

From: john salmo <jsalmo608@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 30, 2021 8:40 AM
To: hstouder@gmail.com
Cc: All Alders <allalders@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Accessory Dwelling Unit Change - Comment for Plans Commission

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

Freddie Mac says less than 10% of ADUs are rented out on the open market. The rest are either for relatives/children, or used just as extension of the main living space. One of the big reasons there is because most cities require they only be built on owner occupied properties.

If serious about solving the housing crisis this ordinance needs to open for rental properties. They're infinitely more likely to be built for a return to investor than for an owner household. And if we really want to add units and add density this is the only way it'll get done. 20 units over 10 years isn't enough especially knowing likely only 2 are actually rentals, and this ordinance won't do much unless you let landlords have equal rights to owner-occupants to do their part to increase density in the city.

There's no difference between owners and renters all are members of the community and deserve increased access to amenity here. No danger to health safety welfare or enjoyment. Please open the ordinance up to non owner occupied too so it can actually make a difference. More affordable to rent a \$150k ADU than a apartment in a \$15m apartment building.

Thank for your work,

John
W Gorham St

From: ulrike dieterle <ulrike.dieterle@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, November 1, 2021 5:06 PM

To: All Alders <allalders@cityofmadison.com>; ulrike dieterle <ulrike.dieterle@gmail.com>

Subject: Item 68079 -Amending Tables 28C-1, 28D-2 and 28E-2 to change Accessory Dwelling Units ("ADU") from a conditional use to a permitted use

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

Accessory dwelling units (ADU's) should continue to go through a rigorous conditional use review process. To do less is an insult to neighbors. Neighbors need to have full and unimpeded input into any proposal for an ADU within the City of Madison, especially neighbors bordering the property where an ADU is proposed. "Granny flats" is a euphemistic phrase for "I'm setting up a rental business in my backyard." **This is capitalism at its very worst.**

Laying down more concrete and impervious surfaces is not "Housing Forward." This is "Housing Backwards" with no thought to the environmental impact of creating more run off, hard surfaces, more energy consumption, more heat islands. The Great Lakes region is warming faster than any other area in the contiguous United States according to a 2019 report by the Environmental Law and Policy Center and reported in the Wisconsin State Journal recently. We do not need to add to our climate woes by further reducing green spaces and plants that increase oxygen and store carbon. We have already lost far too much green space and too many trees to aggressive development. One 40-year old tree provides 260 lbs of oxygen a year which is enough for a family of four. The same tree holds 1 ton of carbon. How much oxygen has aggressive development taken out of our environment already? Why increase the negative impact already imposed by ADU's on our neighborhoods?

Council needs to redirect its energies to environmentally sound practices, not promote the creation of structures on every green space in our city. The mantra should be "an urban forest in every yard," not an ADU for every "granny."

Ulrike Dieterle, 323 N Blackhawk Ave, Madison 53705

From: almostcathy@gmail.com <almostcathy@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 3, 2021 1:38 PM
To: All Alders <allalders@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: [All Alders] Accessory Dwelling Units

Recipient: All Alders

Name: Cathy Douglas
Address: 3117 Worthington Av., City of Madison, WI 53714
Phone: 608-284-9558
Email: almostcathy@gmail.com

Would you like us to contact you? Yes, by email

Message:

I'm happy to see that Madison is considering ways to make accessory dwelling units "granny flats" easier to build for homeowners. I have no personal interest in doing so, but am glad to see the council considering this option to create more affordable housing. One thing that's especially appealing about this form of housing is that it's often used to help extended families live together and care for one another. Creating new affordable housing for long-term renters is also a worthy goal.

However, I do have one concern, and that is that people may take advantage of relaxed regulations to create units for the purpose of using them as vacation rentals Airbnb, etc.. Madison currently has a very sensible set of rules for regulating vacation rentals, but my understanding is that an accessory unit on one's property can legally be rented out short-term on platforms like Airbnb. Which is fine as far as existing ADUs are concerned, but my worry is that people might start creating new accessory units for the express purpose of renting them out short-term. This could cause problems for neighborhoods, and would do nothing to ease the housing shortage.

I would suggest that the new regs for ADUs should require that any new unit should not be allowed as a vacation rental for a certain number of years maybe five years or something like that. This would allow people with existing ADUs to continue using them as vacation rentals, if that is their choice, but also discourage homeowners from creating new ADUs with the sole purpose of using them as tourist rentals.

Thanks to all for your consideration, and for your work on the Common Council.

From: eileenlittleredt@gmail.com <eileenlittleredt@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 4:43 PM
To: All Alders <allalders@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: [All Alders] ADUs

Recipient: All Alders

Name: Eileen and Craig Thompson
Address: 311 Campbell Street , Madison, WI 53711
Phone: 608-256-4504
Email: eileenlittleredt@gmail.com

Would you like us to contact you? Yes, by email

Message:

We believe there needs to be time for more significant discussions about which neighborhoods participate and the specific rules on usage and legal jurisdictions. While we understand there are benefits, we are opposed to these ADU's in historic districts, and particularly Vilas Neighborhood. We feel there are reasons indicating that Vilas Neighborhood is not an adequate location for ADU's.

