

From: [Guequierre, John](#)
To: [Ilona Rodan](#)
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Re: Old Sauk expansion
Date: Tuesday, April 30, 2024 3:05:00 AM

Hello, Ilona and Barry,

Thank you for your input on the Old Sauk project. I'm adding them to the official public record.

John Guequierre
district19@cityofmadison.com

From: Ilona Rodan <catbehaviorsolutions@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 27, 2024 5:27 PM
To: Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Old Sauk expansion

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

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

As long-time homeowners in this area, we know the traffic, the community and the flood potential will make this worse for all of us. We are NOT Nimbys. We care about Madison and have for over 46 years we've lived here. Measurements on traffic on Old Sauk Road have grown to the point we already have difficulty getting out of our neighborhood. The wildlife crossing Old Sauk is at risk too. We are highly opposed and will not vote again for a mayor or alderman who don't listen to the people who live here.

Ilona and Barry Ganetzky

Ilona Rodan, DVM, Dipl. ABVP, Specialist in Feline Medicine, Advanced Certificate in Feline Behaviour - with Distinction
Cat Behavior Solutions
Medical director and owner, Cat Care Clinic, Madison 1987-2015
Co-editor and author, Feline Behavioral Health and Welfare
Past-president of American Association of Feline Practitioners
Chair of AAFP Feline Welfare Committee

From: [Guequierre, John](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Fw: District 19: Why is the Middle Missing (A Housing Mystery)? - Old Sauk Project
Date: Tuesday, April 30, 2024 3:00:19 AM

From: Ryan Murray <rmurray910@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2024 1:24 PM
To: Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Re: District 19: Why is the Middle Missing (A Housing Mystery)?

You don't often get email from rmurray910@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Thank you so much for this email. I found it very thoughtful and informative.

For what it's worth, I'm in favor of the proposed development, or any similar development, at the Old Sauk property. For two years I have lived immediately adjacent to Old Sauk and for the seven prior years I lived directly on Old Sauk. Both of my homes have been less than a mile from the proposed development. It's a terrific neighborhood and more people should be able to enjoy it.

Thanks again,

Ryan Murray
321 Glenthistle Court, Madison, WI 53705

On Thu, Apr 25, 2024, 2:13 PM Alder Guequierre <noreply@cityofmadison.com> wrote:

[View this email in your browser](#)

[City of Madison](#)



Why is the Middle Missing (A Housing Mystery)?

Seeking an Alternative

As the residents of District 19 grapple with building permit applications for multifamily apartment buildings, opponents of those projects, (most notably the Stone House Development proposal for 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd), often propose a less dense development similar to the many two- and four-unit condominium developments in the area built in the 1980's through early 2000's. This is an excellent and appropriate question. Madison's city government sees the low production of this category of housing as an urgent problem. Two- and four-unit buildings and townhomes and even some larger condominium developments are an historical first step to home ownership. After nearly two decades without significant new construction of this category of housing across the US, the absence is mourned and is now often referred to as "the missing middle".

I serve on a subcommittee of the Housing Strategy Committee which has been tasked with seeking out tools that Madison might employ to encourage more development of "missing middle" housing. To that end the subcommittee has taken testimony from Madison builders, developers, architects, and financial institutions, and reviewed numerous studies of the problem. The subcommittee concluded that the obstacles are formidable and almost completely beyond Madison's ability to incentivize. The subcommittee is now searching for creative tools and ideas for chipping away at those few obstacles within the City's control. While Madison is focusing on how to incentivize "missing middle" housing that would comprise that affordable first-step to home ownership, the findings of the subcommittee apply for the most part to the entire range of home prices. In the balance of this blog, I'll try to describe the obstacles and even offer a rather radical suggestion to residents who would prefer missing middle owned housing to larger rental projects.

Legacy of the Great Recession

The primary spark for the Great Recession of 2007 to 2009 was a near mindless explosion of real estate debt, which, when the poor quality of the collateral became apparent, led to an equally sudden implosion of the financial institutions that had provided the funding. The Federal Reserve stepped forward to take radical actions to avoid the evaporation of credit and the money supply that prompted the Great Depression of the 1930's. While not well

known, the construction industry, especially in the Midwest, actually suffered an even greater contraction than during the Great Depression. Congress and the regulatory agencies for banking and mortgage finance (FDIC, FNMA, FHLMC, FHA, VA) responded with new regulations and vastly more intensive inspections of bank assets.

Regulators noted that construction lending to developers of condos and other forms of “missing middle” housing were a particular source of bad loans. Regulators required a virtual halt to any construction lending for such projects. I remember bankers telling me at the time that at least one regulator was in their office every day telling loan officers what they could and couldn’t approve. FNMA and FHLMC, the principal underwriters of mortgages, dramatically increased the number of condo units that had to be presold before they would approve any mortgages in a project. This regulatory noose around construction lending has only relaxed slightly in the intervening 1-1/2 decades.

