

From: [Kathleen Lowry](#)
To: [Kevin McCormick](#)
Cc: [Duncan, John](#); [Stouder, Heather](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); sundevils98@yahoo.com; rasoldner@madison.k12.wi.us; [Field, Derek](#); [Figueroa Cole, Yannette](#); kianespencer@gmail.com; [Ledell Gmail](#); mcsheppard@madisoncollege.edu; nicole.solheim@gmail.com; pwheck@gmail.com; [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Janet Wheaton](#); [Tom Solyst](#); [Donna Biddle](#); [John Kroeger](#); [Ann Dunlap](#); [Stephanie Lemancik](#)
Subject: Re: 25 unanswered questions
Date: Monday, November 27, 2023 5:21:31 PM

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

Getting online to speak?

On Nov 27, 2023, at 4:41 PM, Kevin McCormick <justuwait2016@yahoo.com> wrote:

All are excellent questions. But #25 hits the nail on the head!

On Monday, November 27, 2023 at 03:11:36 PM CST, Janet Wheaton <jmwheat07@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello -

John Duncan replied that all of our questions have been answered. Every question listed below has been asked by five different individuals and has not answered. Questions were sent through an email to John and Tim Parks, sent to public comments or asked at the in person meeting on 11/6 that John and Tim were present.

1. Is this a design where everyone feels safe and protected?
2. Can this plan guarantee students & apartment residents do not have access to each other's spaces?
3. Would this model be approved without more in-depth study and community input if this was a public school?
4. Do students who attend private schools deserve the same oversight & protection given to public school students?
5. Is this proposal held to the same high standards and scrutiny to ensure safety for all?
6. Have you addressed the potential safety and health risks given the Bishop, priests and property management did not adhere to and enforce COVID public health orders and mandates?
7. Why have Tim Parks and John Duncan expressed approval prior to public input?
8. What physical security measures have been specified to ensure distinction between school, students and residents?
9. Will locks be added before floor 2 & 3?
10. What lock or restriction will be on the shared elevator?
11. Why hasn't more testing been done in apartments above and below where school would be?
12. How are you defining parking spaces for 41 staff and designated tenant parking?
13. Have you changed the traffic pattern flow?
14. What is the responsibility of the owner and management to facilitate communication?
15. What threshold of noise will be deemed acceptable?
16. What considerations have been made for increased population? ie: electrical, plumbing?
17. Does SAA have a School Safety Intervention Team?

18. Can children and others get out of windows?
19. Do cameras vet visitors?
20. What is the Standard Response Protocols in place?
21. Who is the outside resource person for safety security coordination?
22. What is the single point of entry?
23. Who do we contact regarding an incident involving a student?
24. Who is liable for problems outside the defined school area?
25. What informed individuals would ever consider putting a school in this building?

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Kevin McCormick](#)
To: [Duncan, John](#); [Stouder, Heather](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); sundevils98@yahoo.com; rasoldner@madison.k12.wi.us; [Field, Derek](#); [Figueroa Cole, Yannette](#); kianespencer@gmail.com; [Ledell Gmail](#); mcsheppard@madisoncollege.edu; nicole.solheim@gmail.com; pwheck@gmail.com; [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Janet Wheaton](#)
Cc: [Tom Solyst](#); [Donna Biddle](#); [John Kroeger](#); [Kathleen Lowry](#); [Ann Dunlap](#); [Stephanie Lemancik](#)
Subject: Re: 25 unanswered questions
Date: Monday, November 27, 2023 4:41:44 PM

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

All are excellent questions. But #25 hits the nail on the head!

On Monday, November 27, 2023 at 03:11:36 PM CST, Janet Wheaton <jmwheat07@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello -

John Duncan replied that all of our questions have been answered. Every question listed below has been asked by five different individuals and has not answered. Questions were sent through an email to John and Tim Parks, sent to public comments or asked at the in person meeting on 11/6 that John and Tim were present.

