their surroundings, natural features, lot and block characteristics, and access to urban services, transit, arterial streets, parks, and amenities.

It is our understanding that this Escalation Clause has been used very little since 2018 or not at all, one exception could possibly be for a location on East Washington Ave which is obviously a very different street than Old Sauk Rd. It appears that there is no written process as to how these 8 factors will be formally reviewed and there are no detailed definitions of the eight factors. We can only hope that the analysis to be used will be fair and transparent.

So now we all face a Stone House Development proposal for 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd that requires the use of this Escalation Clause. Below is our analysis of the eight factors based on what we know about the property and the Stone House proposal.

1) Relationships between proposed buildings and their surroundings.

The proposed structure is huge, approximately 425' long, 40' high and with only a 30' setback from the curb of Old Sauk Rd, enormously large when compared to the

surrounding homes that surround up to one mile or more in all directions from the site. It is assumed that because of shadowing issues the structure has to be located very close to Old Sauk Rd, which then means the access driveway with all of its noise and light impacts is located to the back of the site, very close to neighboring homes. Homes in the neighborhoods have architectural styles with sloped roofs, most of them resembling Colonial, Mid-Century, French/English Country, not a Craftsman or Prairie style and not with flat roofs as being proposed. What is being proposed is not seamlessly integrated with the surrounding developments nor sustains aesthetic desirability compatible with the existing or intended characteristics of the area as defined and required in both the Comprehensive Plan and the Madison General Ordinances.

2) Natural features. This site is in a flood prone area per the City Flood Risk Map that extends from Old Sauk Rd across this site to E Spyglass Ct to Pebble Beach Dr. Today the site has a large depression that acts as a rain garden and this is proposed to be replaced with impervious roofs and driveways.

3) Lot and block characteristics. In this suburban residential area there are only lots and the surrounding lots sizes and setbacks follow existing zoning requirements. This enormously large structure, set so close to Old Sauk Rd is totally inconsistent and does not follow the existing lot characteristics of the area.

4) Access to urban services. We assume urban services to be defined as sanitary sewers, water, fire protection, parks, streets, roads and mass transit. We assume that all of these services will be available to this property. However, it is known that the Old Sauk Rd stormwater sewers are woefully undersized.

5) Transit. Old Sauk Rd does have limited bus service, but it is not a BRT route. The bus is only used by M-F commuters and university students, despite the hopes of some, it is not used to access amenities or for shopping.

6) Arterial streets. Old Sauk Rd is a two lane, minor arterial road with use of over 10,000 vehicles per day, including many emergency vehicles. It is not a Principal arterial road, not on or close to the BRT corridor, not in the Regional Corridor and Growth Priority Area and not in the Preferred Transit Oriented Development Area. It has bike lanes on both sides, one lightly used south side parking lane and it will surely have safety issues if and when increased parking was to occur as a result of this proposal.

7) Parks. There are two parks in the vicinity, one located on Everglades Dr and the other on Pebble Beach Dr. It is surprising that the Stone House proposal has no playground proposed or features for children, but does have adult facilities like Bocce.

8) Amenities. This is a suburban residential area, there are no amenities close by, there are no amenities that can be walked to. Taking a bus or riding a bike to the closest amenities would be very time consuming for this location and doesn't happen, despite the hopes of some. The closest grocery store is approximately 2 miles away. To be honest for this location, a vehicle is required to access amenities, always has and will always be.

Sincerely, Gary and Barb Foster
6506 Old Sauk Rd

From: [Guequierre, John](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Fw: Stone House development
Date: Thursday, May 30, 2024 11:41:31 AM
Attachments: [alder_role_brochure_2012.pdf](#)

From: Timothy Burns <tjburns@fastmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2024 11:18 AM
To: Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Stone House development

[You don't often get email from tjburns@fastmail.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.

I sent an email to allalders@cityofmadison, so I assume you got my email on my main issues with the Stone House development. I am writing specifically to you as I have had people telling me you are posting such nonsense as that we are "afraid of renters". I rented for years before I was able to afford to buy a house! Why should I be afraid of people who are like I myself was? Rather than posting such things, how about coming around and talking to some of us?

I know early on you stated something to the effect that you didn't take an oath to this neighborhood, but to the City of Madison. We don't elect alders at large here, we elect by alder district. I know we didn't elect you, and my understanding is that the Common Counsel, which seems to entirely support this type of project, appointed you. It really sounds like your allegiance is to them, not to us. It has been clear that your personal opinion is also at odds with that of your constituents. However, your obligation is to represent the people of your district. It is not to post nonsense to make it appear that our opposition is petty, but to explain the real reasons for our opposition.

My understanding is that the majority of those who have contacted you from the district are opposed to this development. When are you going to take a position that represents that point of view?

I did look up the duties of an alder in Madison; the only official thing I could find was a flyer from 2012. I'm attaching it for your perusal. Please note the items under "The Core Alder Job". I has been pretty obvious that you disagree with the opinions of the majority of your constituents who have expressed an opinion, and that the Common Counsel also disagrees. If the information in this flyer is out of date, please provide me with the latest publication on the subject.

I understand that you were on the board of a neighborhood that suffered from the 2018 flood. Given the runoff potential of paving 4 acres uphill from our street, I don't understand how you would to have this neighborhood deal with water issues like that.

I try not to be so blunt in my communications, but I see no other way to express my displeasure with your "representation". If I am in error in stating your positions in this matter, please let me know.

Timothy Burns
17 E Spyglass Ct
Madison

Need to know more about City Government?

The City of Madison Government Resource Guide can help!

www.cityofmadison.com/Council/councilmembers/resourceGuide.cfm

Here you will find:

- Board, Commission, Committee Information & Procedures
- City Organizational Chart
- Information on the Budget Process
- Open Meetings Law
- Information on the Mayor and Common Council
- Information on individual City Departments//Divisions



Still have questions?
Contact Council Staff at
(608) 266-4071 or
council@cityofmadison.com

Genuine politics - even politics worthy of the name - the only politics I am willing to devote myself to - is simply a matter of serving those around us: serving the community and serving those who will come after us. Its deepest roots are moral because it is a responsibility expressed through action, to and for the whole. - Václav Havel (Czech politician)

Madison Common Council Office

210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
Room 417
Madison WI 53703

Phone: 608-266-4071
Fax: 608-267-8669
E-mail: council@cityofmadison.com

City of Madison
Common Council

What is an Alder's Role in the City of Madison?



cityofmadison.com/council

What is an Alder's Role in the City of Madison?

The Basics

Conduct yourself in a professional manner.

Attend and participate at Council Meetings.

Be available to constituents.

Follow all Ethics rules and other applicable standards of conduct.



Common Council
www.cityofmadison.com/council

City's Ethics Code
www.cityofmadison.com/attorney/ethics

The Core Alder Job

Advocate for your district and your constituents in the City process.

Serve on City committees as appointed and be an active, prepared and equal participant.



Communicate actively with your constituents in multiple ways (e.g. listservs, newsletters, website, and meetings) about City resources and issues, policy debates, development proposals, and other relevant information.

Participate fully in the process of developing and approving the annual City Budget.

Communicate the needs and views of your constituents to City staff, committees and the Council.

City Committee Information
www.cityofmadison.com/mayor/mycommit

City Budgets
www.cityofmadison.com/finance/budget



Additional Important Responsibilities

Act as a liaison between the committees you serve on and the Council; and sponsor legislation for those committees.

Participate in the development and implementation of a Council Legislative Agenda.

Prepare and educate yourself and your constituents on city-wide and/or controversial policy topics or issues that come before the Council, and engage in the debate and decision-making process around them.

Advance policy issues important to your district and the City.

Help make City government accessible and welcoming to all Madison residents.

Resident Information
www.cityofmadison.com/residents

From: [Kim Bunke](#)
To: ledell.zellers@gmail.com; [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Fruhling, William](#); [Parks, Timothy](#)
Subject: Re: Opposition to the proposed Stone House Development for 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road, Plan Commission Meeting on 6/10/2024, Legistar Nos. 82950, 82972, 82979
Date: Wednesday, May 29, 2024 12:05:02 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from kmbunke@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,

I wish this email to be filed in the three above Legistar Numbers.

These properties shouldn't be combined before development. If anything, they should be further divided, to allow an effective margin of stormwater-permeable surface around any buildings to be erected upon them.

Sincerely,
Kim Bunke
Woodland Hills

From: [FMS](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Guequierre, John](#); ledell.zellers@gmail.com; [All Alders](#); [Planning](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); hstrouder@cityofmadison.com
Subject: Opposition to Stone House Development project at 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road (Legistar Nos. 82950, 82972, 82979)
Date: Monday, May 27, 2024 11:02:29 AM

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

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

To Plan Commission Chair Zellers and Alder Guequierre:

I am writing in opposition to the proposed demolition permit, conditional use and Certified Survey Map associated with the Stone House Development project at 6610 – 6706 Old Sauk Road.

The size and density of the project is inappropriate for this location.

The proposed multi-story structure would tower over the surrounding mature, stable neighborhood.

Adjoining and nearby residents who have invested in and maintained their homes for decades in a sought-after low-density setting would now be faced with increased traffic, noise and disruption from an incongruous, high-density apartment complex.

A preferred proposal for this location would retain the current wooded condition and history of the farm as green space.

If new construction is inevitable, then a far better land use example can be found just a block away – the lower-impact development at Sauk Woods Court.

I request that the City Plan Commission and the Common Council reject the current proposal in favor of a project that is consistent with the prevailing residential density of the neighborhood.

Thank you.

Frederick M. Swed, Jr., P.E.
6313 Appalachian Way
Madison, WI 53705

<!--[if !supportLineBreakNewLine]-->
<!--[endif]-->

From: jan.lehman7795@gmail.com
To: [All Alders](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Guequierre, John](#)
Subject: Old Sauk Road: Demo Permit - 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road, 82950/cond Use - 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, 82972/CSM-6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, 82979
Date: Saturday, May 25, 2024 4:16:29 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from jan.lehman7795@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Please note our objections to this proposed project.

We are 100% opposed to the project as presented as it creates many negative impacts to our home which is adjacent to the facility. The footprint of this proposal is too large for the property.

Watershed and flooding issues are a primary concern as well as 24/7 lights and noise from the property. Increased traffic on Old Sauk Road and limited access to the property from the street are issues as well. With recent storms and rain, our sump pumps are working overtime.

The water issues created by this project will only increase our concerns for where storm runoff will collect or travel. (Most likely in our basements and yards!) Current zoning is adequate for development of the property versus changing zoning to meet the needs of a building that will be too large and an eyesore to our lovely neighborhood.

Jan and Ernest Lehman
10 Saint Andrews Circle
Madison, WI 53717
608-831-2682

Sent from my iPad

From: [Guequierre, John](#)
To: [Tanner](#)
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Re: Old Sauk Rd. Proposal, Files #82972 & 82979
Date: Thursday, May 23, 2024 3:19:35 PM

Hello, Tanner,

Thanks for your input. I'm adding your comments to the official Plan Commission comments file.

John Guequierre
district19@cityofmadison.com
608.571.3530

From: Tanner <tanbob2@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 6:26 AM
To: Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: Plan Commission Comments <pccomments@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Old Sauk Rd. Proposal, Files #82972 & 82979

Some people who received this message don't often get email from tanbob2@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear Alder John Guequierre and other Plan Commission members,

I support this Stone House proposal as a rough idea, please see my three main comments below.

Section summary: as our oldest neighbors move on, younger neighbors will experience any zoning changes frankly.

To add to those who email you "We'll soon be dead or moved to a nursing home," please note these folks who oppose change—like multi-family housing—will soon be dead or moved to a nursing home frankly. Their input, no matter how strong—since they have much more time for civic involvement—should not outweigh younger community members who will live in Madison for decades after any residential developments.

Section summary: consider and maybe ask how community members would feel if Stone House developed senior housing on the site.

While some proposal opponents claim a "deeper fear of the kind of people who would live in the Stone House project" and an "intrusion of renters will inevitably degrade that sense of neighborhood," I wonder what these opponents would think if it is senior housing. Future neighbors are renters regardless but discriminating against neighbors based on age is ageism, not racism as addressed in District 19 blog posts.

Also, this current market-rate proposal has the same story count as three-story homes with no subsidized units contrary to a "dark canyon of high-rise apartment projects . . . with subsidized units" notion.

Thanks,
Tanner

"The only thing we have to fear is fear itself" - FDR

From: [Guequierre, John](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Fw: Whence the Red No-Rezoning Signs?
Date: Thursday, May 23, 2024 3:05:24 PM
Attachments: [Side-by-Side Comparison of SH Site Context Pix.pdf](#)

From: the-greens31@charter.net <the-greens31@charter.net>
Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2024 4:14 PM
To: Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Whence the Red No-Rezoning Signs?

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

Greetings, Alder John

We've met two nights this last week, "on the circuit", at Tishler's Town Hall and the West Side Budget Engagement event. It's good to see we have the same interests. And, thank you for your blog articles "Why is the Middle Missing" & "Why are there 'No-Rezoning' Yard Signs on Old Sauk Road?"

As you have to meld the concerns and voices over the entire District, how you view issues, and then give voice to a consensus, carries considerable importance. On the other hand, we in opposition to the Stone House proposal, as it stands, have a much lesser voice, and face an uphill challenge to be as clear as possible in message and communicating that message. I understand you've had a lot of feedback, some or most of which can be ... discordant. We certainly can't speak of the whole, but what follows is somewhere between largely and entirely consistent with the "local" group immediately around the Pierstorff Farm with whom we are in good communication.

Let me say, as simply as possible, these are the "3 legs of the stool" for our position, in no particular order:

1. There is a **technical issue and concern with stormwater handling, runoff, and mitigation**. North-side neighbors to the farm suffered during the August 2018 deluge, and that was then under conditions of substantially undeveloped land that was permeable and could absorb rainfall. A great amount of detail has been generated on this point, and, as you've visited the site, and spoken with these neighbors, there isn't any more to be added here.
2. **Massing and setbacks** have to be found that are agreeable not just to the City but mutually with the neighboring community. Pardon this qualitative, subjective, personal opinion: Even now at 3-stories (originally at 4) the height, length (about 400 ft), and setbacks are ... appalling. Unfortunately, we do not have the Stone House 3D CAD model to work with. As a lesser 2D substitute/approximation I put together the attached Side-by-Side Comparison using some of the Stone House "comparables" [qualifications, mostly obvious, upon request]. In the "worst case" comparison to Settlers Woods, its setback from the curb is about 84 ft (and its length along Old Sauk is substantially less) whereas setback for the Stone House building ranges from roughly 35-40 ft; the impact of these two developments is

substantially different.

3. The development is exclusively apartment-only rental , that is there is **no Missing Middle housing, especially as could provide stakeholder equity**. As mentioned, below, I think it is universally agreed that Missing Middle housing is not only desirable but has its own building crisis greater than that for more, and more apartments. Yes, I've heard the historical impediments to now building Missing Middle housing; but, in Madison especially, that should be taken as a challenge, not a brick wall. The City does have the zoning and use tools, I believe, to move in that direction. I'm just beginning discussion with a local real broker (Troy Thiel) who does not feel it is impossible to build Missing Middle developments in today's environment. This is all a work in progress. But - Why is Missing Middle especially desirable for us (besides filling the accepted need)? First, it offers the possibility of ownership and the greater likelihood of permanent residence, literally and figuratively invested in the neighborhood. Secondly, it would be family oriented with children going to local schools. Last I looked, the Stone House development has a pool, a bocce ball court, and a dog park ... with no recognition of a family (think playground) orientation; this may reflect on exactly who their target renters really are. Thirdly, one would hope to keep the scale and setbacks down and provide a better architectural diversity.

The 2nd and 3rd points are very much a part of what we consider "*neighborhood character*". We are neither naïve nor ignorant of how this phrase can be pejoratively interpreted despite that lack of meaning or intent on our part; so, to avoid misinterpretation, let me use these words from the Comprehensive Plan as the intended meaning for the 2nd point: "This also underscores the importance of ensuring redevelopment can integrate well with its surroundings through context-sensitive design and scale." As to the 3rd point, the intent is to further invested-family housing that participates, thrives, integrates, and grows within the community.

You might well ask at this point – What does a red No Rezoning sign mean? Good question – It's the closest we could come in a simplistic message to drivers-by that communicates our lack of support for the pending development of the Pierstorff Farm. Other, longer wordings are certainly conceivable. But the real complaint is to find better use with an intermediate level of zoning, compatible with the above, which the City will accept. So far, this is simply not the case.