1. Proximity - There have been studies indicating that there is already an average of 10 feet or less between most of the homes in the Vilas neighborhood. Adding ADU's into the mix with this minimal distance and then ADU's being " a minimum of three 3 feet from any property line" is way to close. This minimal distance seems like we are creating townhouses. In older neighborhoods this means more problems with water drainage, maintenance access between properties eg. House painting, window privacy and lighting issues whether outside lights or interior lights creating light pollution.

2. Increased Traffic, Parking - We deal with college students living in a large number of rental properties and homes, in addition to the many UW stadium events, University of Wisconsin and Edgewood college commuters, and Henry Vilas zoo bringing outsiders to our neighborhood. This creates increased auto traffic and limited access to parking and presents added demands for homeowners in this neighborhood trash, vandalism,
We also have to deal with the alternate side emergency snow days which have many time conflicted with the "No parking signs 8-noon" for Parking maintenance.

3. Narrow Streets and Alleys - With the already existing traffic from UW stadium events, University of Wisconsin and Edgewood commuters, and Vilas zoo guests brings many outsiders into the small area and increases to the homeowners in neighborhood. The streets are narrower than perimeter surrounding neighborhoods and these ADU's will add additional demands to streets and alleys in this older neighborhood. Increasing the density on these older neighborhood roads will create additional stresses on the land and roads. This is not only a safety issue for firetrucks, but more cars creates more accidents.

4 In addition to the aforementioned concerns, ADU's may unfortunately devalue the existing properties not increase values.

We oppose allowing ADU's in our neighborhood.

From: H J <hmjones3@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, November 12, 2021 5:14 PM

To: All Alders <allalders@cityofmadison.com>; District 17 <noreply@cityofmadison.com>; Gary Halverson <gary@halverson4madison.com>; Planning <planning@cityofmadison.com>

Subject: ADUs

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

Hi, I am curious why it has not been proposed to also change the occupancy restrictions for having and ADU? Currently requires the owner to occupy either the primary residence or the ADU.

If we want to gradually increase density in the future for SFH areas the. We should remove this occupancy requirement.

I would like to hear the logic of maintaining this restriction along with the proposed changes.

Thanks, Hilton Jones

From: jwelsh99@gmail.com <jwelsh99@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 22, 2021 1:39 PM
To: All Alders <allalders@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: [All Alders] ADU zoning changes

Recipient: All Alders

Name: John Welsh
Address: 5133 Oak Valley Drive, Madison, WI 53704
Email: jwelsh99@gmail.com

Would you like us to contact you? Yes, by email

Message:

Hello Alders, I want to express my deep opposition to the ADU amendment being considered tonight at the Plan Commission#68079 and at the Common Council meeting on December 7th I believe. I understand the need for more housing which is already all being stuffed on the Eastside for the homeless but changing ordinances to allow anyone to build a ADU on their property will be disruptive to many other neighbors. Who knows what will be built, who will live in them, all the noise of building these and the neighbor and neighborhood issues that will result from these especially in established neighborhoods. I can only imagine landlords and homeowners rushing to build these so they can make a buck and allow anyone to live in them. I have no idea where this proposal came from but it seems very ill conceived with all the issues that will result from this. I ask that you please vote NO on the amendment for ADU's if/when it comes before the council.

Sincerely,

John Welsh/Brian Culley/Vincenzo Cefalu

From: Nicholas Davies <nbdavies@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 5, 2021 6:13 PM
To: All Alders <allalders@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Yes to ADUs (68079)

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

Hello alders!

I live in Eastmoreland, and it's great! I can walk to groceries, restaurants, cafes, parks, churches, a library, a bus transfer point, and more. More people would live here if they could.

But our zoning code forbids us from welcoming more people to Eastmoreland. Much of the neighborhood is zoned TR-C1, which limits each plot to one housing unit.

Single-family zoning was and still is one of the mechanisms used to exclude people of color from certain neighborhoods and make it harder for them to save and build wealth. It's no coincidence that affluent, effectively still-redlined neighborhoods are the most stridently against this extremely modest change.

Madison as a whole has something like a 10,000 housing unit deficit, which is causing real estate prices and rental prices to rise. People are having to compete for the opportunity to pay more than they budgeted for on housing.

ADUs don't solve the housing shortage on their own, and this will just remove a procedural hurdle for those seeking to build one. But for the people whose problems they will solve, those people deserve options. They deserve being able to make plans, knowing those plans won't get tied up in city process. People who have another child, or have to care for an elder, shouldn't be forced back into the housing market.

Yes, an ADU could also be rented out to supplement the mortgage on the main house, but that could be a first-generation homeowner who couldn't afford that mortgage on their own. That renter could take pressure off the rental market by living in the ADU.

We shouldn't stop here though. Just think how much more vibrant and walkable and self-sufficient our neighborhoods could be, if we allowed accessory commercial spaces as well, if we didn't limit storefronts to often-unwelcoming arterial streets. An ice cream stand across from the school. A corner store to pick up that last dinner ingredient. A bike repair shop where you need it most.

This isn't radical. In much of the world, it's commonplace. It's our tainted historic legacy that's holding us back.

Thank you,

Nick Davies
3717 Richard St