1. Is this a design where everyone feels safe and protected?
2. Can this plan guarantee students & apartment residents do not have access to each other's spaces?
3. Would this model be approved without more in-depth study and community input if this was a public school?
4. Do students who attend private schools deserve the same oversight & protection given to public school students?
5. Is this proposal held to the same high standards and scrutiny to ensure safety for all?
6. Have you addressed the potential safety and health risks given the Bishop, priests and property management did not adhere to and enforce COVID public health orders and mandates?
7. Why have Tim Parks and John Duncan expressed approval prior to public input?
8. What physical security measures have been specified to ensure distinction between school, students and residents?
9. Will locks be added before floor 2 & 3?
10. What lock or restriction will be on the shared elevator?
11. Why hasn't more testing been done in apartments above and below where school would be?
12. How are you defining parking spaces for 41 staff and designated tenant parking?
13. Have you changed the traffic pattern flow?
14. What is the responsibility of the owner and management to facilitate communication?
15. What threshold of noise will be deemed acceptable?
16. What considerations have been made for increased population? ie: electrical, plumbing?
17. Does SAA have a School Safety Intervention Team?
18. Can children and others get out of windows?
19. Do cameras vet visitors?
20. What is the Standard Response Protocols in place?
21. Who is the outside resource person for safety security coordination?
22. What is the single point of entry?
23. Who do we contact regarding an incident involving a student?
24. Who is liable for problems outside the defined school area?
25. What informed individuals would ever consider putting a school in this building?

Sent from my iPhone

From: [LaVonne Wendt](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Agenda #79963
Date: Wednesday, November 22, 2023 11:13:34 AM

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

We are NOT in favor of a middle/high school as a tenant at Holy Name Heights. A school at this location will increase traffic tremendously, increase noise, increase commotion, and increase issues. We already need a traffic light to get out of our community (Coventry Village) onto to High Point.

At the very least, there should be a fence around the school grounds to decrease the appeal of the woods on our property.

Thank you.

LaVonne Wendt
Jerry Olson
7844 Courtyard Drive
Madison, WI 53719

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: basailorman@gmail.com
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Holy Name Heights rezoning opposition.
Date: Sunday, November 26, 2023 4:42:32 PM

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

We are residents at 706 South High Point Road, Holy Name Heights Apartments. We would like to register our strong opposition to the proposal to rezone the building to include Saint Ambrose School.

We have been very pleased with how the building is currently managed. We believe the current plan to place a school in a residential building is woefully lacking in well-researched consideration of the many consequences of this change. A most obvious, and probably most important consequence, is the security issue, relevant to all effected parties. Mixing students, their families, friends and teachers in a building residents call home is outrageous. I cannot imagine how parents could send their students into such a situation. As a resident I bristle at the thought of so many strangers in my home everyday. Certainly there are apartment buildings that include retail on their ground levels, but these buildings are designed to accommodate both residents and shoppers from the start with strong security and segregation built in.

There are traffic issues, noise issues, parking issues, and on and on. And each issue has many complexities. Take noise, for example. Not only will there be the added noise and activity during the school day, but during many after school hours activities as well. We already have Blue Plate Catering in the building. We don't need more noise.

It surprises me that parents and educators would be in favor of this move for Saint Ambrose School. While financial motives may be behind this proposal, it seems to me to go against the interests of both the residents of Holy Name Heights AND the students, parents and teachers of Saint Ambrose alike.

We believe both parties to this proposal deserve better.

We strongly oppose the re-zoning proposal.
Richard and Peggy Friedman

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Msgr. James Bartylla](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Cc: [Duncan, John](#)
Subject: RE: Dear City Rep - Nov 27th Plan Commission Mtg #79963 - Msgr. Jim Bartylla
Date: Monday, November 27, 2023 11:47:10 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

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

Monday of the 34th Week in Ordinary Time, November 27th

Dear City Representative (cc: Alder Duncan),

I registered to speak online regarding matter #79963 (702-706 S. High Point Rd.) for tonight's (November 27th) Plan Commission online meeting at 5:30 pm. Due to the fact that I spoke on this issue at the previous Plan Commission meeting, I hereby withdraw my request to speak for the sake of collective expediency, although I remain firmly in support of the proposal. I couldn't find a place online in which I could withdraw. If you need me to do some type of online withdraw to remove my name as a speaker for tonight's meeting, please let me know, otherwise I'll presume this email suffices. Thank you so much for your work for the common good.