Normally, I would have started with the following, but, rather, I will close with it. As always, discussions should agree on the commonality of different perspectives. Presently these include the following which have never been at issue with us:

- There will be development of the Pierstorff farm
- Development will be of greater density than is presently the case, there
- Madison, Dane County, and the country face a housing shortage

But, there are other points of common agreement:

- There is a dearth of alternative, Missing Middle housing, including any with shareholder equity (i.e. non-rental)
- Affordability is also an important consideration


Together, these determine the direction for development toward higher density. Given that the stormwater issue must be resolved, we are only in disagreement about, fundamentally, scale and use. Yes, we must collectively work out the pathway to Missing Middle housing, and the City would have to compromise on “maximizing opportunity”. When problem solving, with multiple constraints and viewpoints, “optimizing opportunity” for both the City and the local community would be a preferable goal; presently, there is no evident optimization process. One of our greatest concerns about the West Area Plan is this direction-without-limits mantra. There is no recognition of how high, how dense, or how fast the City is willing to grow; worse, there is no recognition of how far extant residents are willing to, and should have to, go in the City’s process of accepting a greater, and greater, and greater population within fixed city limits. Renters will continue to be an ever increasing percentage (presently around 50%, I believe) of Madisonians, wholly dependent on landlords. Rental rates are going up (highest in the nation according to Channel 3). This is not a solution to affordability.

Regards,
Mike & Sam (aka Lynn) Green
6709 Old Sauk Rd
Madison



- HIGH ROOF 136'-2"
- ROOF 133'-0"
- THIRD FLOOR 122'-4"
- SECOND FLOOR 111'-2"
- FIRST FLOOR 100'-0"
- PARKING LEVEL 88'-0"

2 SOUTH ELEVATION
A201 1/18" = 1'-0"






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




- HIGH ROOF 136'-2"
- ROOF 133'-8"
- THIRD FLOOR 122'-4"
- SECOND FLOOR 111'-2"
- FIRST FLOOR 100'-0"
- PARKING LEVEL 89'-0"

2 SOUTH ELEVATION
A201 1/18" = 1'-0"






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






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




C




- 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
A201
1/16" = 1'-0"





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



From: [Guequierre, John](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Fw: [District 19] West Side Plan and Stone House Apt. bldg.
Date: Thursday, May 23, 2024 2:50:15 PM

From: noreply <noreply@cityofmadison.com>
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2024 5:07 PM
To: Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: [District 19] West Side Plan and Stone House Apt. bldg.

Recipient: District 19: John P. Guequierre
Fri, 05/17/2024 - 17:03

John Norman

he/him

709 Blue Ridge Pkwy

Madison, Wisconsin. 53705 Yes, by email. jawnorman@gmail.com District 19 West Side Plan and Stone House Apt. bldg. Comments on Madison's West Side Planning Process

I strenuously object to the draft West Area Plan, which is an affront to the purpose of zoning in the first place. The TR-U2 re-zoning is wholly inappropriate for this residential area. Old Sauk Road is already a very congested road at the rush hour times and can be dangerous. Adding several hundred persons in an apartment building would be irresponsible in terms of safety. After studying the "City of Madison Urban Forestry Task Force Final Report", it is not evident to me that those promoting west side densification have even read this report, which provides excellent documentation of how Madison has fallen behind in maintaining a healthy urban environment for its residents. The American Forests Association identifies an overall urban tree cover of 40% as healthy for human habitation—the latest survey measured a paltry 23% urban tree cover, the same value as Chicago. Pittsburg has a canopy cover of 42% and is increasing that to 60%. Raleigh N.C., a city only slightly larger than Madison, and also a capital city, has 55% tree cover. How many mature trees are to be removed as the west side is densified and where and when will they be replaced. Trees provide many benefits that are both esthetic and practical—especially mature trees like the ones to be removed to build the Stone House 136-unit apartment building. The most important trees in the city are the street trees, and this proposed apartment building is built so close to Old Sauk Road that eight feet is not likely to be available for street trees along Old Sauk—leaving a stark, ugly gap if the trees lining that road. We need to increase our urban tree cover not continue to decrease it. In Recommendation 4 under "Zoning" the taskforce recommended a removal cost of \$500-\$1000 per inch of diameter breast height to be borne by the developer. Is this being implemented with the West Side planning? This Taskforce report is a plea to the planners of the City of Madison to take trees more seriously, not view adequately treed areas, like the west side, as opportunities to densify and compromise tree cover. Projects like the development at Ridge St. and Harvey St where all the mature trees were removed and plans included new trees to be planted; however, developers changed their minds and never planted the trees. No matter the reason, such planning errors are unconscionable.

I am not against developing that 3.8-acre site, but it must be something more in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood. Once this monstrosity is built, it will stand for 50 years, whereas the projection of a net 2000 housing units short in the future could change tomorrow with a sudden drop in the currently unstable stock market, just as happened in 2008; or worse, it could happen during construction, and we would be left with a half-built apartment building.

Yours Respectfully,
John Norman, 709 Blue Ridge Pkwy, Madison, WI 537

From: [Guequierre, John](#)
To: [Ann Conroy](#)
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Re: Development on Old Sauk
Date: Thursday, May 23, 2024 2:48:20 PM

Hello, Ann,

Thanks for your input. I'm copying it to the official Plan Commission web site so that all of the Plan Commissioners have access to it.

John Guequierre
district19@cityofmadison.com
608.571.3530

From: Ann Conroy <annjconroy@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2024 5:14 PM
To: Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Development on Old Sauk

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

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

I have lived in Parkwood Hills since 1989. I bought two homes here because of it's location to schools, pool, easy access to country roads for biking, quietness etc. I am so upset that there is consideration of high density housing in this area. I am not a NIMN. If a smaller, less dense apartment building went up that fit the style of the neighborhood, I would be supportive, but the 3 buildings that have been proposed are wrong for this neighborhood. First of all, I can hardly turn left on Blue Ridge, now due to so many cars going down Old Sauk. Those cars stick to the main roads to get people to work, but if you increase the density, there will be cars racing through Parkwood Hills to get to Mineral Point or the beltline where there are more lanes for traffic. The architecture of the proposed building is not in line with the neighborhood.

There are already run-off issues in the area and building will add to it. It is 91 times larger than the 4 houses across the street- take that in. That is way out of proportion. There are no other high density buildings in this area.

I hope that you listen to all the people in the surrounding neighborhoods who are against this plan. I appreciate your hearing my opinion.

From: [Guequierre, John](#)
To: [Mark Alan Kraft](#)
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Re: Old Sauk Rd proposed development and rezoning...
Date: Thursday, May 23, 2024 2:08:25 PM

Hi, Mark,

Thank you for your input. I'm also copying it to the official Plan Commission site for resident comments.

All the best,

John Guequierre
district19@cityofmadison.com

From: Mark Alan Kraft <makraft66@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 8:03 AM
To: Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Old Sauk Rd proposed development and rezoning...

You 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.

This is supposed to go to Alder Guequierre!! I got this address when I copied and pasted! 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: [Mark Alan Kraft](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Old Sauk](#)
Subject: Old Sauk Road Development rezoning proposal
Date: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 8:08:39 AM

You 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: [Tanner](#)
To: [Guequierre, John](#)
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Old Sauk Rd. Proposal, Files #82972 & 82979
Date: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 6:27:11 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from tanbob2@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear Alder John Guequierre and other Plan Commission members,

I support this Stone House proposal as a rough idea, please see my three main comments below.

Section summary: as our oldest neighbors move on, younger neighbors will experience any zoning changes frankly.

To add to those who email you "We'll soon be dead or moved to a nursing home," please note these folks who oppose change—like multi-family housing—will soon be dead or moved to a nursing home frankly. Their input, no matter how strong—since they have much more time for civic involvement—should not outweigh younger community members who will live in Madison for decades after any residential developments.

Section summary: consider and maybe ask how community members would feel if Stone House developed senior housing on the site.

While some proposal opponents claim a "deeper fear of the kind of people who would live in the Stone House project" and an "intrusion of renters will inevitably degrade that sense of neighborhood," I wonder what these opponents would think if it is senior housing. Future neighbors are renters regardless but discriminating against neighbors based on age is ageism, not racism as addressed in District 19 blog posts.

Also, this current market-rate proposal has the same story count as three-story homes with no subsidized units contrary to a "dark canyon of high-rise apartment projects . . . with subsidized units" notion.

Thanks,
Tanner

"The only thing we have to fear is fear itself" - FDR

View project details on the project page: [https://www.giscloud.com/Viewer/1000-Park-Road-New-York-NY](#)

Caution: This report was generated using data from the City of New York's Department of Transportation's OpenStreetMap data.

View City of New York's OpenStreetMap data: [https://data.cityofnewyork.org/transportation/openstreetmap-data](#)



This image shows the traffic congestion along the street and the impact of the proposed development on the surrounding area. The image shows a long line of cars parked along the street, which is a result of the proposed development and the surrounding area's high density of parking spaces.



This image shows the impact of the proposed development on the surrounding area, specifically the impact on the street's capacity and the surrounding area's high density of parking spaces.



In the United States an alternative to side parking on the street. However, this has been shown to cause an increase in the number of accidents when used on street streets. Thus, if you have a passenger vehicle parked especially along the street that will cause an issue. "Bike lanes" for road users and safety. Here will see numerous still open with the street.

The goal is not to create a road that is completely unusable, especially if it is possible to use the road for the purpose of the road.

The goal is not to create a road that is completely unusable, especially if it is possible to use the road for the purpose of the road.

However, the goal is not to create a road that is completely unusable, especially if it is possible to use the road for the purpose of the road.

From: [Fun to Build](#)
To: Ledell.Zellers@gmail.com; [Guequierre, John](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Fruhling, William](#)
Subject: 6610 - 6706 Old Sauk Rd, Legistar 82950, 82972 and 82979, Please Post to Public Comments To All 3 Locations
Date: Saturday, May 18, 2024 3:00:54 PM

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

Dear Alder Guequierre and Chair Zellers,

There are many reasons why we oppose the proposed Stone House 138 Unit Apartment complex at 6610 - 6706 Old Sauk Rd, one being all the new potential street parking and its associated safety concerns that will impact Old Sauk Rd and the surrounding neighborhoods.

At the 3/13/24 Proposal Meeting we were told renters will not be required to rent a parking space which means there will be lots of street parking on Old Sauk Rd (Photo 1 below) and into the adjacent neighborhoods (Photo 2 shows San Juan Trail). Street parking will also come from families renting one apartment and owning more than one vehicle.

In Photo 1 you can see how Old Sauk Rd is narrowed significantly with street parking. Given that Old Sauk Rd is only a two lane road, that it carries a huge volume of traffic, that it is a major route for emergency vehicles and that it is sometimes slippery due to snow, ice and rainwater, this is a safety concern. In Photo 3 you can see how narrow the road becomes when a bus and vehicle are opposing each other. You can actually see in the photo how the bus has moved to the yellow centerline and the opposing vehicle has moved into the bicycle lane. Not a safe situation.

In Photo 2, vehicles parking on both sides of San Juan Trail narrow the street so significantly that only one vehicle can pass through at a time. Not a safe situation.

In Photo 3, imagine if there were a bicyclist using the bicycle lane with the parked vehicles. The bicyclist will move approximately 3' from all of the parked vehicles to avoid being hit by a potentially opening door. In this situation if there was also a bicyclist using the right bicycle lane, plus the parked vehicles, the left bicyclist moved over 3', the bus and the vehicle opposing the bus, there would not be enough room for all. Not a safe situation.

We simply ask because of this one unsafe situation alone, you do not approve this project as proposed.

Sincerely, Gary and Barb Foster
6506 Old Sauk Rd





From: Steve Mason
To: Frubling, William; Guequerra, John; ledell.zellers@gmail.com; Parks, Timothy; Plan Commission Comments
Cc: friendsofoldsauk@gmail.com
Subject: Re: Old Sauk Road / proposed development
Date: Thursday, May 16, 2024 11:15:13 AM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from smason65@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.

In an attempt to place the Stone House Project application for change of zoning to TR-U2 in the proper context I offer these two attachments.



As the above illustrates, this project is widely discordant with the current street scape. The violation of the front yard setback from that required for the adjacent dwellings in the SR zone will increase the apparent height of the already overly tall 3stories+ and provide for a looming presence along Old Sauk Road. It will dwarf all those structures nearby including a neighboring 32 unit apartment complex. In its current form this apartment building will offer an extremely odd presence as there would be no other structure of this scale anywhere nearby. The only other large scale structures from Gammon road to Old Middleton are St. Thomas Church and Crestwood school. They both are well set back from Old Sauk. The extremely large footprint covers a large portion of the site. I realize that the city seeking more high density housing, however this proposal is way over the top. There is multi family housing and zoning in the area to accommodate it. A change to an Urban zoning from an SR zoning should be denied.

Why is this bloated oversized project seemingly being forced into this neighborhood?

Steve Mason
Woodland Hills
District 19 resident

From: [Zellers, Benjamin](#)
To: [Micaela Sullivan-Fowler](#); [Guequierre, John](#)
Cc: peter.fowler@outlook.com
Subject: RE: Opposition to the Stone House Development on Old Sauk Rd.
Date: Wednesday, May 15, 2024 2:20:11 PM

Hello Micaela –

Thank you for sharing your concerns - I have passed along your email to be included with comments to the Plan Commission. I am not part of the staff team reviewing the proposal you mention below.

- Ben

Ben Zellers, AICP, CNU-A

City of Madison Planning Division
608-266-4866

From: Micaela Sullivan-Fowler <Micaela.Sullivan-Fowler@outlook.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2024 10:54 AM
To: Zellers, Benjamin <BZellers@cityofmadison.com>; Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: peter.fowler@outlook.com
Subject: Opposition to the Stone House Development on Old Sauk Rd.

Some people who received this message don't often get email from micaela.sullivan-fowler@outlook.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear Ben and John,

I (we) join our fellow Old Sauk Rd. residents in strongly, tenaciously opposing the proposal by Stone House developers for a 130+ unit structure on Old Sauk Rd. In addition to all the reasons we've suggested, and you've heard on other meetings; flooding concerns, parking concerns on the street and on the side streets, light pollution, loss of habitat and throughways for "wild" animals, obstruction of the bike lane, running roughshod over the zoning realities, etc.-

I would like to add that I do bicycle on that road (all the way to and from campus), I also take the MTA R bus, and we had children that attended Crestwood School. Very few people from the Old Sauk neighborhoods seem to take the bus- usually relying on their cars, making Old Sauk already, as we call it, Old Sauk speedway, rarely paying attention to the speed limit and backing up enormously when Crestwood is starting and finishing. Adding, what, 100-200+ cars to that traffic trajectory every day seems unthinkable.

And, all those cars coming from the side streets or the Stone House Parking garage come right onto the bike lane, making that even more often unnerving than it already is. Additionally, I

think we walked our children to school only a handful of times- our side of Old Sauk does not have a sidewalk, it is dangerous to cross Old Sauk, and again, the congestion of all those cars bunching at the crossing guard every morning and afternoon would only get worse with the Stone House structure. This is NOT a walking-to-shops neighborhood. The nearest shops are far off Gammon or into Middleton or towards campus.

The only remotely walkable structure is maybe St. Thomas. Or, the Oak Crest Tavern at the very bottom of Old Sauk. Very few people ever walk to either of those. They walk in their neighborhoods to enjoy the trees, gardens, etc., or to enjoy Owen Conservation Park.

The new tenants will most likely NOT be walking to shops or work- and that means MORE cars and parking and traffic- returning to my original overarching concern. Old Sauk DOES NOT need more cars...(or a 130+ unit structure). Thank you for listening.

Micaela Sullivan-Fowler and Peter Fowler
6410 Old Sauk Rd.
Madison, WI 53705
608 658-8821

From: [Rick Jenison](#)
To: ledell.zellers@gmail.com
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Fruhling, William](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Guequierre, John](#)
Subject: 6610 -6706 Old Sauk Road proposed development
Date: Wednesday, May 15, 2024 1:03:55 PM

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

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

Re: Opposition to the Stone House Development for 6610 -6706 Old Sauk Road. -- Plan Commission Meeting on June 10, 2024. Legistar Nos. 82950, 82972, 82979.

