

**From:** [Jeremy Cesarec](#)  
**To:** [All Alders](#)  
**Subject:** support for transit oriented development #74703  
**Date:** Monday, December 5, 2022 10:09:46 AM

---

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

Hello Alders,

I just learned about this proposed ordinance and I am in favor of it. I'm a single-family homeowner in Tenney-Lapham and I welcome more population density in our city's desirable, walkable neighborhoods near reliable public transportation.

As you consider this proposal in coming weeks, I urge you to act in the interest of climate resiliency and housing equity and support this ordinance.

Thank you,  
Jeremy Cesarec  
408 Sidney St, Madison, WI 53703

**From:** [Austin Griesbach](#)  
**To:** [All Alders](#)  
**Subject:** TOD Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, October 31, 2022 10:55:12 AM

---

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

Hello, I am writing about the upcoming Transit Oriented Development zoning overlay ordinance discussion. I am strongly in favor of the move towards transit oriented development, and just have a few comments on the zoning overlay ordinance in regards to historic districts.

I encourage you to avoid granting exemptions to local and national historic districts from the potential zoning changes. The new zoning would eliminate parking requirements on new development, which more easily allows the preservation of the historic context due to the vastly reduced footprint. Further, by allowing for increases in permitted units, existing buildings can be repurposed into multi-family housing without any appreciable changes to district character at all. Lastly, the city does not currently recognize national historic districts, so recognizing them only in the form of zoning exceptions would create unnecessary edge cases and policy conflicts.

I am currently a renter in Monona. With Madison's push towards transit oriented development and more people-friendly streets, I am strongly considering relocating towards Madison instead. By going all the way with the updates to zoning to match the modern understanding of what makes cities work, a relocation like this would be not only more feasible, but even more desirable. At the very least, as transit oriented development brings new people-friendly storefronts and enhanced business corridors to Madison, I can say without a doubt that the areas that I'll visit the most and spend the most money at are going to be precisely the places that fully allow for it.

**From:** [cailey.jamison@gmail.com](mailto:cailey.jamison@gmail.com)  
**To:** [All Alders](#)  
**Subject:** [All Alders] TOD Feedback  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 29, 2022 2:16:39 PM

---

**Recipient:** All Alders

**Name:** Cailey Jamison  
**Address:** 1827 E Washington Ave #167, Madison, WI 53704  
**Phone:** 608-327-9309  
**Email:** [cailey.jamison@gmail.com](mailto:cailey.jamison@gmail.com)

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

**Message:**

Hi all

I'm a Madison Marquette Neighborhood/District 6 resident and wanted to reach out and share my thoughts ahead of the TPPB's consideration of the Transit Oriented Development plan next Monday.

I fully support the TOD plan's goals and encourage Council to move forward with it. However, I did want to share some thoughts about proposed historic district carveouts and owner-occupancy requirements.

Existing local/national historic district protections are sufficient, and further limitations would block a gentle increase in density the city needs in order to remain an affordable place to live for future generations. Preventing very small increases in density near transit stands in the way of more walkable, 15-minute city neighborhoods, and would serve the interests of a few wealthy homeowners rather than the whole city. Excluding these areas from the plan could lead to more cars and parking requirements – often directly at odds with maintaining the "character" of the area and meeting our climate goals. On the other hand, more density + fewer cars – while maintaining historic district aesthetics – is exactly what we should be looking for as the city grows. And the clearest way to get there is to include these areas in TOD while relying on existing protections to ensure that changes are in line with current character.

In order for millennials like me and future generations to afford housing in Madison, the city must increase housing supply. The city has been underbuilding for years now and it has caught up to us. To solve that issue, we need to build – and requiring owner occupancy for duplexes/ADUs will prevent much of the needed supply building in the city. More houses and more options helps everyone. For that reason, we should not impose additional residency restrictions on duplexes.