Respectfully, Msgr. Jim Bartylla

"He must increase, I must decrease." - John 3:30

Msgr. James Bartylla, Vicar General, Diocese of Madison
Voice: 608-821-3011, Fax 608-440-2808
Office Email: vicargeneral@madisondiocese.org
Personal/Confidential Email: james.bartylla@madisondiocese.org
Website: www.madisondiocese.org

From: ptril04@aol.com
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Planning Commission Meeting - November 27, 2023 - Agenda Item 79963
Date: Sunday, November 26, 2023 11:18:16 PM

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

Planning Commission:

As a current resident of Holy Name Heights Apartments, located at 702/706 S. High Point Rd. - Madison, WI, I fully support Agenda Item #79963. I support the effort by St. Ambrose Academy to obtain space at the current Holy Name Heights building to add a private middle/high school as a tenant to the current building. I support it for these reasons:

1. As a city, we often speak of "sustainability" in our community. The current building is a perfect example of how a building can be enhanced to be used to its fullest capacity. The fact, that this building was initially built to be a school/seminary back in 1963 should not be lost in this discussion. The idea that now 60 years later, it may again house an educational institution is exciting and I for one believe this school and the tenants who currently reside in the same building can collaborate to make this shared experience comfortable and safe for all.
2. As a community, we are often concerned about the education of our local youth. I have had a chance to examine St. Ambrose and meet with both some parents and children associated with this school. I am impressed with the many opportunities this school offers our youth, the strength of its educational program, and believe that its residing at the Holy Name Heights facility will only enhance what is offered to those who attend this school. As a community that says they are interested in education and new opportunities for its youth, it might be time to do everything we can to support such programs; including this school and the educational experience it adds to Madison.

Thanks for your time.

Sincerely,

Peter Trilling

From: [Janet Wheaton](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Monday 11/27 meeting
Date: Sunday, November 26, 2023 2:24:17 PM

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

Re: file # 79963

Plan Commission Agenda heading - you ask

1. Who benefits?

The Catholic Diocese. This was made clear by Diocese staff in two separate meetings. Their forecasting 8 years ago in making the decision to convert Holy Name to a mixed use building with 'commercial and dwellings' has not paid off. The investment and the current debt was shared by the Chief of Staff of the Diocese at our 10/22/23 meeting with the 21 people in attendance opposing the school.

2. Who's burdened?

The residents living in these apartments who should have been informed about the possibility of the Diocese's year long 'keep it quiet' plan to move a school into the building where the open advertising to the general public continues to line the property and online ...to rent a market rate apartment in a quiet peaceful setting.

3. How can policymakers mitigate unintended consequences?

Start by voting NO to adding a school to a mixed use building with 66 apartment occupants, including the Bishop, Priests and Diocese staff and those guests and families that visit. Plus a catering company that employs up to hundreds of full and part time staff. This is the mixed use model that is sold to an applicant looking to rent an apartment. Fire Marshal Bill Sullivan referred to this proposal when we spoke, as, "think of it as a marriage of students and residents." A lot of red flags went up for me immediately upon hearing this. Sadly there will be consequences that are now 'foreseeable' based on the lack of scrutiny and security in this plan and the dismissive responses from the Diocese and City officials in addressing the serious concerns and questions from the residents. The plan commissions role to mitigate the unintended consequences has to be taken seriously to prevent and avoid all possible risks by taking a proactive approach by voting against the proposed action and not a reactive one as some have suggested when a question has been raised.

4. Who doesn't have a voice?

The 11-18 year old children and the residents of these apartments ranging from their mid 20's to mid 90's from all walks of life and all denominations. Safety and Health have to take precedence over financial gain. The intermingling and interactions between children and adults is not only a major concern but also a potential risk to vulnerable children and adults. These kids deserve every opportunity to be properly educated and cared for in an enriched environment. The Diocese has to put their self interest and financial gain aside and assist school officials to ensure that the students have a safe school building and community that affords them the best possible opportunity to succeed in a secured building. A long time supporter of private schools has made suggestions to the Diocese and others as to what is available within 10 minutes from their current location. The plan commission voting NO will restart the efforts of the Diocese and St.Ambrose to find a stand alone secure building that would allow staff and students to access their classrooms and activity spaces free from restrictions, limitations and as much as possible to avoid unnecessary risk by having Best School Safety Practices in place.