Dear Plan Commission Chair Zellers,

While we support reasonable, common-sense development of the Old Sauk Road parcels, we are adamantly opposed to Stone House's unreasonable proposal for the following reasons:

- The project would increase the risk of substantial flooding to neighborhood homes and yards.
- This building will be 40 feet in height towering over adjacent properties and extending down Old Sauk Road significantly longer than a football field.
- The property is 19 times larger than the apartment building next door. It lacks the setbacks that make all of the nearby properties, including multi-family properties, and the entire existing neighborhood so attractive and cohesive.
- The project would subject the neighborhood to noise 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.
- TR-U rezoning exists to "stabilize and protect and encourage the essential characteristics of high-density residential areas...". This area is low-density. The Stone House Development proposal for rezoning to TR-U2 should be rejected.
- It is inconceivable that Old Sauk Road can provide the infrastructure for several hundred more cars. Old Sauk Road is not a major arterial road. It is dangerously congested at peak times. The Ayres traffic impact analysis requested by the city of Madison predicts a post-build level of service rating of 'E' (severe congestion: Volumes nearing capacity) at the intersection of Old Middleton and Old Sauk at PM peak. There is no obvious way to

expand the current two-lane Old Sauk Road to accommodate the increase in traffic. In the last several years traffic volume has increased significantly in Parkwood Hills. One of the many negative consequences of approving this proposal is that Everglade Drive, San Juan Trail, Blue Ridge Parkway and North Yellowstone Drive will increasingly serve as conduits between Mineral Point Road and Old Sauk Road for the additional Stone House vehicles. Not only will traffic be severely congested in our suburban neighborhood streets, but the inflow streets south of Old Sauk will almost certainly serve as overflow street parking in excess of the available on-site parking spaces (168), which are not included in the rent. It is telling that the West Area Plan has proposed to connect the Yosemite Place cul-de-sac to Yosemite Trail presumably to further accommodate the increase traffic flow into Parkwood Hills from the nearby Stone House development ingress/egress. The West Area Plan contains very few proposed changes to road connectivity. Why is this particular cul-de-sac, developed in the early 1960s, just now being targeted for decommissioning?

The high-density Stone House proposal should be rejected in its current form in favor of a reasonable common-sense lower-density development maintaining the current LMR land use without the escalator clause.

Sincerely,

Rick and Delores Jenison
505 San Juan Trail

CC: Alder John Guiquierre, Acting Planning Division Director Bill Fruhling, Planner Timothy Parks

From: [Jaime Madden](#)
To: ledell.zellers@gmail.com
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Fruhling, William](#); [Parks, Timothy](#)
Subject: Development for 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd
Date: Wednesday, May 15, 2024 12:48:48 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from jl Madden1@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Re: Opposition to the Stone House Development for 6610 -6706 Old Sauk Road. -- Plan Commission Meeting on June 10, 2024. Legistar Nos. 82950, 82972, 82979.

Dear Plan Commission Chair Zellers,

I respectfully ask that you and all Commission members carefully consider my views. I wish this email to be filed in the three above Legistar Nos.

While I may support the low-density, multi-family dwelling development of the above-mentioned Old Sauk Road parcels, I am strongly opposed to the proposal submitted by Stone House Development. This proposal for a large-scale, high-density structure, is unreasonable among neighborhoods that have long been zoned as single-family low-density properties. It does not fit with the existing fabric of the neighborhood and lacks any feature or character that would add to the value or experience of the existing residents.

This structure is outsized and out of character when compared to the surrounding area and lacks common sense. Please carefully consider my objections.

Major objections to the project:

- The project would increase the risk of substantial flooding to neighborhood homes and yards.
- This building would establish a wall, 40 feet in height towering over adjacent properties and extending down Old Sauk Road significantly longer than a football field.
- The property is 19 times larger than the apartment building next door. It lacks the setbacks that make all of the nearby properties, including multi-family properties, and the entire existing neighborhood so attractive and cohesive.
- The project would subject the neighborhood to noise 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.
- TR-U rezoning exists to "stabilize and protect and encourage the essential characteristics of high-density residential areas...". This area is low-density. The Stone House Development proposal for rezoning to TR-U2 should be rejected.

I would also like to add that the recent blog post on the "No Rezoning" signs by Alder Guequierre is a gross misrepresentation of the issue at hand and of the residents in his district. Alder Guequierre stated that current residents are fearful of renters and even went so far as to assert that we believe renters would be to blame if home values were to decrease as a result of this development. I don't believe a single person on either of the two Zoom meetings with Stone House indicated a fear of renters, however, there were plenty of other fears addressed:

- Fear of the loss of the character of the neighborhood.
- Fear of the loss of nature, wildlife, and sunlight.
- Fear of the increased noise and traffic pollution.
- Fear of increased traffic and the danger it brings to pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Fear of inadequate stormwater management and subsequent flooding.
- Fear of the dangerous precedent this building would set.
- Fear of the loss of the contract between homeowners and the city that is established with current zoning regulations.
- Fear of our voices being silenced and overrun by the developers.

Alder Guequierre makes it abundantly clear how he feels about the development and the residents in his district. Further, his writing lacks the objectivity that it is necessary to have as an Alderperson. Creating an us vs. them narrative as Alder Guequierre has done is unproductive. At best, it is a fear-mongering tactic that has been deployed to detract from the true issues at hand.

Respectfully yours,
Jaime Madden

933 Pebble Beach Drive
Madison, WI 53717

From: [Parks, Timothy](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: FW: District 19: Why are there "No-Rezoning" Yard Signs on Old Sauk Road?
Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2024 2:15:49 PM

From: Alder Guequierre <noreply@cityofmadison.com>
Sent: Monday, May 13, 2024 3:31 PM
To: Parks, Timothy <TParks@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: District 19: Why are there "No-Rezoning" Yard Signs on Old Sauk Road?

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

[View this email in your browser](#)

Why are there "No-Rezoning" Yard Signs on Old Sauk Road?

The Issue

Those driving, biking, or walking down Old Sauk Road between Gammon and Old Middleton, unavoidably notice a string of bright red yard signs on both sides of the street declaring "No Rezoning". The signs have been posted by an organized group of local residents who are opposed to a demolition and building permit application from Stone House Development. Stone House proposes to remove the ancient barn and several residences on the property between 6610 and 6706 Old Sauk and build a 3-story, 138-unit, market-rate apartment building.

Madison's Process for Considering the Stone House Permit Application

Stone House has applied to the City for a permit to demolish the existing buildings (Legislative #82950), rezone the property from SR-C1 and SR-C3 to TR-U2 (Legislative #82972) and approve the associated certified survey map (Legislative #82979). Interested persons can use the above legislative numbers or the property address in the search function at www.cityofmadison.com to see maps, the permit applications, and accumulated public comments.

The permit applications are currently being reviewed by multiple departments

with relevant expertise, such as stormwater management. The applications are tentatively scheduled to appear on the Planning Commission's June 10 agenda, and, if approved, to appear on the Common Council's June 18 agenda. It is not unusual for the Plan Commission or the Common Council to refer the applications back to relevant departments, boards, commissions, or committees for further review before taking final action.

Focus of this Blog

The Old Sauk project is one of many permit applications. I think it deserves some attention because the issues and passions involved have erupted in the past and will continue to arise not only with regard to specific projects but also with regard to the Madison's land use decision-making as it methodically crafts area plans such as the currently gestating West Area Plan and Northeast Area Plan.

What I'm going to try to do is describe the competing goals and concerns as dispassionately as possible, recognizing that I'm human and beset by my own infrastructure of prejudices, preconceptions, and ignorance. That objective weighing of positive and negative impacts is something that the Plan Commission and Common Council (I am a member of both) will strive for as we make decisions that are the right thing for all of Madison.

We need to dig deep to get to the heart of this matter. I'm going to briefly torture you with a tortured analogy for which I hope you can forgive me. I have found the act of mucking out a barn to be regenerative. For those of you who are not familiar with the term, "mucking out" a barn refers to shoveling the accumulated livestock manure and bedding into a manure spreader or pile outside the barn and getting down to the concrete or packed earth floor. I can tell you from personal experience that the task is hard labor, and the conclusion is immensely satisfying, albeit leaving one unpopular in polite company for some time. In my life in business and nonprofit voluntarism I have found that problem solving often benefits from mucking out all of the fecal camouflage and getting down to the real issues.

What are the fundamental issues? My thinking on the choice at hand is bookended by an NPR news segment and one of the more memorable emails I've received from opponents of the project.

1. On April 23, NPR addressed the estimated shortage of 4 to 7 million homes in the US. Mary Louise Kelly interviewed Alex Horowitz, director of Pew's Housing Policy Initiative. When Kelly asked what was driving the shortage, Horowitz replied: "So restrictive zoning is the primary culprit. It's made it hard to build homes in the areas where there are jobs."
2. I've received many emails about the project, some in support, but most opposed. One message was particularly poignant, and I'll paraphrase: "We're old and we'll soon be dead or moved to a nursing home. Can't you wait until we're gone?"

Developer and Proponent Motivation

The developer's motivations are obvious. Most residential development in Madison and Dane County is accomplished by private, for-profit ventures. Stone House has a long history in the city and is known for at least modifying plans somewhat in response to neighborhood interaction. They can be counted upon to chart a course that maximizes profit within the boundaries of applicable laws. Since the Stone House business model is to hold the assets they develop for extended periods, they are more motivated than the develop-and-flee ventures to focus on durable specifications, energy efficiency, and ease of maintenance.

I anticipate that the Plan Commission and Common Council will hear from at least two groups of engaged individuals and organized advocacy entities. One group will focus on the Old Sauk project as part of a broader solution to accelerate the construction of new housing to address Madison's widely acknowledged housing shortage, which is a driving force behind rapidly rising prices and rents. Supporting re-development within the beltline to higher density and where demand seems to be the highest, has generated more housing faster than the slow process of extending utilities and infrastructure to undeveloped land beyond the beltline. The process by which particular properties emerge as re-developable is unpredictable and tedious, hence the interest in maximizing every opportunity as it arises.

I expect a second group will advocate for denser development as part of the broad campaign to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, avoid sprawl, and generally strive for a more sustainable urban future. The positions of this group are generally rooted in climate science, although some conclusions relating to specific environments may be subject to further rigorous study.

Opponent Fears and Concerns

One of the things I want to stress is that the opponents are good people in the best sense of that term. I have walked the property, met with the owner, and spoken directly with neighbors who oppose the Stone House project and corresponded with many others. Those who are still economically active make massive contributions to Madison's vibrant economy. Many of those who are retired are the voluntary backbone of many Madison non-profits. They are not racists, notwithstanding that some out of ignorance use phrases that are widely recognized as racist. Their opposition is heartfelt. They pay the heavy property tax burden which supports the services Madison loves and immigrants find so enticing.

Residents point out that they have long expected the property to be developed but would prefer a more modest scale. Please see my April 25 blog: ["Why is the Middle Missing"](#). In that blog I explored the economic reasons why that kind of development has become so rare.

Opponents are concerned about the stormwater and traffic impacts of building

138 new dwelling units in the neighborhood. These are matters that are now being considered by various departments. Madison wants infrastructure to match the growth our city is experiencing. After the flood event of 2018, Madison strengthened its stormwater management requirements for new developments. The Stone House project will need to satisfy those requirements. It would be nice, if the developer designed to even higher standards than the law requires, but Madison can't enforce that.

A common theme in opponent comments is that the scale of the project – a single 138-unit structure of three stories, fits poorly with the neighboring one and two-story single-family dwellings. I suspect that most people would find a 10-story high-rise next to a one-story dwelling aesthetically jarring. It becomes a little more subjective in this instance, given the number of Madison neighborhoods where single-family homes are juxtaposed with 3-story apartments. Do long-term property owners develop a more finely tuned sense of architectural aesthetics? To what extent is this objection, so typical of other zoning fights, a cover for more basic concerns? I have no idea. One mission of the Plan Commission is to preserve the nuances of the environment that make Madison so desirable and special.

The vast majority of opponent comments appear to be about a fear of loss of home value driven by the deeper fear of the kind of people who would live in the Stone House project.

Fear of reduced home valuation seems to be a Madison tradition erupting with every new proposed development yet almost never actually occurring. It's a basic human fear. As was famously said two millennia ago: "For those who pile up their treasure on earth, that is where their heart will be."

In basic economics, why would a project like that proposed result in declining property values? Property values respond fairly directly to the classic demand-supply formulation. Will homeowners flee the neighborhood out of their distaste for the impact of the project, possibly combined with a decline in the number of interested potential buyers unwilling to buy a home near such a project? It's difficult to look at climbing assessments across the city, many of which include neighborhoods with a mix of large rental developments and single-family homes and conclude that there is such a relationship. To the best of my knowledge, there has not been an academically rigorous study that accurately measures such a relationship. In part, this kind of fear depends on a certain level of mistrust among neighbors – that some will bolt out of fear rather than harbor some optimism about the future of the neighborhood.

I sense that we are getting to the floor of the barn. Underneath it all is just simple human fear of the "other", in this case, renters. This is not to say that it is an illegitimate discomfort, even though raising this question may in itself cause discomfort. On a fundamental level, on the floor of the barn, is it in Madison's best interest to preserve one or more neighborhoods where the propertied class is comfortably isolated from renters and all of their real and imagined odious

characteristics?

This promises to be an interesting exercise in democracy.

[View full blog post](#)

Copyright © 2024 [City of Madison, Wisconsin](#)

You are currently subscribed to receive emails from the City of Madison.

City of Madison

210 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.

Madison, WI 53703

[Manage my subscriptions](#) | [Unsubscribe from all City of Madison email lists](#)

||

From: [Grace Kwon](#)
Subject: Slow Down, Satya
Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2024 1:45:08 PM
Attachments: [1842220888-7ef7a8d856daa87d3250b1804c7cd1425e6fd665696a36627ffcef788a1c442c-d.png](#)

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.

Hope you enjoy this original song written by Dan Stier, a man of many talents-
songwriter, singer and attorney!

Slow Down, Satya

I take an early morning walk down a neighborhood street
A canopy of green up above
Turkeys cross the road, there are neighbors who I greet
Along a route I've grown to know and love

Chorus:

**Slow down, Satya, can we save a tree or two?
Or is density the only game you play?
We'd love to work together, oh, Satya, wouldn't you
Compromise in a sensible way?
A little common sense could save the day**

Nature and neighbors team up for the common good
All part of a neighborhood that lasts
What you're doing, Satya, is gonna wreck our 'hood
We need our neighborhoods to last

**Oh, slow down, Satya, can we save a tree or two?
Balance should guide your every day
We'd love to work together, oh, Satya, wouldn't you
Compromise in a sensible way?
A little common sense could save the day**

We don't like making a great big fuss
But we can't take this lying down
"Common sense" should guide you and everyone of us

What goes around is gonna come around

Slow down, Satya, can we save a tree or two?

Is density your only game at play?

We'd love to work together, oh, Satya, wouldn't you?

Compromise in a sensible way?

A little common sense could save the day





Slow Down Satya!
vimeo.com

From: [Guequierre, John](#)
To: [Fun to Build](#); Ledell.Zellers@gmail.com; [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Fruhling, William](#)
Subject: Re: 6610 - 6706 Old Sauk Rd, Legistar 82950, 82972 and 82979, Please Post to Public Comments To All 3 Locations
Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2024 11:46:17 AM

Dear Gary and Barb,

Thank you for taking the time to read and respond to my blog. In retrospect, I wish I had ended the blog with a note that I welcome contrary opinions, all of which I will try to seriously consider as this matter comes before the Commission and Council. I would only point out that listening to a viewpoint and arriving at a different conclusion is not the same as failing to listen. I probably fail on that count too often myself. When my brilliant logic is so superior, the only reason for someone disagreeing with me is that they didn't listen. It has probably taken too many years for me to realize that is not true.

All the best,

John Guequierre
district19@cityofmadison.com
608.571.3530

From: Fun to Build <foster07cn@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2024 10:50 AM
To: Ledell.Zellers@gmail.com <Ledell.Zellers@gmail.com>; Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>; Parks, Timothy <TParks@cityofmadison.com>; Plan Commission Comments <pccomments@cityofmadison.com>; Fruhling, William <WFruhling@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: 6610 - 6706 Old Sauk Rd, Legistar 82950, 82972 and 82979, Please Post to Public Comments To All 3 Locations

Dear Alder Guequierre,

We appreciate your attempt to get to the bottom of the issues surrounding the proposed housing development at 6610 – 6706 Old Sauk Rd in your May 13, 2014 Blog titled “Why are there “No-Rezoning” Yard Signs on Old Sauk Road?”. You are correct, as residents on Old Sauk Rd we are very concerned about the outcome of the City’s departmental review of stormwater and traffic impacts. We also agree that it would be neighborly if Stone House Development’s (SH) stormwater proposed design was to be to a higher standard, but it’s not.