Thank you for everything you are doing on this project and for being a voice of reason at every meeting I've observed, and please do everything you can to make this TOD plan even better. I will be reaching out to the other involved groups to share similar thoughts. Have a

great week!

Cailey Jamison

**From:** [ianjamison@gmail.com](mailto:ianjamison@gmail.com)  
**To:** [All Alders](#)  
**Subject:** [All Alders] TOD Feedback  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 29, 2022 8:34:08 AM

---

**Recipient:** All Alders

**Name:** Ian Jamison  
**Address:** 1827 E Washington Ave, Apt 167, Madison, WI 53704  
**Phone:** 608-327-9063  
**Email:** [ianjamison@gmail.com](mailto:ianjamison@gmail.com)

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

**Message:**

I wanted to reach out and share my thoughts ahead of the Council's consideration of the TOD plan on January 3.

I wholeheartedly support the plan and its goals and urge you to move forward with it. My two pieces of feedback are with regards to proposed historic district carveouts and owner-occupancy requirements.

Existing local/national historic district protections are sufficient, and extending further limitations is at odds with the gentle increase in density we're looking for. It stands in the way of more walkable, 15-minute city neighborhoods, and would serve the interests of the few rather than the whole city. Excluding these areas from the plan could lead to more cars and parking requirements – often directly at odds with maintaining the "character" of the area. On the other hand, more density + fewer cars – while maintaining area aesthetics – is exactly what we should be looking for here. And the clearest way to get there is to include these areas in TOD while relying on existing protections to ensure that changes are in line with current character.

I also believe that the top impediment to affordable housing is lack of supply. The city has been underbuilding for years now and it has caught up to us. To solve that issue, we need to build – and we shouldn't be worried about who is building or why. More houses and more options helps everyone. For that reason, we should not impose additional residency restrictions on duplexes.

Thank you for everything you do and please do everything you can to make this TOD plan even better. I will be reaching out to the other involved groups to share similar thoughts. Have a great week!

**From:** [council](#)  
**To:** [All Alders](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Legistar items 70576 & 74703 (Transit-Oriented Development Overlay Zoning)  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 30, 2022 11:46:41 AM

---

Alders,

The following message was received in the council inbox.

- Council Staff

**From:** Eric Richards

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 29, 2022 4:14 PM

**To:** council ; Plan Commission Comments ; Transportation Commission ; Lynch, Thomas ; Stouder, Heather

**Subject:** Legistar items 70576 & 74703 (Transit-Oriented Development Overlay Zoning)

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

Hello,

I am a homeowner in the Emerson East neighborhood (TR-C4) and I am an area representative on the Emerson East Neighborhood Association board. I am writing to express my personal support of Transit-Oriented Development Overlay Zoning. I also approve of the proposed specific TR-C4 zone changes; I feel they are a reasonable step in the right direction.

Our current zoning situation is one of the largest barriers to our city's continued equitable growth. TOD overlay zoning is an effective tool for improving our city's housing supply while also making it easy for more and more residents to access public transit. Study after study show that prioritizing public transit access and multi-family housing have huge impacts on cost of living, traffic congestion, and equitable access to all. If we want to be a modern city, we need to make changes that allow us to grow like one.

I believe local and national historical districts should be included in TOD overlay and not excluded as exceptions. Current protections for those sites are sufficient, and any changes affecting those areas can be reviewed on a case-by-case basis through the existing historical preservation channels. It doesn't make sense to entirely exclude those areas from a TOD overlay.

As far as proposed owner-occupancy requirement for multi-unit residential dwellings goes ... I see the reasoning, but I feel that it does not fit in with the overall TOD overlay plan. Adding that clause would just serve to give people a reason to vote this down. Any changes to zoning regarding owner-occupancy should be made for each zoning categorization itself separately and not restricted to only overlap with TOD overlay zones. For example, an owner-occupancy change to TR-C4 should impact *all* TR-C4 and not just the TR-C4 parcels that intersect with a TOD overlay.

Thank you,

Eric Richards  
201 N Third St