Thank you in advance for carefully considering your decision.

Respectfully submitted,
Janet Wheaton
706 S. High Point Rd.
Resident - Holy Name Heights

~~October 26, 2023~~

Updated 11/12/23 J.W.

Dear Plan Commission:

The purpose of our letter today is to convey our concerns about the proposal for St. Ambrose Academy moving into Holy Name Heights Apartment complex.

After one informational meeting hosted by St. Ambrose, most concerned residents felt that we had little hope in objecting to the move and were told that the Bishop would make a decision in late June. However, once we noticed the yellow Public Notice signs posted at the driveway entrances, we inquired and then felt that perhaps we have an opportunity to speak up.

These are our primary concerns opposing St. Ambrose Academy's move to Holy Name Heights:

- * The safety and security of everyone living and working in the building. The residents, business staff and of course the students and school staff. School safety is paramount in today's culture.
- * The proposal mentioned a maximum of 260 students plus staff. The interaction between residents, staff and students presents a potential health risk to the community.
- * Our concerns represent all the reasons historically residents and schools are housed in separate facilities.

Thank you for your consideration regarding our strong opposition to this plan.

Respectfully submitted,

Signed below by the following residents of Holy Name Heights:

Kathleen Lowry Apt. 306

Jack Kroeger Apt. 222

Donna Biddie Apt. 228

Janet Wheaton Apt. 10

Ken Wheaton Apt. 10

Kevin McCormick Apt. 14

Tom R. Solyst Apt. 328

Dennie Petersen Apt. 204

Ann Dunlap Apt. 22

Elaine Kroeger Apt. 222

Stephanie Lemarié Apt 5

Brada Branda Apt 122

Paul Stauffer Apt 8

Paul Stauffer Apt 8

Clay Stauffer

Stephanie Kriebel 110

Michael A. Coon 27

Maria Stuckert

To the members of the Madison Plan Commission,

I am writing regarding proposal 79963, which proposes the modification of the zoning of Holy Name Heights, in order to allow St. Ambrose Academy to become a tenant. As a resident of the building for nearly two and a half years, I am opposed to the current proposal as written.

While it is not unheard of for schools to occupy the same building as residential and commercial tenants, it is exceedingly rare. Nearly all the examples I could find of schools being incorporated in mixed-use development had the schools in separate buildings. I was able to find two examples, 8 Spruce Street in NYC and Crosstown Concourse in Memphis. With so few examples of this setup, I think it is important to consider them as models of successful implementation. Unfortunately, looking at the plans for these schools reveals several glaring deficiencies with the St. Ambrose School's proposal.

First, security. In both examples, the school and residents have exclusive use of separate entrances. This exclusivity is enforced not just with policy, but with physical barriers. This model of having separate access points is common in mixed-use development, even just for mixed commercial and residential use. For instance, today at Holy Name Heights, Blue Plate Catering has their own exclusive entrance to the building. Except for the front door during business hours, entrances require keycard access. Once inside the building, a person has easy access to all apartments, as there are apartments on the ground floor and elevators do not require keycard access. While this may be satisfactory for a mixed use commercial and residential building, it is entirely insufficient security for a school. Under the current proposal, St. Ambrose has no plans to establish a single exclusive entry point for the school, and intends to rely on policy, rather than physical barriers to separate the school from residents. They intend for several staircases to be shared, and have no plans to require keycard access for the elevator, despite it providing unrestricted access to both residential and school areas. While all residents are required to complete a background check, no such requirement is in place for guests of residents, who are not documented anywhere. This specific concern has been brought to the attention of the St. Ambrose multiple times, but it has still not been addressed.