We greatly disagree with your analysis about our fears and especially with your conclusion: “just simple human fear of the “other”, in this case, renters.” We willingly purchased our home on Old Sauk Rd immediately next to apartment buildings knowing that we were buying next to renters and we have never regretted that decision.

Let me explain what we fear.

We fear the City, the Plan Commission (PC) and the Common Council (CC) is about to radically change the zoning designation of our Madison neighborhood from single family suburban zoning to urban zoning, which is a very radical jump. We believe as property owners zoning is a contract that we have with the City to protect us and prevent radical changes. In this particular case, the City/PC/CC could decide that it's okay to spot change to urban zoning a 3.7 acre oasis in the middle of thousands of acres of single family housing. We fear if the City/PC/CC can do something like this, then they are all too powerful to do more and take advantage of powerless residents.

We fear that SH will be allowed to use the little or never used Escalator Clause to densify this property by my estimate to 700%+ more than the surrounding neighborhoods. According to the 2023 Comprehensive Plan there are 8 Select Factors to be considered to determine if escalation is to be allowed. I have asked but never have received an answer how this process of determination of the 8 Select Factors actually works. We assume because the PC has already given the okay to SH to proceed with their escalated application that there will be no discussion about the 8 Select Factors and we fear they are just meaningless words and the Comprehensive Plan is not to be trusted.

We also fear that if escalation is allowed for 6610 – 6706 Old Sauk Rd the precedent will be set for additional high rise apartments along Old Sauk Rd. The draft West Area Plan is proceeding full speed ahead to change multiple properties along Old Sauk Rd to LMR or MR designations, with escalation potential. Our fear is where we live on Old Sauk Rd we could very quickly have high rise apartments to our right and to our left.

I would argue that an apartment complex in a neighborhood will lessen the appreciation value potential of adjacent single family homes if compared to no apartment complex being developed in that neighborhood. What we fear most is what is going to happen to the valuations of those neighbors that reside directly on the property boundary to 6610 – 6707 Old Sauk Rd. If today you have quiet and trees in your backyard and tomorrow you have a 3-story apartment with balconies overlooking your backyard, noises, light pollution and a 6' fence instead of trees, how will that not decrease your valuation? If you were in the shoes of that neighbor, do you really believe your property value wouldn't suffer?

Our fear is that the City/PC/CC takes a path of least resistance to address the need for additional housing by helping developers just build more and more rent only apartments and not tackle the need for diversified options of Missing Middle housing and home ownership that would make the City stronger. We fear that the City/PC/CC is not willing or able to hit pause or step back in this situation at 6610 – 6706 Old Sauk Rd and challenge the developer to alternative options and not just another apartment complex.

Our fear is that the approval process will ultimately allow a stormwater plan that won't

perform well and has no way to be maintained that will ultimately lead to greater flooding to adjacent property and neighbors than if this property was not developed at all.

Lastly, we fear as neighborhood residents we have no one from the City/PC/CC listening to our voices or being an advocate for our concerns.

Sincerely, Gary and Barb Foster
6506 Old Sauk Rd

From: [Fun to Build](#)
To: Ledell.Zellers@gmail.com; [Guequierre, John](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Fruhling, William](#)
Subject: 6610 - 6706 Old Sauk Rd, Legistar 82950, 82972 and 82979, Please Post to Public Comments To All 3 Locations
Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2024 10:50:17 AM

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

Dear Alder Guequierre,

We appreciate your attempt to get to the bottom of the issues surrounding the proposed housing development at 6610 – 6706 Old Sauk Rd in your May 13, 2014 Blog titled “Why are there “No-Rezoning” Yard Signs on Old Sauk Road?”. You are correct, as residents on Old Sauk Rd we are very concerned about the outcome of the City’s departmental review of stormwater and traffic impacts. We also agree that it would be neighborly if Stone House Development’s (SH) stormwater proposed design was to be to a higher standard, but it’s not.

We greatly disagree with your analysis about our fears and especially with your conclusion: “just simple human fear of the “other”, in this case, renters.” We willingly purchased our home on Old Sauk Rd immediately next to apartment buildings knowing that we were buying next to renters and we have never regretted that decision.

Let me explain what we fear.

We fear the City, the Plan Commission (PC) and the Common Council (CC) is about to radically change the zoning designation of our Madison neighborhood from single family suburban zoning to urban zoning, which is a very radical jump. We believe as property owners zoning is a contract that we have with the City to protect us and prevent radical changes. In this particular case, the City/PC/CC could decide that it’s okay to spot change to urban zoning a 3.7 acre oasis in the middle of thousands of acres of single family housing. We fear if the City/PC/CC can do something like this, then they are all too powerful to do more and take advantage of powerless residents.

We fear that SH will be allowed to use the little or never used Escalator Clause to densify this property by my estimate to 700%+ more than the surrounding neighborhoods. According to the 2023 Comprehensive Plan there are 8 Select Factors to be considered to determine if escalation is to be allowed. I have asked but never have received an answer how this process of determination of the 8 Select Factors actually works. We assume because the PC has already given the okay to SH to proceed with their escalated application that there will be no discussion about the 8 Select Factors and we fear they are just meaningless words and the Comprehensive Plan is not to be trusted.

We also fear that if escalation is allowed for 6610 – 6706 Old Sauk Rd the precedent will be set for additional high rise apartments along Old Sauk Rd. The draft West Area Plan is proceeding full speed ahead to change multiple properties along Old Sauk Rd

to LMR or MR designations, with escalation potential. Our fear is where we live on Old Sauk Rd we could very quickly have high rise apartments to our right and to our left.

I would argue that an apartment complex in a neighborhood will lessen the appreciation value potential of adjacent single family homes if compared to no apartment complex being developed in that neighborhood. What we fear most is what is going to happen to the valuations of those neighbors that reside directly on the property boundary to 6610 – 6707 Old Sauk Rd. If today you have quiet and trees in your backyard and tomorrow you have a 3-story apartment with balconies overlooking your backyard, noises, light pollution and a 6' fence instead of trees, how will that not decrease your valuation? If you were in the shoes of that neighbor, do you really believe your property value wouldn't suffer?

Our fear is that the City/PC/CC takes a path of least resistance to address the need for additional housing by helping developers just build more and more rent only apartments and not tackle the need for diversified options of Missing Middle housing and home ownership that would make the City stronger. We fear that the City/PC/CC is not willing or able to hit pause or step back in this situation at 6610 – 6706 Old Sauk Rd and challenge the developer to alternative options and not just another apartment complex.

Our fear is that the approval process will ultimately allow a stormwater plan that won't perform well and has no way to be maintained that will ultimately lead to greater flooding to adjacent property and neighbors than if this property was not developed at all.

Lastly, we fear as neighborhood residents we have no one from the City/PC/CC listening to our voices or being an advocate for our concerns.

Sincerely, Gary and Barb Foster
6506 Old Sauk Rd

From: [Bonnie Normington](mailto:bjnormington@yahoo.com)
To: ledell.zellers@gmail.com
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Fruhling, William](#); [Parks, Timothy](#)
Subject: Opposition to the Stone House Development for 6610 -6706 Old Sauk Road / legistar nos 82950, 82972, 82979
Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2024 7:15:29 AM

[You don't often get email from bjnormington@yahoo.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 Plan Commission Chair Zellers,

I respectfully ask that you and all Commission members carefully consider my views.

I wish this email to be filed in the three above Legistar Nos.

While we support reasonable, common sense development of the Old Sauk Road parcels, we are adamantly opposed to Stone House's unreasonable proposal, lacking any foundation in common sense. Please carefully consider my objections.

Major objections to the project:

The project would increase the risk of substantial flooding to neighborhood homes and yards.

This building would establish a wall, 40 feet in height towering over adjacent properties and extending down Old Sauk Road significantly longer than a football field.

The property is 19 times larger than the apartment building next door. It lacks the set backs that make all of the nearby properties, including multi-family properties, and the entire existing neighborhood so attractive and cohesive. The project would subject the neighborhood to noise 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.

TR-U rezoning exists to "stabilize and protect and encourage the essential characteristics of high density residential areas...". This area is low density. The Stone House Development proposal for rezoning to TR-U2 should be rejected.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Normington

413 Bordner Drive
Madison, WI 53705

CC: Alder John Guequierre, Acting Planning Division Director Bill Fruhling, Planner Timothy Parks.

From: [Bonnie Normington](mailto:bjnormington@yahoo.com)
To: ledell.zellers@gmail.com
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Fruhling, William](#); [Parks, Timothy](#)
Subject: Opposition to the Stone House Development for 6610 -6706 Old Sauk Road. -- Plan Commission Meeting on June 10, 2024. Legistar Nos. 82950, 82972, 82979.
Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2024 7:32:49 AM

[You don't often get email from bjnormington@yahoo.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 Plan Commission Chair Zellers,

I respectfully ask that you and all Commission members carefully consider my views.

I wish this email to be filed in the three above Legistar Nos.

While we support reasonable, common sense development of the Old Sauk Road parcels, we are adamantly opposed to Stone House's unreasonable proposal, lacking any foundation in common sense. Please carefully consider my objections.

Major objections to the project:

- The project would increase the risk of substantial flooding to neighborhood homes and yards.
- This building would establish a wall, 40 feet in height towering over adjacent properties and extending down Old Sauk Road significantly longer than a football field.
- The property is 19 times larger than the apartment building next door. It lacks the set backs that make all of the nearby properties, including multi-family properties, and the entire existing neighborhood so attractive and cohesive.
- The project would subject the neighborhood to noise 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.
- TR-U rezoning exists to "stabilize and protect and encourage the essential characteristics of high density residential areas...". This area is low density. The Stone House Development proposal for rezoning to TR-U2 should be rejected.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Normington

\$13 Bordner Drive
Madison, WI 53705

CC: Alder John Guiquierre, Acting Planning Division Director Bill Fruhling, Planner Timothy Parks.

From: [Amy Irving](#)
To: ledell.zellers@gmail.com
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Fruhling, William](#); [Parks, Timothy](#)
Subject: Opposition to the Stone House Development for 6610 -6706 Old Sauk Road. -- Plan Commission Meeting on June 10, 2024. Legistar Nos. 82950, 82972, 82979.
Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2024 9:07:53 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from aairving@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,

I respectfully ask that you and all Commission members carefully consider my views.

I wish this email to be filed in Legistar Nos. 82950, 82972, 82979.

While I support reasonable, common sense development of the Old Sauk Road parcels, I adamantly oppose Stone House's current proposal for the following reasons:

- TR-U rezoning exists to "stabilize and protect and encourage the essential characteristics of **high density** residential areas...". This area is low density. The Stone House Development proposal for rezoning to TR-U2 should be rejected.
- The property is 19 times larger than the apartment building next door. It lacks the setbacks that make all of the nearby properties, including multi-family properties, and the entire existing neighborhood desirable and cohesive.
- Old Sauk road supports a single lane of traffic in each direction, and lacks a sidewalk on the North side where the elementary school is located. This road is unsuitable to introduce significant additional traffic and will not lend itself well to pedestrian crossings—the current crossing at Crestwood is already difficult and dangerous.
- This building would establish a wall, 40 feet in height towering over adjacent properties and extending down Old Sauk Road significantly longer than a football field.
- The project would increase the risk of substantial flooding to neighborhood homes and yards.
- The project would subject the neighborhood to noise 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 carefully consider my objections, and those raised by my neighbors.

Sincerely,

Amy Irving
950 Sauk Ridge Trail
Madison, WI 53717

.....

CC: Alder John Guiquierre, Acting Planning Division Director Bill Fruhling, Planner

Timothy Parks

From: [Dan Stier](#)
To: dzellers@cityofmadison.com; [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Fruhling, William](#); [Parks, Timothy](#)
Subject: Plan Commission Meeting on June 10, 2024 Legistar Nos. 82950, 82972.82979
Date: Monday, May 13, 2024 5:07:29 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from ddstier@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:

I, Dan Stier, residing at 606 San Juan Trail, state my strong opposition to the Stone House Development proposal for 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road. Please give my comments your most serious consideration and include them in all three Legistar files shown above,

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.

My 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 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.

I also need to comment in exasperation as to how we arrived at the point where this awful proposal is receiving consideration by the Plan Commission. At the October 24, 2023 virtual meeting, Stone House representatives and Planner Tim Parks presented the proposal to a large number of citizens living in the vicinity of the Old Sauk site. A great deal of shocked opposition surfaced through the course of the meeting as it became obvious that so much agreement had already been established between Stone House and the City. Stone House and Mr. Parks effectively "tag teamed" responses to questions with the city planner raising the specter of a development limit of 70 units/acre, thereby permitting Stone House to present itself as a reputable developer who would not maximize the number of proposed units.

"Taken aback" by opposition to the project, Stone House's Kellen Rice provided the following assurances:

"For a 4 acre site, this is not a high density project"

"This is a high quality development". "We all just need to take a breath. This is the first of several meetings and it's a process, and we purposely did not come up with a design, we don't have any renderings because we're not assuming what the building should look like. So this is the first of more meetings, and we hope that you'll be patient and allow us to make our case"

If this is in fact not a high density project, why is the site being rezoned to TR-U2, "established to stabilize and protect and encourage the essential characteristics of **high-density**

residential areas"? There haven't been "several meetings". There hasn't been any "process" involving the neighborhood's citizens. There was one more virtual meeting in March where Stone House presented the proposal that would be advanced in its formal application of April 8th. Consistent with word passed along by Stone House very soon after the October virtual meeting (and consistent with a common developer practice), Stone House reduced the project from 4 to 3 stories. As mentioned above, the enormous "footprint" remained, building a wall along Old Sauk Road to a height of 40 feet and extending to a length larger than a football field.

When questioned at the October meeting, Helen Bradbury conceded that "there's a **hitch** in the zoning; maybe Tim can help me out. It's on an arterial road and you meet certain conditions. **No one understands what those conditions are. We're talking to the city about defining what those conditions are.**"

Planner Parks then commented: "As Helen Bradbury noted in her comments, **an escalator clause, if you will**, that on arterial roadways ... under select conditions that development could go to a higher density. The issue that we're having with the LMR recommendation for the site in the Comp Plan is exactly what those select conditions are, **and that is something that we are discussing internally as well as with the project team.**"

Neither Helen Bradbury nor any reasonably intelligent homeowner would have discovered the "escalator clause" and "select conditions" unless they read and re-read the GFLU and the Comprehensive Plan and cross-referenced these documents and, even then, they would likely have missed the "hitch". The Generalized Future Land Use Map (GFLU) leads one to believe that LMR is the future land use category for the Old Sauk site and shows that LMR is 30 du/acre and 3 floors. Indeed, that is exactly what we were told by the first real estate attorney we talked to. There is no direct reference to an "escalator" clause or a "hitch" in the GFLU. Finding it is like finding a buried artifact in an archeological dig - you must dig and dig to find the tiny double-asterisked footnote in the Comprehensive Plan. That's why, despite her developer expertise, Helen Bradbury was so confused. It's hidden. It's undefined. It's a "hitch" in the plan. Only a professional planner, like Tim Parks, knows where to find the "hitch" and that it can be used to increase density even though it is "undefined." Is this the "transparency" that the city prides itself on? How can a hidden double asterisk and an undefined "hitch" be used to dramatically increase density on these parcels?

We worked vigorously to understand the implications of the "escalator clause" and strived to define "select conditions" and to share our thoughts with the city and the planning staff. We had the sense that those thoughts disappeared down a "rabbit hole". Adding to the feeling that we've gone down the rabbit hole, Planner Parks recently announced that the term "escalator" clause was a term "devised by neighbors of the project."!

The words of Helen Bradbury and Tim Parks together regarding the escalator clause were ringing in our ears. Helen Bradbury: **We're talking to the city about defining what those conditions are.** Tim Parks: **The issue that we're having with the LMR recommendation for the site in the Comp Plan is exactly what those select conditions are, and that is something that we are discussing internally as well as with the project team.**"

What is obvious is that we have a team, city and developer, working together to bring a high-density apartment building to the Old Sauk site. In the end, Stone House and Tim Parks are simply following a city-established process, encouraging a relay team approach to

development to achieve a city priority, high density housing. We are appalled by the process and the result.