Construction and mortgage lending are necessary oxygen for residential development. An essential lubricant is the construction period and related insurance, including liability insurance for related architectural and engineering services. Another dramatic casualty of the Great Recession was AIG, the insurance giant, which had underwritten a huge portion of development period coverage. AIG abandoned such coverage entirely. Other insurance giants did not rush in, noting that another result of the Great Recession was an acceleration of the trend of condo associations suing every entity involved in the development and condo residents suing their association. Court decisions that allowed condo associations to bring suit against the developer and other parties many years after construction, exploded premiums, and caused more insurers to leave the market. Again, this continues. For me, it’s personal. I consult nationally on various aspects of construction technology, and my insurer will not permit me to consult on condo projects. I’m sure if I sought special coverage for a condo project, the sky-high premium would essentially rule out my participation.

In 2022, condominium development in Madison was 1/7 of the 2007 volume.

The Inflation of all Components

Disruption of long-standing supply-chain arrangements by US tariff policy, further damaged by the supply-chain impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent monetary and fiscal policy reactions resulted in hyperinflation of building materials, which has only partially receded. The long-expected retirement of “Boomers”, who comprised an over-sized proportion of the construction trades, followed by the pandemic-related exit of construction workers, and an apparent growing aversion of younger cohorts to construction jobs have combined to create a labor shortage and inflation in construction wages.

Separate from material and labor inflation is the trend toward enhancing building codes to increase safety and especially to improve energy efficiency

and less reliance on fossil fuels. The impact of greater economies-of-scale with increased use of sustainable materials has helped reduce the costs of sustainable buildings, but the overall effect is still an increase in up-front costs, fortunately often offset by long-term energy savings.

In summary, it costs much more to build any kind of housing today compared to a decade or two ago, and particularly more expensive to build missing middle housing.

Obstacles Peculiar to Wisconsin and Madison

Wisconsin is the only remaining state that has not adopted some version of the International Residential Code. Wisconsin did finally adopt a version of the International Building Code for commercial and larger multi-family structures, but it has clung to its Uniform Dwelling Code for one-and-two-family residences. Moreover, the International Residential Code covers one-and-two-family residences and townhouses, a favorite for of condominium development. Interpretations of Wisconsin's residential code push townhouses into the commercial code and its tougher requirements for all kinds of costly features including sprinkler systems.

Wisconsin also has a relatively tough statute for the creation of condominiums, adding time and investment to generating an acceptable document set.

Madison's permit approval process is infamous as a gauntlet that adds multiple layers of risk for the developer and frequent redesigns, at least compared to other cities and states. Multiple staff departments and various committees, boards, and commissions evaluate every aspect of a building proposal. This includes the intense civil engineering exercise of meeting Madison's stormwater ordinance that was toughened after the 2018 flood event. Then there is the frequent uprising of concerned residents that any kind of development in their neighborhood should be avoided as negatively impacting the character of the neighborhood. Famously, developers and contractors who work in multiple Dane County municipalities say they add 15% to 30% to their bids for projects to compensate for the extra difficulty and risk of doing business in Madison. That may not be exactly true, but it is probably partially true, despite some concerted efforts by the City to streamline the permitting process.

Bottom Line

A developer of apartment buildings which plans to hold the project in its portfolio, can amortize the high costs over 30 or 40 years. A developer of for-sale (ownership) housing needs to charge enough to generate a profit immediately. The bottom line of the testimony taken by the Housing Strategy subcommittee on owned housing is that the risks are too high and the assurance of a reasonable return on the effort too low to attract developers and contractors to missing middle housing. It's just too hard.

The Housing Strategy Committee will probably make some recommendations on a few things the City might do to incentivize missing middle housing at the

affordable end of the scale, such as pre-approved repetitive plans. Its suggestions will take time to evaluate and implement, and may or may not be effective.

What Happens if a Rental Development is Thwarted?

The eruptions of objections to multi-family rental projects in historically low-density single-family neighborhoods is not new, but appears to be more frequent and more boisterous, garnering news coverage. The forces pushing for more housing and more density are enormous, much broader than just a small group within the Planning Department. Advocates note that it isn't just a matter of boosting supply to meet demand and provide affordable housing, it's also a matter of reducing urban sprawl and reducing the carbon footprint of housing development. It's easy to conclude from social media posts that advocates of greater density are at least as energized and boisterous as the opponents.

What would happen, if an energetic citizens' effort persuaded a developer of a large multi-family project to withdraw its application? We can only speculate.

Based on our Housing Strategy study, one of the least likely results would be a developer stepping forward to propose a "missing middle" project. Even less likely in this moment of municipal austerity would be Madison's acquisition of the property as a park, given the costs of development and ongoing maintenance. Perhaps more likely is the possibility that mounting pressure for development would encourage a developer to come forward for an even larger project with even less responsiveness to neighborhood desires.