Second, noise. Both schools I found occupied only the lower floors of the building. Not only does this make it easier to establish exclusive stairways and entrances, but it greatly diminishes the noise impact on residents. To date, despite being asked multiple times, no effort has been made to even measure the expected noise impact of the school on the apartments above,

and especially below, the school. The only noise measurements were taken for the gym. Moreover, both schools were constructed at the same time as the apartments, meaning no existing residents had to deal with construction noise, the impact of which has also not been measured. One of the main draws of Holy Name Heights for current residents is how quiet is. Until shown evidence otherwise, it is difficult to imagine that the school will not be a significant source of noise for the residents above and below the school.

Setting aside the comparison to existing mixed-use residential and school buildings, I have several additional concerns with the proposal submitted to the Plan Commission.

First, parking. The Letter of Intent says that St. Ambrose will have exclusive use of 41 parking spots, and “use as needed of any additional parking spaces.” Given that they project to have 33 staff members, and 80 students old enough to drive in 5 years (and it is my current understanding that they are allowed to drive themselves to school if they have a license), 41 parking spots seems to be a significant underestimate of demand. This is not considering special events they might have that bring in additional visitors. Rather than an accurate estimate of parking space use, this reads to me as an expansive mandate to access many more than 41 spots, which could cause parking problems for others who need the parking, such as members of the community who attend Mass, or residents.

Second, traffic. To my knowledge, St. Ambrose bases their belief that they will not impact traffic on a single Monday morning in April when students came to Holy Name Heights for Mass. As someone who frequently commutes within the specific timeframe in which they expect to have students arrive, I am particularly concerned with the utilization of the Junction Road entrance, which is frequently congested today. Moreover, it is a windy road which I am concerned will be dangerous for teenage drivers in the winter. Restricting the drop-off and pick-up lines to the High Point Road entrance would be much more sensible, in my opinion, given that it is already a one-way loop with the entrance. I raised this concern in the survey back in April and never received any response.

Third, public health. In 2020, St. Ambrose Academy joined with other Catholic schools in Dane County to sue the state in order to reopen in violation of the Dane County Health Department order, claiming a religious exemption which they were granted. I do not wish to re-litigate what the most appropriate time to reopen schools during the COVID-19 pandemic was. However, it is deeply concerning that St. Ambrose would be empowered to ignore similar public

health orders in the next pandemic. Therefore, I have a particular concern with amending the zoning to include private schools specifically, as there is a significantly greater risk that they will have the power to challenge public health orders and put residents at risk.

Despite having two meetings with residents, one of which was 7 months ago, I have yet to see the team implement any of the feedback from residents. Therefore, with construction set to begin in less than two months, I do not have any faith that any of these concerns will be addressed by them unless they are forced to by the Plan Commission.

For these reasons, I ask that the Plan Commission deny the request to amend the zoning of Holy Name Heights at this time. While I do not think it would be impossible to add a school to the building, I find the current proposal woefully inadequate at protecting and serving the interests of both students and residents.

Thank you,

Heather Sweeney

Holy Name Heights Resident

From: [Ken Wheaton](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Stouder, Heather](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Duncan, John](#); Ledell.zellers@gmail.com; Cleveland, Julie; rasoldner@madison.k12.wi.us; pwheck@gmail.com; sundevis98@yahoo.com; [Field, Derek](#); nicole.solheim@gmail.com; klanespencer@gmail.com; [Figuroa Cole, Yannette](#); mcsheppard@madisoncollege.edu
Cc: jwheat07@gmail.com
Subject: Tonight's meeting
Date: Monday, November 27, 2023 1:53:05 PM

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

Plan Commission,

I am writing in strong opposition to adding a school to where my wife and I call home, Holy Name Heights apartment complex.

This morning we have received even more disturbing news when an email from Mr. Duncan our alderman forwarded a response to one of the residents to a question that had gone unanswered for weeks. This was one of many questions waiting to be answered.

To paraphrase - St. Ambrose Academy's plan for notifying students, staff, residents and commercial tenants of an imminent threat and emergency will be by assigning a half a dozen people to a text group message to alert the hundreds of people in this building at any given time.

This plan is:
INEFFECTIVE
INEFFICIENT
IRRESPONSIBLE
UNACCEPTABLE and
DANGEROUS

The plan commission has a responsibility under their own Standards of Review to protect the public interest and to vote against anything detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety and general welfare.