The entire "process" has been grossly unfair. Our last-ditch effort is to plead with the Plan Commission to correct the gross unfairness. Limit rezoning to the sort of "incremental", "gentle", "modest" increase that the City and housing advocates claim is their approach to the type of neighborhood involved here. We implore you to reject the massive increase in zoning to "high density" sought by Stone House.

From: [Gary Bertram](#)
To: Ledell.Zellers@gmail.com
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#); district19@cityofmadison.co; [Fruhling, William](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Gary Bertram](#)
Subject: Stone House Development Proposal on Old Sauk Road
Date: Monday, May 13, 2024 3:29:48 PM

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

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

Re: Opposition to the Stone House Development for 6610 -6706 Old Sauk Road. -- Plan Commission Meeting on June 10, 2024. Legistar Nos. 82950, 82972, 82979.

Dear Plan Commission Chair Zellers,

I respectfully ask that you and all Commission members carefully consider my views.

I wish this email to be filed in the three above Legistar Nos.

While we support reasonable, common sense development of the Old Sauk Road parcels, we are adamantly opposed to Stone House's unreasonable proposal, lacking any foundation in common sense. Please carefully consider my objections.

I acknowledge that the planning commission has spent countless hours developing the draft for the West Side Plan. However, acceptance of building proposals and the accompanying zoning changes should be tailored to each individual neighborhood. The parcel on Old Sauk Road in no way lends itself to the extreme high density proposed. This especially applies to the oversized footprint. A step forward would be to approve multiple smaller buildings constructed around existing large canopy trees and surrounded by extended permeable green spaces. With climatic changes accompanied by increased temperatures and more frequent severe weather events, adaptations like this would serve to reduce temperatures and subsequent concerns for damaging runoff.

It has been recommended by the Urban Forestry Task Force that tree canopy should be at least 40% and I don't believe the city is even close in meeting that benchmark. Obviously there is a limit to increasing canopy on public spaces and that is why increasing tree canopy on new development of private property like that of Old Saul is so important. This is an opportunity to go above and beyond what select zoning conditions are at present.

Finally, with regard to select zoning conditions, I believe it is understood that factors like relationship between proposed buildings and surroundings, natural features, as well as lot and block characteristics are required. Changing zoning from SR-C1/SR-C3 to TR-U2 would be a disservice to the community.

Gary Bertram
12 Court of Brixham, Madison, Wi 53705

From: [Parks, Timothy](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Development Proposal 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road
Date: Monday, May 13, 2024 12:02:53 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

From: Hal Harlowe <hharlowe@murphydesmond.com>
Sent: Monday, May 13, 2024 11:49 AM
To: ledell.zellers@gmail.com
Cc: Fruhling, William <WFruhling@cityofmadison.com>; Parks, Timothy <TParks@cityofmadison.com>; Hal Harlowe <hharlowe@murphydesmond.com>
Subject: Development Proposal 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road

You don't often get email from hharlowe@murphydesmond.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,

I respectfully wish to register my opposition to the above proposed development.

I have no objection whatsoever to developing the subject parcels in a way that is architecturally compatible with the surrounding area. What is being proposed is not. Despite representations made by Stone House in its proposals, in fact, the only structures in the surrounding area that are higher than two stories are churches. The proposed development will be starkly incongruent with the neighborhood and will violate the principle that new buildings be harmonious with their surrounding neighborhood. I urge commission members to walk through the neighborhood of the proposed development. It will be instantly evident that what is being proposed is jarring dissonant from and will unnecessarily have a significant negative impact upon the surrounding neighborhood.

Hal Harlowe

(608) 268-5602
601 Yosemite Pl. Madison, WI 53705



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic transmission (including any files attached hereto) contains information that is legally privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure. It is intended for use only by the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, dissemination, copying, distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this confidential information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please destroy it, remove it from your computer and/or network and immediately notify me by email. Thank you. Receipt by anyone other than the named recipient(s) is not a waiver of any attorney-client, work product or other applicable privilege, protection or doctrine.

From: [Parks, Timothy](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Cc: [Bridget Barnett](#)
Subject: FW: West Area Plan
Date: Monday, May 13, 2024 11:02:22 AM

From: WestPlan <westplan@cityofmadison.com>
Sent: Monday, May 13, 2024 10:51 AM
To: Bridget Barnett <bridgetvbarnett@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: West Area Plan

Hello Bridget -

The review of the Stonehouse proposal at 6610 Old Sauk Road is happening on a different timeline from the West Area Plan process. Project information [is here](#). I will pass along your email to Tim Parks, who is the contact person in the Planning Division for that project review.

- Ben

Ben Zellers, AICP, CNU-A
City of Madison Planning Division
608-266-4866

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

From: Bridget Barnett <bridgetvbarnett@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 8, 2024 1:47 PM
To: WestPlan <westplan@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: West Area Plan

[You don't often get email from bridgetvbarnett@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.

Hi there.

Just chiming in. As a resident of Parkwood Hills and a 4x a day traveler of Old Sauk road, both by car and bike I am opposed to the ridiculous size of the Stone House project. Currently, it would be 19x larger than any other multi family unit on that road.

Let that sink in....19x

Not opposed to reasonable apartments or likewise as there are many along that road.

Please reconsider this proposal. Traffic is already crowded and will be even more so with a project of that size. Not to mention other infrastructure issues.

Thank you.
Sent from my iPhone

From: [Edge garner](#)
To: ledell.zellers@gmail.com; [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Fruhling, William](#); [Parks, Timothy](#)
Subject: Fwd: Model Comment and Additional Data
Date: Friday, May 10, 2024 4:16:16 PM
Attachments: [ADDITIONAL_DATA - F.docx](#)
[ADDITIONAL_DATA - F.pdf](#)
[Select Conditons - F.docx](#)
[Select Conditons - F.pdf](#)

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

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

\

Begin forwarded message:

From: Old Sauk <friendsofoldsauk@gmail.com>
Date: May 10, 2024 at 1:04:04 PM CDT
Subject: **Model Comment and Additional Data**

Dear Friend,

The Petition remains available. If you intend to sign it, we urge that you do so as soon as possible. If for some reason, you cannot access the email containing the Petition, please let us know. We're happy to send another copy.

Below you will find a model letter for submitting your comments stating your reasons for objecting to the Stone House Development proposal for the parcels at 6610 - 6706 Old Sauk Road. Please feel free to cut, paste, and submit the entire letter. For those who wish to dig deeper, see the Additional Data and Select Conditions attachments below.

Though the Plan Commission hearing is not until June 10th, we ask that you submit your comments as soon as possible. We strongly recommend that you check Legistar files after June 6th as that is the date when the city Planning Department staff will likely file its report. You may wish to comment further after you see that report. For your convenience, here's the primary Legistar link:

<https://madison.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=6631406&GUID=A24D1169-C0CE-4E95-ABD6-D403452124E1&Options=ID%7CText%7C&Search=82972>

TO: ledell.zellers@gmail.com
CC: pccomments@cityofmadison.com
District19@cityofmadison.com
bfruhling@cityofmadison.com
tparks@cityofmadison.com

Re: Opposition to the Stone House Development for 6610 -6706 Old Sauk Road. -- Plan Commission Meeting on June 10, 2024. Legistar Nos. 82950, 82972, 82979.

Dear Plan Commission Chair Zellers,

I respectfully ask that you and all Commission members carefully consider my views.

I wish this email to be filed in the three above Legistar Nos.

While we support reasonable, common sense development of the Old Sauk Road parcels, we are adamantly opposed to Stone House's unreasonable proposal, lacking any foundation in common sense. Please carefully consider my objections.

Major objections to the project:

- The project would increase the risk of substantial flooding to neighborhood homes and yards.
- This building would establish a wall, 40 feet in height towering over adjacent properties and extending down Old Sauk Road significantly longer than a football field.
- The property is 19 times larger than the apartment building next door. It lacks the set backs that make all of the nearby properties, including multi-family properties, and the entire existing neighborhood so attractive and cohesive.
- The project would subject the neighborhood to noise 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.
- TR-U rezoning exists to "stablize and protect and encourage the essential characteristics of **high density** residential areas...". This area is low density. The Stone House Development proposal for rezoning to TR-U2 should be rejected.

Sincerely,

Edith G. Garner and Jac B. Garner (signed electronically)
921 Pebble Beach Dr
Madison, wi. 53717

.....
Address

CC: Alder John Guiquierre, Acting Planning Division Director Bill Fruhling, Planner Timothy Parks.

| . **FOR THOSE WHO WANT TO GO DEEPER**

ADDITIONAL DATA

POINT 1. FLOODING RISKS ARE INCREASED.

A. Existing runoff problems in the area are well documented.

B. The footprint of the apartment complex will create a significant amount of runoff water, as the permeable (grassy areas, diverse vegetation and trees) surfaces will be removed. This will result in a huge increase in runoff water that needs to be removed from the current site.

C. The Stone House proposed technology for addressing the storm water runoff problems is a combination of underground infiltration tanks and infiltration pond system, pushing water into the underground sand layer. This puts surrounding homeowners' lower levels and basements in jeopardy of flooding. Also, any major flooding event with runoff will be directed onto the property of existing homeowners. The technology for this massive amount of runoff on this size of property is unprecedented in the City of Madison and viability of this proposed solution on this property is in question by qualified hydrology engineers.

D. The reality is, this development's watershed solution is inadequate and puts the homes of existing residents at risk of significant flooding.

POINT 2. THE MASSIVE SIZE OF THE BUILDING IS SO EXTREME THAT IT DESTROYS THE NEIGHBORHOOD.



A. The Stone House proposal is 19.6 times the density of the nearest multi-family residence, Settlers Woods.

B. It is 91 times larger than the average size of the four houses directly across the street.

C. The average density of surrounding parcels is 7.9 units per acre. The Stone House density is 36.6 units per acre.

ADDITIONAL DATA

D. 100% of the 65 residential dwellings on Old Sauk Road from Old Middleton Road to Gammon Road are less than 3 stories tall, and all have lawns and garages. The closest 3 story resident on Old Sauk Road is 1.5 miles from Gammon Road, where Old Sauk Road is widened to 4 lanes. The closest 3-story multi-family building to Old Sauk Road is Yorktown Apartments. The closest TR-U2 area is 2.3 miles away from the site.

E. 97% of the residences on Old Sauk Road have roofs that are not flat. There are no rooftop recreation areas.

G. Chapter 28 of the City Ordinances states that zoning exists to "create a sense of place." The surrounding neighborhood, including multi-family buildings, could best be described as nature-oriented and "homey" or "cozy." There's no significant set back from the road for this proposed development. Its facade is anything but homey; like the Lake View Sanatorium below, it is institutional.



POINT 3. TR-U2 REZONING IS WRONG FOR THIS SITE.

A. We support a development that increases density and at the same time bears some reasonable relationship with the surrounding residences. There are no other high density apartment complexes near the site. The nearest TR-U2 zoned property is on Sheboygan Avenue, a location adjacent to Hilldale, a major shopping hub. Rezoning to TR-U2 is wrong for this site.

B. We support rezoning that allows gently denser development that would keep similar setbacks and have comparably sized units, such as duplexes, triplexes and small apartment buildings, with green spaces in between. These would be, preferably 2 stories like those nearby, and 3 stories at the most.

C. In contrast TR-U2, Traditional Residential, refers to urban **high density development**. It permits multi-family units on smaller lots, with smaller setbacks, ie., front yard setback is 15 feet, coverage up to 75 % of the lot (80% conditional

ADDITIONAL DATA

use of the lot). Urban high density gives the complex a much larger footprint than suburban zoning and correspondingly less green space.

D. TR-U districts are “established to stabilize and protect the essential characteristics of high-density residential areas...”. The neighborhoods surrounding the Old Sauk site are not and never will be high density. This is wrong.

E. The draft West Area Plan identifies a Missing Middle housing priority. We acknowledge that owner-occupied Missing Middle housing is a heavy lift, however, Missing Middle rental housing does not face the same challenges. 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 neighborhood. The LMR land use designation, if not escalated, supports Missing Middle-type housing.

F. 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. It should be developed for this type of housing.

G. On October 24, 2023, at the public meeting, Helen Bradbury said that Stone House Development wanted to build housing for people who don't want to live on East Washington Avenue. Fine, we welcome these like-minded people. If Stone House Development wants to build homes for folks attracted to our beautiful warm green neighborhood, it should build something compliments the neighborhood and shares its best features. Instead of doing that, she's bring the East Washington Avenue to Old Sauk Road. That's wrong.

POINT 4: ESCALATION IS WRONG FOR THESE PARCELS. ESCALATION CAUSES IRREPARABLE HARM. THE SELECT CONDITIONS FACTORS ARE NOT PRESENT.

A. One and two story residences adjoin the property on 3 sides. This makes it a 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, lighting, smells, traffic, surface parking, trash pickup, building shadows. It deprives homeowners of their privacy, tranquility and enjoyment of their yards. Home is supposed to be a sanctuary; this development invades adjacent homeowners' sanctuaries.

ADDITIONAL DATA

B. The Stone House 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 north side of Old Sauk Road. The proposed development will make a bad situation much worse.

C. These parcels are perfect for single family, duplexes, triplexes, quads, townhouses, row houses and small apartment buildings. The city ill-serves future generations and damages existing residents if it approves of this project and forever denies the city's citizens desirable housing that preserves this beautiful neighborhood.

D. The facts and data set for the above show that select conditions factors weigh in favor of not escalating. The property's land use should be simple LMR.

ADDITIONAL DATA

POINT 1. FLOODING RISKS ARE INCREASED.


A. Existing runoff problems in the area are well documented.

B. The footprint of the apartment complex will create a significant amount of runoff water, as the permeable (grassy areas, diverse vegetation and trees) surfaces will be removed. This will result in a huge increase in runoff water that needs to be removed from the current site.

C. The Stone House proposed technology for addressing the storm water runoff problems is a combination of underground infiltration tanks and infiltration pond system, pushing water into the underground sand layer. This puts surrounding homeowners' lower levels and basements in jeopardy of flooding. Also, any major flooding event with runoff will be directed onto the property of existing homeowners. The technology for this massive amount of runoff on this size of property is unprecedented in the City of Madison and viability of this proposed solution on this property is in question by qualified hydrology engineers.

D. The reality is, this development's watershed solution is inadequate and puts the homes of existing residents at risk of significant flooding.

POINT 2. THE MASSIVE SIZE OF THE BUILDING IS SO EXTREME THAT IT DESTROYS THE NEIGHBORHOOD.



A. The Stone House proposal is 19.6 times the density of the nearest multi-family residence, Settlers Woods.

B. It is 91 times larger than the average size of the four houses directly across the street.

C. The average density of surrounding parcels is 7.9 units per acre. The Stone House density is 36.6 units per acre.

ADDITIONAL DATA

D. 100% of the 65 residential dwellings on Old Sauk Road from Old Middleton Road to Gammon Road are less than 3 stories tall, and all have lawns and garages. The closest 3 story resident on Old Sauk Road is 1.5 miles from Gammon Road, where Old Sauk Road is widened to 4 lanes. The closest 3-story multi-family building to Old Sauk Road is Yorktown Apartments. The closest TR-U2 area is 2.3 miles away from the site.

E. 97% of the residences on Old Sauk Road have roofs that are not flat. There are no rooftop recreation areas.

G. Chapter 28 of the City Ordinances states that zoning exists to "create a sense of place." The surrounding neighborhood, including multi-family buildings, could best be described as nature-oriented and "homey" or "cozy." There's no significant set back from the road for this proposed development. Its facade is anything but homey; like the Lake View Sanatorium below, it is institutional.



POINT 3. TR-U2 REZONING IS WRONG FOR THIS SITE.

A. We support a development that increases density and at the same time bears some reasonable relationship with the surrounding residences. There are no other high density apartment complexes near the site. The nearest TR-U2 zoned property is on Sheboygan Avenue, a location adjacent to Hilldale, a major shopping hub. Rezoning to TR-U2 is wrong for this site.

B. We support rezoning that allows gently denser development that would keep similar setbacks and have comparably sized units, such as duplexes, triplexes and small apartment buildings, with green spaces in between. These would be, preferably 2 stories like those nearby, and 3 stories at the most.

C. In contrast TR-U2, Traditional Residential, refers to urban **high density development**. It permits multi-family units on smaller lots, with smaller setbacks, ie., front yard setback is 15 feet, coverage up to 75 % of the lot (80% conditional

ADDITIONAL DATA

use of the lot). Urban high density gives the complex a much larger footprint than suburban zoning and correspondingly less green space.