Thank you,
Ken Wheaton
706 S.High Point Rd.
Legistar File ID: 79963

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Katie Kretschman](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: 11/27/23 Planning Commission Meeting - Item number 5, Legistar File ID 79963
Date: Monday, November 27, 2023 2:11:30 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing to share my thoughts regarding the proposal to update the zoning for 702-706 S High Point Road to allow for a school to occupy some of the space.

I have a number of concerns regarding this proposal:

1. My sense is that a majority of the current residents do not wish for this to happen, and I include myself in that group. It is understandable that the Catholic Diocese would want to make efficient use of available building space to benefit financially, however there are many other options under the current zoning that could be pursued for that and would have a much more limited negative impact on the land, traffic, and overall environment of both the building space and natural/outdoor space that surrounds it. For example, re-work newly available office space to create additional apartments for renting, rent out available office space to non-school-based businesses or organizations.
2. Representatives of the diocese have suggested that the space was formerly a school and they would like for it to be a school again. That is true of the building's history, and I can understand that sentiment, but the use of the building in that way was prior to the space being zoned to allow for apartments to be built and for space to be rented by businesses (as best I understand it). The building is now more public in nature and is no longer only inhabited by adult male residents attending the seminary aspiring to become catholic priests and high-school-aged boys attending the private catholic boarding high school. By the request and design of the diocese, the nature of this property has changed significantly from that point in time.
3. Traffic concerns - St. Ambrose Academy will uptick the population of the building and surrounding area by over 200 people. Many of those individuals will be children who will be dropped off via cars driven by others, and there will also be children and adults who will be driving themselves and parking onsite. This will create a significant increase in traffic to the area, especially at the start and close of each school day. Both the intersection of Watts Road and South High Point Road and the intersection of Junction Road and the driveway for the property off of the west-end are going to become much more congested and these intersections are already of concern safety-wise. Additionally, the drive around the property has proven to be of concern with the current and somewhat limited traffic flow - blind spots, drive through parking areas that afford limited visibility. Has anyone from the traffic division reviewed the proposal or done some sort of impact study? As far as I am aware, these steps have not been taken.
4. Environmental concerns - the land of this property offers a green space that is frequented by many animal species and is an appreciated/welcomed natural area open to the public. Has anyone studied the impact of the increased population on the land? Especially considering that students will regularly be using the outdoor space? How about the impact of the human-sponsored noise - both vocal and automobile-related?
5. Those who are interested in pushing this project along (representatives of St. Ambrose Academy primarily) do not appear to be too concerned with the feedback and questions brought forward by the residents and it does not feel like they are serious about

considering the issues that have been shared. It seems as though they simply want this project to proceed and are jumping through the hoops that have been placed in their path with minimal responsible energy investment to try and get this approved. The meetings that have been hosted appear to be offered from the perspective of convincing the residents that this is something we should want - not offering solid responses to our questions or clear plans regarding how our concerns will be addressed. There are many other space options for St. Ambrose to consider for their school.

Once again, I am opposed to the proposal for rezoning 702-706 S High Point Road and I do not support St. Ambrose Academy being approved to move onto this property.

Thank you for your consideration of the feedback that I have offered in this message!

-Katie Kretschman (current Holy Name Heights apartment tenant)

From: [Jackie Schramm](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Support for Holy Name Heights Zoning change
Date: Monday, November 27, 2023 3:02:09 PM

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

Dear Plan Commission,

I am very much in support of the zoning change to 702-726 S High Point Road to allow for a private school tenant at Holy Name Heights/Bishop O'Connor Center.

This project aligns with the previous use of the property as a school and also aligns with the vision of the Diocese of Madison related to support for Catholic schools. The Holy Name Heights property has many existing amenities that are ideal for a school such as gymnasium, auditorium, outdoor fields, and outdoor track. It would be wonderful to see them used far more often than they are now.

As a resident of Holy Name Heights, I was well aware that I was moving into a mixed-use building and that tenants could change. I think a school would fill the space as a long-term tenant which may even have a positive impact on our rental costs in the future. We had a large rent increase this past year and I am hoping with greater financial stability, future increases may not be as large.