D. TR-U districts are “established to stabilize and protect the essential characteristics of high-density residential areas...”. The neighborhoods surrounding the Old Sauk site are not and never will be high density. This is wrong.

E. The draft West Area Plan identifies a Missing Middle housing priority. We acknowledge that owner-occupied Missing Middle housing is a heavy lift, however, Missing Middle rental housing does not face the same challenges. 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 neighborhood. The LMR land use designation, if not escalated, supports Missing Middle-type housing.

F. 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. It should be developed for this type of housing.

G. On October 24, 2023, at the public meeting, Helen Bradbury said that Stone House Development wanted to build housing for people who don't want to live on East Washington Avenue. Fine, we welcome these like-minded people. If Stone House Development wants to build homes for folks attracted to our beautiful warm green neighborhood, it should build something compliments the neighborhood and shares its best features. Instead of doing that, she's bring the East Washington Avenue to Old Sauk Road. That's wrong.

POINT 4: ESCALATION IS WRONG FOR THESE PARCELS. ESCALATION CAUSES IRREPARABLE HARM. THE SELECT CONDITIONS FACTORS ARE NOT PRESENT.

A. One and two story residences adjoin the property on 3 sides. This makes it a 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, lighting, smells, traffic, surface parking, trash pickup, building shadows. It deprives homeowners of their privacy, tranquility and enjoyment of their yards. Home is supposed to be a sanctuary; this development invades adjacent homeowners' sanctuaries.

ADDITIONAL DATA

B. The Stone House 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 north side of Old Sauk Road. The proposed development will make a bad situation much worse.

C. These parcels are perfect for single family, duplexes, triplexes, quads, townhouses, row houses and small apartment buildings. The city ill-serves future generations and damages existing residents if it approves of this project and forever denies the city's citizens desirable housing that preserves this beautiful neighborhood.

D. The facts and data set for the above show that select conditions factors weigh in favor of not escalating. The property's land use should be simple LMR.

SELECT CONDITIONS DO NOT SUPPORT INCREASED DENSITY

THE NEW 8 FACTORS SELECT CONDITIONS TEST

**** Appropriate in select conditions at up to 70 DU/ac and four stories, except for parts of the city with an Area Plan adopted after the 2023 Comprehensive Plan Interim Update. Factors to be considered include relationships between proposed buildings and their surroundings, natural features, lot and block characteristics, and access to urban services, transit, arterial streets, parks, and amenities. Comprehensive Plan. P.20**

These factors are vague, but in any reasonable interpretation, they would require that the Common Council conclude it should not allow increased density on the Old Sauk parcels. Residents' comments establish facts from which the Plan Commission and the Common Council must conclude that density on this site should not be increased.

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE PROPOSED BUILDING AND THE SURROUNDINGS

The neighboring homes, condos and apartments have inviting front yards and a nature-orientation. The 3 story, 138 unit building and driveway could cover up to 80% of the site. This is an urban high density plan. It is 19 times larger than the nearest apartment building. It is many times the density of nearby residential housing.

The 3 story, 138 unit in the Stone House proposal is grossly incompatible with the 1 and 2 story residences surrounding it. It is a huge building with an institutional urban design. It's immense size makes it impossible to soften its hard edges with trees or other vegetation. It dwarfs everything around it.

See Additional Data and Argument.

LOT AND BLOCK CHARACTERISTICS

The 3 story 138 unit mega-complex, when imagined in place with the surrounding property, i.e., low profile residences on lots with trees, large yards and shady terraces, is not be in harmony with the characteristics of the surrounding property. It does not seamlessly integrate into the neighborhood. Instead, It tears the neighborhood apart.

TRANSIT AND ARTERIAL STREET

Old Sauk Road, between Old Middleton Road and Gammon Road, is a two lane minor arterial road with non-BRT bus service. Per the draft West Area plan, these features weigh in favor of developing the site for Missing Middle Housing. High density housing aggravates existing traffic problems. East-west vehicle traffic, the bus line and the bike lane and parking fill this road with competing uses. Congestion problems and pedestrian risk are particularly aggravated around Crestwood School. There are no traffic lights. Left turns are high risk. Entering Old Sauk Road is high risk. There are virtually no cross walks.

SELECT CONDITIONS DO NOT SUPPORT INCREASED DENSITY

AMENITIES AND URBAN SERVICES

There are no coffee shops, restaurants, movie theaters, mercantile shops or other amenities to walk to from the site. All surrounding structures on the entire stretch of Old Sauk Road from Old Middleton Road to Gammon Road are residential. This area is not about activity. It's about rest.

In the past, city planners have said that amenities and services are all present because you can take the bus to them. Yet, and you can drive and bike to them too. The fact is that you can get there from the site. That does not move them to the site. This argument is ludicrous.

NATURAL FEATURES

Storm drainage and storage problems near the parcel would be aggravated by a development that is many times denser than the present development, therefore, the "natural features" factor weighs against a finding of "select conditions."

After a fair consideration of these factors, there can be no finding of "select conditions" on Old Sauk Road.

SELECT CONDITIONS DO NOT SUPPORT INCREASED DENSITY

THE NEW 8 FACTORS SELECT CONDITIONS TEST

**** Appropriate in select conditions at up to 70 DU/ac and four stories, except for parts of the city with an Area Plan adopted after the 2023 Comprehensive Plan Interim Update. Factors to be considered include relationships between proposed buildings and their surroundings, natural features, lot and block characteristics, and access to urban services, transit, arterial streets, parks, and amenities. Comprehensive Plan. P.20**

These factors are vague, but in any reasonable interpretation, they would require that the Common Council conclude it should not allow increased density on the Old Sauk parcels. Residents' comments establish facts from which the Plan Commission and the Common Council must conclude that density on this site should not be increased.

RELATONSHIPS BETWEEN THE PROPOSED BUILDING AND THE SURROUNDINGS

The neighboring homes, condos and apartments have inviting front yards and a nature-orientation. The 3 story, 138 unit building and driveway could cover up to 80% of the site. This is an urban high density plan. It is 19 times larger than the nearest apartment building. It is many times the density of nearby residential housing.

The 3 story, 138 unit in the Stone House proposal is grossly incompatible with the 1 and 2 story residences surrounding it. It is a huge building with an institutional urban design. It's immense size makes it impossible to soften its hard edges with trees or other vegetation. It dwarfs everything around it.

See Additional Data and Argument.

LOT AND BLOCK CHARACTERISTICS

The 3 story 138 unit mega-complex, when imagined in place with the surrounding property, i.e., low profile residences on lots with trees, large yards and shady terraces, is not be in harmony with the characteristics of the surrounding property. It does not seamlessly integrate into the neighborhood. Instead, It tears the neighborhood apart.

TRANSIT AND ARTERIAL STREET

Old Sauk Road, between Old Middleton Road and Gammon Road, is a two lane minor arterial road with non-BRT bus service. Per the draft West Area plan, these features weigh in favor of developing the site for Missing Middle Housing. High density housing aggravates existing traffic problems. East-west vehicle traffic, the bus line and the bike lane and parking fill this road with competing uses. Congestion problems and pedestrian risk are particularly aggravated around Crestwood School. There are no traffic lights. Left turns are high risk. Entering Old Sauk Road is high risk. There are virtually no cross walks.

SELECT CONDITIONS DO NOT SUPPORT INCREASED DENSITY

AMENITIES AND URBAN SERVICES

There are no coffee shops, restaurants, movie theaters, mercantile shops or other amenities to walk to from the site. All surrounding structures on the entire stretch of Old Sauk Road from Old Middleton Road to Gammon Road are residential. This area is not about activity. It's about rest.

In the past, city planners have said that amenities and services are all present because you can take the bus to them. Yet, and you can drive and bike to them too. The fact is that you can get there from the site. That does not move them to the site. This argument is ludicrous.

NATURAL FEATURES

Storm drainage and storage problems near the parcel would be aggravated by a development that is many times denser than the present development, therefore, the "natural features" factor weighs against a finding of "select conditions."

After a fair consideration of these factors, there can be no finding of "select conditions" on Old Sauk Road.

From: [Tom Balistreri](mailto:Tom.Balistreri@charter.net)
To: ledell.zellers@gmail.com
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Fruhling, William](#); tpark@cityofmadison.com
Subject: proposed building at 6610-566706 Old Sauk Road
Date: Friday, May 10, 2024 3:45:03 PM

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

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

I am a resident of what up to now has been the Parkwood Hills neighborhood. I live near the area of Old Sauk Road and San Juan Trail where a developer is proposing to construct a massive apartment building right in the heart of neighborhoods of mostly single family homes. I strongly object to this building as presently proposed for all the reasons presented to you by the Friends of Old Sauk organization and other very concerned residents of the area. But in view of the location of my home I have a special reason for objection. The proposed development would not have nearly enough on-site parking for all the people who would live in the building. The plan is for roughly one on-site parking space for every apartment. But many of the apartments would be two and three bedroom units. This means that two or three or more people living in these apartments could each have their own vehicles but there would only be parking for one of them. The other vehicle owners would have to park on the street. But there are not very many streets to park on. There are no adjoining streets on the entire north, west and east sides of the building. The only streets are on the south side and there are not very many of them. There is parking on only one side of Old Sauk. And the only streets with ready access south of Old Sauk are San Juan, Everglade and Isle Royal where I live. This means that these streets would become very congested with vehicles parked by the many residents of the new building who have no parking option on the premises. I and my neighbors would wind up living in a parking lot. The constant presence of numerous parked cars would interfere with snow plowing, with deliveries, and with pickups of brush and yard waste. It could interfere in some cases with trash pickup and mail delivery. For the numerous reasons that make the proposed building in its present iteration a really bad idea, it should be rejected. If someone wants to put up an apartment building on the Old Sauk site it should be reconfigured to more appropriately fit the site and the surrounding neighborhoods.

Tom Balistreri
510 Isle Royal Drive
(608) 833-7425
onemotom@charter.net

From: [Rita Black-Radloff](#)
To: ledell.zellers@gmail.com
Cc: [Guequierre, John](#); [Fruhling, William](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Parks, Timothy](#)
Subject: Opposition to the Stone House Development for 6610 -6706 Old Sauk Road. -- Plan Commission Meeting on June 10, 2024. Legistar Nos. 82950, 82972, 82979.
Date: Friday, May 10, 2024 2:33:46 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from rkrbr502@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,

Please respectfully consider my objections and those of my neighbors as you and all Commission members ponder the Stone House Development (SHD) for 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road. This email is filed for the three above Legistar Nos.

While we support reasonable, common sense development of all parcels in the City of Madison, each neighborhood has its appeal and we move to them based on conditions attractive to us.

The Old Sauk Road parcels are up for redevelopment and should reflect the vibe of this neighborhood not an apartment building that will tower over the other houses adjacent and bring potentially 300-500 people. We are strongly opposed to Stone House's unreasonable three/four-story proposals/projects because they lack any foundation in respect for land use, this low-density neighborhood, and environmental common sense. SHD proposals are based solely on money!

Major objections to the project:

- The project would increase the risk of substantial flooding to neighborhood homes and yards.
- This building would establish a wall, 40 feet in height towering over adjacent properties and extending down Old Sauk Road significantly longer than a football field.
- The property is 19 times larger than the apartment building next door. Lacks the set backs that make all of the nearby properties, including multi-family properties and the entire existing neighborhood so attractive and cohesive.
- The project would subject the neighborhood to noise and light pollution, seriously aggravated by the Stone House plan for a recreational area featuring a swimming pool, hot tub, sauna, fire pit, and bocce court.
- TR-U rezoning exists to "stabilize and protect and encourage the essential characteristics of **high density** residential areas...". This area is low density and thus the SHD proposal for rezoning to TR-U2 should be rejected.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

SungJa Black

6 W Spyglass Court, Madison

-still a city where everyday people's voices are heard

CC: Alder John Guiquierre, Acting Planning Division Director Bill Fruhling, Planner Timothy Parks.

From: [Helge Christensen](#)
To: Ledell.Zellers@gmail.com
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Fruhling, William](#); [Parks, Timothy](#)
Subject: Opposition to Stonehouse Development proposal to rezone and construct property at 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road, Madison Wisconsin
Date: Saturday, May 11, 2024 4:24:28 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from helgec01@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

We are residents of a single family home located near to the proposed area considered for rezoning. We are opposed to proposed rezoning of the property and opposed to Stone House Development's proposed construction of a large multi-family building. The rezoning is dramatically inconsistent with not only the immediate area in question but also inconsistent with the entire land area ranging from virtually all the neighborhoods ranging from Old Middleton Road, both sides of North Gammon Road to Stonefield Development and other Middleton residential areas. The defined area is entirely low density, low building heights and almost entirely single family residential. There is virtually no commercial development in the area.

The large development proposed is inconsistent with existing setback requirements and building height. The proposed project adjoins low density and single family housing and has overpowering height with a footprint which removes many trees and leaves almost no green space. It further overpowers the immediate surrounding area with a swimming pool and other outdoor entertainment areas. What land that is not covered by the building is dedicated primarily to surface parking which at best is inadequate and there is little or

no available street parking. There appears to be inadequate run-off water management and run-off will be directed to existing single residence homes. There is inadequate consideration given to service and emergency vehicles on a roadway proposed between the proposed building and adjacent properties; any catastrophic incident would create operational chaos and disruption to the existing neighbors.

We are in the Saukborough neighborhood which was approved by the City of Madison in 1982 as a Planned Community Development District under Sub (4) of Section 29.07 Zoning Ordinance of Madison and is consistent with development of the adjoining Woodlands neighborhood requiring primarily detached and attached owner occupied traditional dwellings with a density of 5du per acre. A dramatic difference to the Stone House proposal.

We are further concerned with water run-off and flood risk, especially as we recall living through the huge rainfall of only a few years ago. Our dwelling is a small development of 9 dwellings within Saukborough. Our small parcel was required to have a huge dedicated trough for flood water to be contained within our development without infringement on neighboring properties. That does not appear to exist on the proposed development which anticipates a substantial underground parking garage - - which will probably flood in the event of another 100 year rainfall!

The existing zoning has provided an area of homes with individual substantial green spaces, abundant trees, adequate parking for residents with limited street parking on relatively narrow,

low speed streets. The proposed property would remove mature trees and have limited space for vegetation to support significant wildlife - - deer, woodland animals, turkeys and numerous varieties of songbirds. The proposed project would create noise, congestion and pressure on wildlife and residents. We are also concerned with the high density being an attraction for crime which has been noted in other recent high density dwellings.

The City of Madison has been very diligent in the past to maintain zoning and common sense development of residential areas which were created with City demands for green spaces, parks, consistent development and, dare we say it, beauty. The proposed project is absolutely inconsistent with the current attributes of this proud Madison suburb.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mrs. Pearl Christensen

Mr. Helge Christensen

From: [Matt Hamilton](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Fruhling, William](#); [Parks, Timothy](#)
Subject: Fwd: Model Comment and Additional Data
Date: Friday, May 10, 2024 3:08:20 PM

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

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

Re: Opposition to the Stone House Development for 6610 -6706 Old Sauk Road. -- Plan Commission Meeting on June 10, 2024. Legistar Nos. 82950, 82972, 82979.

Dear Plan Commission Chair Zellers,

I respectfully ask that you and all Commission members carefully consider my views.

I wish this email to be filed in the three above Legistar Nos.

While we support reasonable, common sense development of the Old Sauk Road parcels, we are adamantly opposed to Stone House's unreasonable proposal, lacking any foundation in common sense. Please carefully consider my objections.

Major objections to the project:

- The project would increase the risk of substantial flooding to neighborhood homes and yards.
- This building would establish a wall, 40 feet in height towering over adjacent properties and extending down Old Sauk Road significantly longer than a football field.
- The property is 19 times larger than the apartment building next door. It lacks the setbacks that make all of the nearby properties, including multi-family properties, and the entire existing neighborhood so attractive and cohesive.
- The project would subject the neighborhood to noise 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.
- TR-U rezoning exists to "stabilize and protect and encourage the essential characteristics of **high density** residential areas...". This area is low density. The Stone House Development proposal for rezoning to TR-U2 should be rejected.