I do not agree with those whose argument against the school is that it would not be a safe and secure environment for children. I think it would be an even safer environment as there are potentially more individuals around to report concerns under the "see something, say something" approach. And I believe that the mixed use nature of the building will act as a deterrent for crime against the children.

I also do not agree with those who state that because they are unable to find a similar use building, that that in of itself is a reason to vote no. I completely disagree with that train of thought.

I attended the first informational meeting and feel that the school and Diocese are doing their due diligence to make sure to limit any negative impacts that the school might have.

I also believe that the City acted with good faith with respect to meeting notifications.

Residents were not entitled to any special updates from the City, school, or Diocese.

I am in total support of the zoning change.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Schramm
706 S High Point Rd Apt 308
Madison, WI 53719

From: [Janet Wheaton](#)
To: [Duncan, John](#); [Stouder, Heather](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); sundevils98@yahoo.com; rasoldner@madison.k12.wi.us; [Field, Derek](#); [Figueroa Cole, Yannette](#); kianespencer@gmail.com; [Ledell Gmail](#); mcsheppard@madisoncollege.edu; nicole.solheim@gmail.com; pwheck@gmail.com; [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Cc: [Tom Solyst](#); [Donna Biddle](#); [John Kroeger](#); [Kathleen Lowry](#); [Ann Dunlap](#); [Kevin McCormick](#); [Stephanie Lemancik](#)
Subject: 25 unanswered questions
Date: Monday, November 27, 2023 3:11:39 PM

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

Hello -

John Duncan replied that all of our questions have been answered. Every question listed below has been asked by five different individuals and has not answered. Questions were sent through an email to John and Tim Parks, sent to public comments or asked at the in person meeting on 11/6 that John and Tim were present.

1. Is this a design where everyone feels safe and protected?
2. Can this plan guarantee students & apartment residents do not have access to each other's spaces?
3. Would this model be approved without more in-depth study and community input if this was a public school?
4. Do students who attend private schools deserve the same oversight & protection given to public school students?
5. Is this proposal held to the same high standards and scrutiny to ensure safety for all?
6. Have you addressed the potential safety and health risks given the Bishop, priests and property management did not adhere to and enforce COVID public health orders and mandates?
7. Why have Tim Parks and John Duncan expressed approval prior to public input?
8. What physical security measures have been specified to ensure distinction between school, students and residents?
9. Will locks be added before floor 2 & 3?
10. What lock or restriction will be on the shared elevator?
11. Why hasn't more testing been done in apartments above and below where school would be?
12. How are you defining parking spaces for 41 staff and designated tenant parking?
13. Have you changed the traffic pattern flow?
14. What is the responsibility of the owner and management to facilitate communication?
15. What threshold of noise will be deemed acceptable?
16. What considerations have been made for increased population? ie: electrical, plumbing?
17. Does SAA have a School Safety Intervention Team?
18. Can children and others get out of windows?
19. Do cameras vet visitors?
20. What is the Standard Response Protocols in place?
21. Who is the outside resource person for safety security coordination?
22. What is the single point of entry?
23. Who do we contact regarding an incident involving a student?
24. Who is liable for problems outside the defined school area?
25. What informed individuals would ever consider putting a school in this building?

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Kevin McCormick](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Item 5 re: Holy Name Heights
Date: Monday, November 27, 2023 3:33:46 PM

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

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

My name is Kevin McCormick. As a resident of Holy Name Heights, I wish to voice my opposition to the proposal before the Planning Commission that would put a school at Holy Name Heights, which is now primarily an apartment building.

I see that the Commission is looking at this proposal from a zoning perspective. I would maintain that it is a public safety issue to place a school for teenagers into an unsecured apartment building, where people can come and go throughout the day.

Even granting that additional measures are being planned to secure the wing where the school is to reside, those plans would not protect the ground floor apartment dwellers, of which I am one.

Also, the ground floor hallways, meeting rooms, garage entrance etc., could be easily reached.

Everyone knows about the violent attacks nationwide in our schools. And this proposal opens up that possibility in a building that is home for many.

The Planning Commission should be proactive here and demand that the Diocese of Madison, Gorman and St. Ambrose Academy formulate a comprehensive plan to upgrade security for the whole building.

In fact the Commission should declare that approval of this project be contingent upon producing this comprehensive security plan.

Thank you for your time.

Kevin W McCormick
Holy Name Heights resident

From: [Quinn C](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Comments for 11/27/2023 meeting, item 5 - ID 79963 (702-726 S High Point Road and 601-701 S Junction Road)
Date: Monday, November 27, 2023 3:43:23 PM

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

Those advocating for St. Ambrose to move into Holy Name Heights have given residents assurances regarding noise and safety, but until construction starts (and ends) and the school year begins, there is no way to know what the impact will be. If things don't go as planned, there is no stopping, or undoing what's been done. If this action is approved, please consider these points:

- The only recourse for residents who don't want to live alongside a high school is to move out.
 - Adding to the burden of moving is that Gorman's lease has no option to sublet or pay a fee to vacate early. Residents must decide 60 days prior to their lease being up if they are going to stay.
- Residents will be stuck in the student drop off/pick up traffic, at least 180 days a year, or be forced to rearrange their schedules to avoid the traffic.
 - With 160 students, cars will be backed up at both entrances/exits of Holy Name. Residents could sit in traffic 10 minutes or more just to get where they are going.
- A huge draw for residents at Holy Name is the "peace and quiet". Imposing months of construction, followed by a high school moving in, will take that away.
- For 7-8 months, residents will contend with the dirt, debris, and noise of construction vehicles and workers inside and outside the building.
- Once the school moves in, foot traffic in the building and around the grounds will increase significantly. Residents will have to be even more vigilant when coming and going.
- Residents who pay rent will have to share common spaces and amenities (like the track, gym, outdoor areas) with St. Ambrose.

Thank you,
Lisa Miller

From: [Janet Wheaton](#)
To: [Duncan, John](#); [Stouder, Heather](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); sundevils98@yahoo.com; rasoldner@madison.k12.wi.us; [Field, Derek](#); [Figueroa Cole, Yannette](#); kianespencer@gmail.com; [Ledell Gmail](#); mcsheppard@madisoncollege.edu; nicole.solheim@gmail.com; pwheck@gmail.com; [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Cc: [Tom Solyst](#); [Donna Biddle](#); [John Kroeger](#); [Kathleen Lowry](#); [Ann Dunlap](#); [Kevin McCormick](#); [Stephanie Lemancik](#)
Subject: 25 unanswered questions
Date: Monday, November 27, 2023 3:11:40 PM

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

Hello -

John Duncan replied that all of our questions have been answered. Every question listed below has been asked by five different individuals and has not answered. Questions were sent through an email to John and Tim Parks, sent to public comments or asked at the in person meeting on 11/6 that John and Tim were present.

1. Is this a design where everyone feels safe and protected?
2. Can this plan guarantee students & apartment residents do not have access to each other's spaces?
3. Would this model be approved without more in-depth study and community input if this was a public school?
4. Do students who attend private schools deserve the same oversight & protection given to public school students?
5. Is this proposal held to the same high standards and scrutiny to ensure safety for all?
6. Have you addressed the potential safety and health risks given the Bishop, priests and property management did not adhere to and enforce COVID public health orders and mandates?
7. Why have Tim Parks and John Duncan expressed approval prior to public input?
8. What physical security measures have been specified to ensure distinction between school, students and residents?
9. Will locks be added before floor 2 & 3?
10. What lock or restriction will be on the shared elevator?
11. Why hasn't more testing been done in apartments above and below where school would be?
12. How are you defining parking spaces for 41 staff and designated tenant parking?
13. Have you changed the traffic pattern flow?
14. What is the responsibility of the owner and management to facilitate communication?
15. What threshold of noise will be deemed acceptable?
16. What considerations have been made for increased population? ie: electrical, plumbing?
17. Does SAA have a School Safety Intervention Team?
18. Can children and others get out of windows?
19. Do cameras vet visitors?
20. What is the Standard Response Protocols in place?
21. Who is the outside resource person for safety security coordination?
22. What is the single point of entry?
23. Who do we contact regarding an incident involving a student?
24. Who is liable for problems outside the defined school area?
25. What informed individuals would ever consider putting a school in this building?

Sent from my iPhone