Sincerely,
Matthew Hamilton and family
802 Blue Ridge Pkwy
Madison, WI
53705

From: [Jeff Laramie](#)
To: ledell.zellers@gmail.com; [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Fruhling, William](#); [Parks, Timothy](#)
Subject: Opposition to the Stone House Development for 6610 -6706 Old Sauk Road. Legistar Nos. 82950, 82972, 82979.
Date: Friday, May 10, 2024 2:33:31 PM

You don't often get email from jlaramie@prodigy.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

TO: ledell.zellers@gmail.com
CC: pccomments@cityofmadison.com
District19@cityofmadison.com
bfruhling@cityofmadison.com
tparks@cityofmadison.com

Re: Opposition to the Stone House Development for 6610 -6706 Old Sauk Road. --
Plan Commission Meeting on June 10, 2024. Legistar Nos. 82950, 82972, 82979.

Dear Plan Commission Chair Zellers,

I respectfully ask that you and all Commission members carefully consider my views.

I wish this email to be filed in the three above Legistar Nos.

While we support reasonable, common sense development of the Old Sauk Road parcels, we are adamantly opposed to Stone House's unreasonable proposal, lacking any foundation in common sense. Please carefully consider my objections.

Major objections to the project:

- The project would increase the risk of substantial flooding to neighborhood homes and yards.
- This building would establish a wall, 40 feet in height towering over adjacent properties and extending down Old Sauk Road significantly longer than a football field.
- The property is 19 times larger than the apartment building next door. It lacks the set backs that make all of the nearby properties, including multi-family properties, and the entire existing neighborhood so attractive and cohesive.
- The project would subject the neighborhood to noise 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.
- TR-U rezoning exists to "stabilize and protect and encourage the essential characteristics of **high density** residential areas...". This area is low density. The Stone House Development proposal for rezoning to TR-U2 should be rejected.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey C Laramie
605 Ozark Trl
Madison, WI 53705

CC: Alder John Guiquierre, Acting Planning Division Director Bill Fruhling, Planner
Timothy Parks.

From: [Steve Mason](#)
 To: [Cynthia Williams](#), [Suzanne Williams](#), [John Settlers](#), [Parks, Timothy](#), [Plan Commission Comments](#)
 Subject: Old Sauk Road / proposed development
 Date: Monday, May 13, 2024 8:23:39 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from smason65@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Examples of multi family housing in the area that were included in the Stone House land use submittal.

		<hr style="width: 100%;"/>	DENSITY
OAK GROVE DRIVE CONDOMINIUMS	OAK GROVE DRIVE CONDOMINIUMS	<hr style="width: 100%;"/>	6.1A / 41 DU .15 A / DU
			<hr style="width: 100%;"/>
722 SAUK RIDGE TRAIL SETTLERS WOODS APARTMENTS	722 SAUK RIDGE TRAIL SETTLERS WOODS APARTMENTS	722 SAUK RIDGE TRAIL SETTLERS WOODS APARTMENTS	2.32A / 32 DU .07A / DU
			
6926-6934 OLD SAUK COURT WYDNEMERE CONDOMINIUMS	6925-6937 OLD SAUK ROAD WYDNEMERE CONDOMINIUMS	6804-6834 OLD SAUK COURT WYDNEMERE CONDOMINIUMS	6709 OLD SAUK ROAD WYDNEMERE CONDOMINIUMS
<hr style="width: 100%;"/>			<hr style="width: 100%;"/>
12.32A / 123 DU			.10 A /DU average
<hr style="width: 100%;"/>			<hr style="width: 100%;"/>
			3.7 A / 138 DU .03 A / DU Acres / Dwelling Unit
LOOKING EAST FROM ACROSS OLD SAUK ROAD			Proposed Stone House Development

This email illustrates a comparison of the density of 3 existing multi family housing examples vs the proposed Stone House development. These examples were included in the Stone House development submittal for a change of zoning. The proposal is over 3 times the density of the average of the existing properties included in their submittal.

As Stone House is seeking a zoning change, I am not sure as to which of the two alternatives they desire. They say the request is for a change to TR-U2 but then include references to LMR proposed in the "West Area Plan" draft.

LMR:

LMR zoning has not been adopted. While the city has outlined some provisions, more specifics would be required. An example of this is a density of 30DU/acre but no lot coverage defined. 30- 3BR units would occupy twice as much land as 30- 1BR. More scalar qualities, setbacks, etc would be required. Stone house highlights a provision for additional density of up to 70DU/acre dependent upon several subjective and interpretive conditions stated in relative terms. These would need be clearly defined in objective terms before adoption. This is all a little hazy, but the Stone House proposal is out of scale and proportion with the immediate area and other multi family dwellings in the wider area. Is the city going to approve a zoning classification that doesn't exist yet for Stone House?

TR-U2

This zoning, by its stated purpose is incompatible with this location.

"The TR-U Districts are established to stabilize and protect and encourage the essential characteristics of high-density residential areas and to accommodate a full range of life-cycle housing."

SR-V2:

Why was this zoning not considered? It is the zoning classification of the Wyndemere Condos.

Steve Mason
 District 19 resident

From: [Marianne Novella](mailto:ledell.zellers@gmail.com)
To: ledell.zellers@gmail.com
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Fruhling, William](#); [Parks, Timothy](#)
Subject: Opposition to the Stone House Development for 6610 -6706 Old Sauk Road. -- Plan Commission Meeting on June 10, 2024. Legistar Nos. 82950, 82972, 82979.
Date: Friday, May 10, 2024 1:31:34 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from marianne.novella@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,

We respectfully ask that you and all Commission members carefully consider my views.

We wish this email to be filed in the three above Legistar Nos.

While we support reasonable, common-sense development of the Old Sauk Road parcels, we are adamantly opposed to Stone House's unreasonable proposal, lacking any foundation in common sense. Please carefully consider my objections.

Major objections to the project:

- The project would increase the risk of substantial flooding to neighborhood homes and yards.
- This building would establish a wall, 40 feet in height towering over adjacent properties and extending down Old Sauk Road significantly longer than a football field.
- The property is 19 times larger than the apartment building next door. It lacks the setbacks that make all the nearby properties, including multi-family properties, and the entire existing neighborhood so attractive and cohesive.
- The project would subject the neighborhood to noise 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.
- TR-U rezoning exists to "stabilize and protect and encourage the essential characteristics of **high-density** residential areas...". **This area is low-density.** The Stone House Development proposal for rezoning to TR-U2 should be rejected.

Sincerely,

Marianne and Giovanni Novella

.....

10 Mt. Rainier Lane, Madison WI 53705

CC: Alder John Guiquierre, Acting Planning Division Director Bill Fruhling, Planner Timothy Parks.

From: [Kathleen stark](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#); Ledell.Zellers@gmail.com; [Guequierre, John](#); bfruchling@cityofmadison.com; [Parks, Timothy](#)
Subject: Opposition to the Stone House Development for 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road
Date: Monday, May 13, 2024 7:05:15 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from strk79automatic@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Re: Opposition to the Stone House Development for 6610 -6706 Old Sauk Road. -- Plan Commission Meeting on June 10, 2024. Legistar Nos. 82950, 82972, 82979.

Dear Plan Commission Chair Zellers,

I respectfully ask that you and all Commission members carefully consider my views.

I wish this email to be filed in the three above Legistar Nos.

While we support reasonable, common sense development of the Old Sauk Road parcels, we are adamantly opposed to Stone House's unreasonable proposal, lacking any foundation in common sense. Please carefully consider my objections.

Major objections to the project:

- The project would increase the risk of substantial flooding to neighborhood homes and yards.
- This building would establish a wall, 40 feet in height towering over adjacent properties and extending down Old Sauk Road significantly longer than a football field.
- The property is 19 times larger than the apartment building next door. It lacks the set backs that make all of the nearby properties, including multi-family properties, and the entire existing neighborhood so attractive and cohesive.
- The project would subject the neighborhood to noise 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.
- TR-U rezoning exists to "stabilize and protect and encourage the essential characteristics of **high density** residential areas...". This area is low density. The Stone House Development proposal for rezoning to TR-U2 should be rejected.

Sincerely,
Thomas and Kathleen Stark
809 Sauk Ridge Trail

From: [Stephen Wiberley](#)
To: ledell.zellers@gmail.com; [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Fruhling, William](#); [Parks, Timothy](#)
Subject: Opposition to Stone House Development for 6610-6702 Old Sauk Rd
Date: Sunday, May 12, 2024 10:04:43 AM

You don't often get email from wiberley@sbcglobal.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Re: Opposition to the Stone House Development for 6610 -6706 Old Sauk Road. --
Plan Commission Meeting on June 10, 2024. Legistar Nos. 82950, 82972, 82979.

Dear Plan Commission Chair Zellers,

We respectfully ask that you and all Commission members carefully consider our views.

We wish this email to be filed in the three above Legistar Nos.

While we support reasonable, common sense development of the Old Sauk Road parcels, we are adamantly opposed to Stone House's unreasonable proposal, lacking any foundation in common sense. Please carefully consider our objections.

Major objections to the project:

- The project would increase the risk of substantial flooding to neighborhood homes and yards.
- This building would establish a wall, 40 feet in height towering over adjacent properties and extending down Old Sauk Road significantly longer than a football field.
- The property is 19 times larger than the apartment building next door. It lacks the set backs that make all of the nearby properties, including multi-family properties, and the entire existing neighborhood so attractive and cohesive.
- The project would subject the neighborhood to noise 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.
- TR-U rezoning exists to "stabilize and protect and encourage the essential characteristics of **high density** residential areas...". This area is low density. The Stone House Development proposal for rezoning to TR-U2 should be rejected.

Sincerely,
Patricia and Stephen Wiberley

.....
Address
6406 Old Sauk Rd

CC: Alder John Guiquierre, Acting Planning Division Director Bill Fruhling, Planner Timothy Parks.

From: [Jane Nelson Worel](mailto:jnelsonworel@gmail.com)
To: ledell.zellers@gmail.com
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Fruhling, William](#); [Parks, Timothy](#)
Subject: Development for Old Sauk Road
Date: Friday, May 10, 2024 2:42:34 PM

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

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

Re: Opposition to the Stone House Development for 6610 -6706 Old Sauk Road. -- Plan Commission Meeting on June 10, 2024. Legistar Nos. 82950, 82972, 82979.

Dear Plan Commission Chair Zellers,

I respectfully ask that you and all Commission members carefully consider my views.

I wish this email to be filed in the three above Legistar Nos.

While we support low density, multi-family dwelling development of the above mentioned Old Sauk Road parcels, we are strongly opposed to the proposal submitted by Stone House Development. This proposal for a large scale, high-density structure, is unreasonable among neighborhoods that have long been zoned as single family low density properties. This structure is oversized and out of character when compared to the surrounding area and lacks common sense. Please carefully consider my objections.

Major objections to the project:

- The project would increase the risk of substantial flooding to neighborhood homes and yards.
- This building would establish a wall, 40 feet in height towering over adjacent properties and extending down Old Sauk Road significantly longer than a football field.
- The property is 19 times larger than the apartment building next door. It lacks the setbacks that make all of the nearby properties, including multi-family properties, and the entire existing neighborhood so attractive and cohesive.
- The project would subject the neighborhood to noise 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.
- TR-U rezoning exists to "stabilize and protect and encourage the essential characteristics of **high density** residential areas...". This area is low density. The Stone House Development proposal for rezoning to TR-U2 should be rejected.

Respectfully yours,

Jane Nelson Worel
717 Pebble Beach Drive
Madison, WI 53717

CC: Alder John Guiquierre, Acting Planning Division Director Bill Fruhling, Planner
Timothy Parks.

From: Parks, Timothy
To: Plan Commission Comments
Subject: FW: Opposition to the Stone House Development for 6610 -6706 Old Sauk Road Plan Commission Meeting on June 10, 2024, Legislar Nos. 82950, 82972, 82979.
Date: Friday, May 10, 2024 6:07:17 AM
Attachments: Side-by-Side Comparison of SR Site Criteria Pk, pdf
184742026b_7d7468d696a675121201a1893c7c143264665696a364778e7788a1c442c-d.png

From: Grace Kwon <gskwon22@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 9, 2024 11:29 PM
To: Izellers@cityofmadison.com
Cc: pccomments@cityofmadison.com; Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>; Fruhling, William <Wfruhling@cityofmadison.com>; Parks, Timothy <TParks@cityofmadison.com>; All Alders <allalders@cityofmadison.com>; council <council@cityofmadison.com>; Planning <planning@cityofmadison.com>; Horvath, Linda <LHorvath@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Opposition to the Stone House Development for 6610 -6706 Old Sauk Road Plan Commission Meeting on June 10, 2024, Legislar Nos. 82950, 82972, 82979.

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.

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 Legislar 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 (Atic 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.

District 19

Sincerely,
Grace Kwon

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




- HIGH ROOF 136'-2"
- ROOF 133'-0"
- THIRD FLOOR 122'-4"
- SECOND FLOOR 111'-2"
- FIRST FLOOR 100'-0"
- PARKING LEVEL 88'-0"

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






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






- HIGH ROOF 136'-2"
- ROOF 133'-8"
- THIRD FLOOR 122'-4"
- SECOND FLOOR 111'-2"
- FIRST FLOOR 100'-0"
- PARKING LEVEL 89'-0"

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






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






2 SOUTH ELEVATION
A201 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"




C



- 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"






- HIGH ROOF 136' - 2"
- ROOF 133' - 8"
- 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
A201 1/16" = 1'-0"



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 existing 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
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=...>

From: [GK](#)
To: keller@cityofmadison.com Plan Commission Comments
Subject: Re: Opposition to the Stone House Development for 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road Plan Commission Meeting on June 10, 2024. Legislator Nos. 82950, 82972, 82979.
Date: Thursday, May 9, 2024 11:36:05 PM
Attachments: [Site by Site Comparison of SR Site Criteria Pw.pdf](#)
[181742086_76746816966875122018187c141246466566a364778f788a1c442c-d.png](#)

You don't often get email from glawson@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 Legistar 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 closest 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.

Sincerely, Grace Kwon District 19

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




- HIGH ROOF 136'-2"
- ROOF 133'-0"
- THIRD FLOOR 122'-4"
- SECOND FLOOR 111'-2"
- FIRST FLOOR 100'-0"
- PARKING LEVEL 88'-0"

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






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






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






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






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




C



- 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
 A201
 1/16" = 1'-0"





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



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 existing 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 North West 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 Salyal
wmeo.com

From: [Michael Onheiber](mailto:Michael.Onheiber)
To: Ledell.Zellers@gmail.com
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Opposition to Stone House Proposal for Development of 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road
Date: Thursday, May 9, 2024 11:59:53 AM

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

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

RE: Plan Commission Meeting on June 10, 2024. Legistar Nos. 82950,82972.82979

Dear Plan Commission Chair Zellers:

We support reasonable, common sense development of the Old Sauk Road parcels, but use of the “escalation clause” to promote the Stone House proposal defies common sense in pursuit of extreme density regardless of the impact on affected neighborhoods. We are adamantly opposed to this proposal. The major objections are:

It would have grossly adverse effects on surrounding property and residents

- The project would increase the risk of substantial flooding to neighborhood homes and yards.
- It would effectively establish a solid wall, 40 feet high, with only 15 feet setback, extending down Old Sauk Road significantly longer than a football field.
- It would greatly increase neighborhood noise (including traffic noise reverberating off the huge structure) and light pollution, aggravated by the plan for a recreation area with a swimming pool, hot tub, sauna, fire pit, and bocce court.
- It would greatly worsen the already existing and poorly managed traffic dangers on Old Sauk Road, and simply extend them through multiple residential streets in Sauk Ridge and Parkwood Hills.

This is not moderate rezoning and reasonable transition to greater density. It is extreme.

- It is 19 times larger than the apartment building located very nearby.
- The average density of surrounding parcels is 7.9 units per acre; The Stone House proposed density is 36.6 units per acre.
- It is 19.6 times the density of the nearest multi-family residence, the Settler's Woods.
- This apartment complex cannot be integrated into the neighborhood. The profile of the proposed project relative to the current community is too extreme.



We support a development that increases density while blending in with the suburban environment of which it will become an integral part

- We would welcome additional multi-family units, small apartment buildings, duplexes and triplexes, on smaller lots, with separating green spaces and setbacks similar to such structures as are already here.
- Current zoning supports the development of such “missing middle” housing.

Please give this your most serious consideration and include it on all three Legistar files shown above,

Sincerely,

Michael and Patrice Onheiber

.....

6706 Carlsbad Drive
Madison, Wi 53705

From: [Parks, Timothy](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Opposition to Stone House Development for 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road
Date: Thursday, May 9, 2024 9:19:13 AM

From: Michael Onheiber <michaelonheiber@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 9, 2024 8:39 AM
To: lzellers@cityofmadison.com
Cc: pcccomments@cityofmadison.com; Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>; Fruhling, William <WFruhling@cityofmadison.com>; Parks, Timothy <TParks@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Opposition to Stone House Development for 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road

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

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

RE: Plan Commission Meeting on June 10, 2024. Legistar Nos. 82950,82972.82979

Dear Plan Commission Chair Zellers:

We support reasonable, common sense development of the Old Sauk Road parcels, but use of the “escalation clause” to promote the Stone House proposal defies common sense in pursuit of extreme density regardless of the impact on affected neighborhoods. We are adamantly opposed to this proposal. The major objections are:

It would have grossly adverse effects on surrounding property and residents

- The project would increase the risk of substantial flooding to neighborhood homes and yards.
- It would effectively establish a solid wall, 40 feet high, with only 15 feet setback, extending down Old Sauk Road significantly longer than a football field.
- It would greatly increase neighborhood noise (including traffic noise reverberating off the huge structure) and light pollution, aggravated by the plan for a recreation area with a swimming pool, hot tub, sauna, fire pit, and bocce court.
- It would greatly worsen the already existing and poorly managed traffic dangers on Old Sauk Road, and simply extend them through multiple residential streets in Sauk Ridge and Parkwood Hills.

This is not moderate rezoning and reasonable transition to greater density. It is extreme.

- It is 19 times larger than the apartment building located very nearby.
- The average density of surrounding parcels is 7.9 units per acre; The Stone House proposed density is 36.6 units per acre.
- It is 19.6 times the density of the nearest multi-family residence, the Settler's Woods.
- This apartment complex cannot be integrated into the neighborhood. The profile of the proposed project relative to the current community is too extreme.



We support a development that increases density while blending in with the suburban environment of which it will become an integral part

- We would welcome additional multi-family units, small apartment buildings, duplexes and triplexes, on smaller lots, with separating green spaces and setbacks similar to such structures as are already here.
- Current zoning supports the development of such “missing middle” housing.

Please give this your most serious consideration and include it on all three Legistar files shown above,

Sincerely,

Michael and Patrice Onheiber

.....

6706 Carlsbad Drive
Madison, Wi 53705

From: [Stouder, Heather](#)
To: [Cleveland, Julie](#)
Cc: [Parks, Timothy](#); [Firchow, Kevin](#); [Fruhling, William](#)
Subject: FW: Opposed to Old Sauk Road development
Date: Wednesday, May 8, 2024 8:03:54 AM

Julie-

Sending for Legistar just in case this isn't already included. Thanks!

Heather

Heather Stouder, AICP *(she, her, hers)*

Administrative Services Manager
City of Madison Department of Planning &
Community & Economic Development
215 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., Ste. 130
Madison, Wisconsin 53703

Office: 608-261-5567

Email: hstouder@cityofmadison.com

Web: <http://www.cityofmadison.com/dpced/>

From: Nancy Wiegand <wiegand@cs.wisc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, May 7, 2024 8:58 PM
To: Stouder, Heather <HStouder@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: Nancy Wiegand <wiegand@cs.wisc.edu>
Subject: Opposed to Old Sauk Road development

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

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

I live in Crestwood, near the proposed development on Old Sauk Road, and I'm hugely opposed to an apartment building being built in this single family residential neighborhood for many reasons. One reason is visual which includes the need to relax when coming home versus entering a high density situation with more noise, people, buildings, and commotion. Another reason is the importance of keeping all trees and greenery. These are vital for people's health and well-being. A park would be the appropriate choice for the land.

Another large reason is that there already is a lot of traffic on Old Sauk Road making it nearly impossible to turn left from Rosa Road. More cars coming down Old Sauk Road would close down any chance of turning left from Rosa. It's a big problem right now.

There is also an elementary school with risky crossings both at the school and at Rosa Road. More traffic would increase the danger for kids and other pedestrians. The 2 crossing guards help, but they're only around certain times.

Perhaps the City is doing this on purpose – driving out its long-term residents with

established houses they worked hard for and now want to relax with greenery and peace. Instead, we're being driven out of the City. The noise, pollution, and crowds are not livable places. The City is being destroyed, which is not going to help the tax base nor the next generation. Anyone with more money will leave the City.

Stop the crowding. development, traffic, noise, and pollution. Respect those of us who have given the City so much for so many years.

Nancy Wiegand

From: [Debi Forrestal](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [All Alders](#)
Subject: Old Sauk Road: Demo Permit - 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, 82950/Cond Use - 6610 - 6706 Old Sauk Rd, 82972/CSM - 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, 82979
Date: Tuesday, May 7, 2024 5:35:51 PM

[You don't often get email from gallery@chorus.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.

I am opposed to the Old Sauk Road Project as presented. Specifically object to approval of the following:

-Demo Permit - (82950) - Opposing 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd (District 19): Consideration of a demolition permit to demolish two single-family residences and a 2 two family residence.

-Cond Use - (82972) - Opposing Consideration of the conditional use in the (Proposed) Traditional Residential Urban 2 (TR-U2 for a multi-family greater than 60 units and the consideration of a conditional use in the TR-U2 District for outdoor recreational to allow the construction of a 3-story, 138 unit apartment building with the accessory of a pool.

-CSM - (82979) -Oppose Approving a Certified Survey Map of property owned by Stone House Development, Inc. located at 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd (District 19).

I am 100% opposed to the project as presented as it creates many negative impacts to my home directly adjacent to the facility. The footprint of this proposal is too large for the property. Watershed and flooding issues are a primary concern as well as 24/7 lights and noise from the property. Shadowing of my property blocking the sun and sky from my property is also a large concern.

Deborah Forrestal
21 Saint Andrews Circle
Madison, WI 53717
608/338-775
Gallery@chorus.net

Sent from my iPad

From: jwestern@chorus.net
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [All Alders](#)
Subject: Old Sauk Road: Demo Permit - 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, 82950 / Cond Use - 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, 82972 / CSM - 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, 82979
Date: Tuesday, May 7, 2024 12:35:50 PM

You don't often get email from jwestern@chorus.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

I am opposed to the Old Sauk Road Project as presented. Specifically object to approval of the following:

> Demo Permit - 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, 82950 - Opposing 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd(District19): Consideration of a demolition permit to demolish two single-family residences and a 2 two family residence.

> Cond Use - 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, 82972 - Opposing Consideration of the conditional use in the [Proposed] Traditional Residential Urban 2(TR-U2 for a multi-family greater than 60 units and the consideration of a conditional use in the TR-U2 District for outdoor recreation all to allow the construction of a 3- story, 138 unit apartment building with the accessory of a pool.

> CSM - 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, 82979 - Oppose Approving a Certified Survey Map of property owned by Stone House Development, Inc. located at 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd(District 19).

I am 100% opposed to the project as presented” as it creates many negative impacts to my home directly adjacent to the facility. The footprint of this proposal to too large for the property. Watershed and flooding issues are a primary concern as well as 24/7 lights and noise from the property with headlights shining directly into my bedroom. Shadowing of my property blocking the sun and sky from my property.

Jeff Western
25 Saint Andrews Circle
Madison, WI 53717
608-692-8414
jwestern@chorus.net

From: [Guequierre, John](#)
To: joylessinmudville@msn.com
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Re: [District 19] Traffic Congestion
Date: Wednesday, May 1, 2024 2:50:23 AM

Hello, Robert,

This is just a note that I received and read your email about traffic controls. I'm an avid biker myself and regularly bike down Old Sauk and Old Middleton. Thank you for the suggestions.

All the best,
John Guequierre
district19@cityofmadison.com
608.571.3530

From: City of Madison <noreply@cityofmadison.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 30, 2024 8:07 AM
To: Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: [District 19] Traffic Congestion

Recipient: District 19: John P. Guequierre

Tue, 04/30/2024 - 08:06

Robert Hunter

I/me/mine (he)

5418 Old Middleton Road

#202

Madison, Wisconsin. 53705-2658 Yes, by email. joylessinmudville@msn.com District 19 Traffic Congestion Hi. I've resided on Old Middleton Road for 7-8 years or so. Pre-Pandemic and pre-reconstruction the traffic was horrible. We were often unable to get out of our driveway onto Old Middleton, having to wait 3-5 or more minutes for a break in the traffic. The only good thing about the Pandemic was that the traffic relented. Prior to the reconstruction, we met w the engineers about the roadway and suggested the installation of speed bumps, traffic lights or other controls to slow/regulate the traffic. We were told: (a) Speed bumps and traffic lights wouldn't be installed because Old Middleton was a bus/emergency vehicle route. But, we're assured that the removal of parking and the installation of a wider dedicated bike lane would make the road safer.

As an avid cyclist and occasional pedestrian, I can assure you that, having now moved beyond the Pandemic, pre-Pandemic levels of traffic are returning and the drivers thoroughly disregard the painted lines of the bike lanes. Often as not, when confronted w traffic stopping (to turn or to wait for pedestrians), following traffic will dodge into the bike lanes to pass, EITHER ON THE LEFT OR RIGHT at high speed.

Furthermore, given the City's intent to permit the construction of a fairly extensive new array of housing out Old Sauk in addition to the thousands of units recently constructed at the end and South of Old Sauk, and the apparent intent to constrict the traffic now on Mineral Point Road to two lanes, the traffic on Old Sauk will merely get worse.

Traffic controls — stop lights, speed bumps — need to be installed at the intersections of Old

Middleton and Old Sauk, and Old Middleton, as well as at the intersection of Old Middleton and Rosa Road. To protect cyclists and pedestrians at the various crossings, the City should also install flexible guards — in Denver I've seen rubber cones/rails placed around crossings to discourage traffic from dodging into the bike lanes to get around stopped or turning traffic.

From: [Robert Hunter](#)
To: [Guequierre, John](#)
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Re: [District 19] Traffic Congestion
Date: Wednesday, May 1, 2024 6:32:19 AM

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

Hi. Thanks for your reply. This is a pic of a bike lane w flexible markers that I saw in Denver.



Sent from my iPhone

On May 1, 2024, at 2:50 AM, Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com> wrote:

Hello, Robert,

This is just a note that I received and read your email about traffic controls. I'm an avid biker myself and regularly bike down Old Sauk and Old Middleton. Thank you for the suggestions.

All the best,
John Guequierre

district19@cityofmadison.com
608.571.3530

From: City of Madison <noreply@cityofmadison.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 30, 2024 8:07 AM
To: Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: [District 19] Traffic Congestion

Recipient: District 19: John P. Guequierre

Tue, 04/30/2024 - 08:06

Robert Hunter
I/me/mine (he)
5418 Old Middleton Road
#202

Madison, Wisconsin. 53705-2658 Yes, by email. joylessinmudville@msn.com
District 19 Traffic Congestion Hi. I've resided on Old Middleton Road for 7-8 years or so. Pre-Pandemic and pre-reconstruction the traffic was horrible. We were often unable to get out of our driveway onto Old Middleton, having to wait 3-5 or more minutes for a break in the traffic. The only good thing about the Pandemic was that the traffic relented. Prior to the reconstruction, we met w the engineers about the roadway and suggested the installation of speed bumps, traffic lights or other controls to slow/regulate the traffic. We were told: (a) Speed bumps and traffic lights wouldn't be installed because Old Middleton was a bus/emergency vehicle route. But, we're assured that the removal of parking and the installation of a wider dedicated bike lane would make the road safer.

As an avid cyclist and occasional pedestrian, I can assure you that, having now moved beyond the Pandemic, pre-Pandemic levels of traffic are returning and the drivers thoroughly disregard the painted lines of the bike lanes. Often as not, when confronted w traffic stopping (to turn or to wait for pedestrians), following traffic will dodge into the bike lanes to pass, EITHER ON THE LEFT OR RIGHT at high speed.

Furthermore, given the City's intent to permit the construction of a fairly extensive new array of housing out Old Sauk in addition to the thousands of units recently constructed at the end and South of Old Sauk, and the apparent intent to constrict the traffic now on Mineral Point Road to two lanes, the traffic on Old Sauk will merely get worse.

Traffic controls — stop lights, speed bumps — need to be installed at the intersections of Old Middleton and Old Sauk, and Old Middleton, as well as at the intersection of Old Middleton and Rosa Road. To protect cyclists and pedestrians at the various crossings, the City should also install flexible guards — in Denver I've seen rubber cones/rails placed around crossings to discourage traffic from dodging into the bike lanes to get around stopped or turning traffic.

From: [Guequierre, John](#)
 To: [Steve Mason](#)
 Cc: [John Guequierre Comments](#)
 Subject: Re: Old Sauk zoning change submittal
 Date: Friday, May 3, 2024 2:04:35 AM

Hello, Steve,

Your original email did include the helpful map. Thanks for this deep dive into the zoning details. I'm copying it to the official repository for public comments.

All the best,
 John Guequierre
 district19@cityofmadison.com
 608.571.3530

From: Steve Mason <smason65@gmail.com>
 Sent: Thursday, May 2, 2024 12:47 PM
 To: Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>
 Subject: Old Sauk zoning change submittal

You don't often get email from smason65@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

John,


While I cannot speak for others, the main objections I have to this project are related to its high density and the request for a change to inappropriate zoning classification. There is, as I will point out a SR zoning classification that addresses multi family housing that could possibly provide a substantial amount of units. This SR classification is already present in the nearby area. As you must know, in its present form, I along with considerable number of others in the district remain strongly opposed to this out of proportion ill fitting project.

In looking at this zoning map I am curious about the change of zoning request from SR-C3 to TR-U2 for the Old Sauk Road development. TR-U2 zoning "Statement of Purpose" deals with high-density residential areas. There are exactly zero high-density residential areas anywhere near the proposed site for this project. The closest TR-U2 location is on Sheboygan Avenue. Its neighbors are WI DOT and the ultra high density Madison Yards development. I do not at all consider this request to be in anyway compatible with the existing character or zoning that surrounds this site and should be denied. Did the developer merely just look around for a zoning category that suited him?

There are several multi family developments in the area. The map below shows one of them that is zoned SR-V2. A provision of that zoning district and its Conditional Uses indicates multi family developments of greater than 24 units with a lot size stipulated @ 1500sf/unit. Another way of looking lot size that is currently used is dwelling units per acre. 43.560sf (1acre) / 1500sf/unit = 29 units per acre. There are additional requirements that would also need to be met such as setbacks, lot coverage, etc. Why was this zoning not considered? It seems this existing zoning could provide a substantial degree of density without overwhelming the site.

Other SR=V2 uses are indicated on the perimeter of the area in the map below.
 "Statements of Purpose" for the zoning districts mentioned are included below the Map

Steve Mason



28.038 - SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL - VARIED DISTRICTS.

(1) Statement of Purpose.

The SR-V Districts are established to stabilize and protect the essential characteristics of residential areas of varying densities and housing types, typically located in the outlying parts of the City, and to promote and encourage a suitable environment for family life while accommodating a full range of life-cycle housing

8.034 - SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL - CONSISTENT DISTRICTS.

(1) Statement of Purpose.

The SR-C Districts are established to stabilize and protect the essential characteristics of low- to moderate-density residential areas typically located in the outlying parts of the City, and to promote and encourage a suitable environment for family life while accommodating a full range of life cycle housing.

28.049 - TRADITIONAL RESIDENTIAL - URBAN DISTRICTS.

(1) Statement of Purpose.

The TR-U Districts are established to stabilize and protect and encourage the essential characteristics of high-density residential areas and to accommodate a full range of life-cycle housing.

From: [Kathy Western](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Stone House, 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd. Legistar: # 82979, #82972, #82950
Date: Tuesday, May 7, 2024 12:00:38 PM

[You don't often get email from kwestern@tds.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.

I am 100% opposed to Stone House's huge apartment building built on this much too small lot.

The size creates many Preventable problems that those of us who live next to the Old Sauk property are painfully aware, such as :

- watershed management issues and flooding
- 24/7 lights and noise from access road right behind my fence, vehicles, pool, hundreds of people, dogs;
- A "Mid-century" institutional box eyesore, not a home, that creates shadowing, blocking the sun and sky in my yard.
- traffic congestion and overflow parking

Homeowners stabilize neighborhoods as renters freely come and go. Established neighborhoods should not be destroyed by a multitude of serious side effects and homeowners demeaned in your quest to add more housing.

Kathy Western
25 Saint Andrews Circle
Madison, WI 53717

Sent from my iPad