The Linden Experience

There is an exception to this grim prognosis for the missing middle. Linden Cohousing was successfully completed just a few years ago on Madison's East Side. Located at 107 Linden Court, it contains 45 one-to-three-bedroom units in a particular form of condominium in which the owners not only share common ownerships of the building's basic structure and exterior amenities, but also some interior common amenities such as kitchen and dining. The project faced all of the other obstacles of missing middle projects, especially condominiums. Yet, it's complete and successful. Madison's Housing Strategy Committee wanted to understand the source of that success. The solution was "de-risking".

De-risking is a process in which some parties in a project (or even an outside but interested party) find ways to reduce the risk for the other necessary parties to the project, thus eliminating the obstacles to moving forward. In the case of Linden Cohousing, most of the ultimate purchasers were motivated to live in a cohousing environment and effectively guaranteed the purchase of the units. That eliminated the risk of the construction lender and the mortgage providers, and provided assurance to the developing contractor that the project would be completed.

A Radical Thought Experiment

Could a group of neighbors concerned about a large multifamily rental project proposed for their neighborhood (such as the project proposed for Old Sauk Road) effectively substitute a lower density missing middle project using de-risking? From the perspective of my personal experience in housing and development over decades I would say it's at least theoretically possible. It would take a heavy dose of courage by the neighbors and perhaps an excessive level of financial foolhardiness. I think it would look something like this:

1. The neighbors would form a corporation, each diverting some of their current investments or even mortgaging their homes to raise a substantial fund.
2. Their corporation would make a competitive offer to the current property owner, taking it off the market.
3. The corporation would engage architects and engineers knowledgeable of Madison's codes and zoning to design a project that was acceptable to the neighbors.
4. The corporation would engage an experienced Madison developer, to generate realistic cost estimates, and commit to the general contractor to de-risk its involvement.
5. The corporation, with the assistance of the general contractor, would then seek construction financing and ultimate mortgage lenders, again making any necessary commitments to de-risk the lenders.
6. This de-risking could include some of the neighbors committing to purchase some of the living units. After all, they may have already been considering downsizing, thwarted by the lack of availability of such units in Madison, and with the added incentive of spending more years in the neighborhood they love.

I'm guessing this isn't likely to happen either for the Old Sauk project or similar projects that will continue to come forth in Madison in coming years. I wouldn't personally invest in anything like this. Nevertheless, it's at least one possible solution. I hardly possess all the expertise to address every aspect of the missing middle, so gladly encourage others to correct any errors I have made and propose other potentially viable solutions.

Stay tuned. I'm working on a blog titled "Why are there 'No Rezoning' yard signs on Old Sauk Road"?

[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: [Guequierre, John](#)
To: [Rachel Holloway](#)
Cc: [Figueroa Cole, Yannette](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Re: Comments on "missing middle", West Area Plan, proactive rezoning
Date: Tuesday, April 30, 2024 12:40:24 AM

Hello, Rachel,

Thanks for your input. I'm traveling in Europe and just now was able to manage my email. I appreciate these sentiments.

John Guequierre
district19@cityofmadison.com
608.571.3530

From: Rachel Holloway <racheljacques@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 26, 2024 3:35 PM
To: Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: Figueroa Cole, Yannette <district10@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Comments on "missing middle", West Area Plan, proactive rezoning

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

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

Alder Guequierre,

Thank you for your latest [email and blog post](#) from April 25th! You provide a thorough and well stated explanation of the "missing middle" issue which is so complex. I have been meaning to write for some time to say how much I appreciate your excellent communication around city land use issues - specifically the west area plan, and the proposed Stone House development on Old Sauk. You are doing a GREAT job relaying key information to us, while trying to explain the various issues raised, and you present "both sides" (pros/cons). I feel you are being very fair in your descriptions. Thank you!! We need this, especially in contentious times when people are feeling especially..."feisty".

I also appreciate your work on the housing committee you cited. I was not aware of this but am so glad that you are working on the housing crisis. It truly is a crisis.

I live in Parkwood Hills, moved here in 2019 from the near east side. I work full time (for county zoning), and have two young children. So life is very full, and as a result I am not able to keep up with current events or participate in civic process as much as I would like - even issues in my own "back yard".

To get this email out today (or this year!) while on the subject, I want to convey my opinions to you on a few issues at once:

1. Neighborhood engagement on land use and development proposals

As a land use planning and zoning professional, I understand the need to share information and solicit public opinion (and even more proactive / deeper engagement) on land use matters in the city. And as a Madison resident, I appreciate the lengths that the City goes to to involve

us in the process so we can make our voices heard. I love Madison and choose to live here for many reasons.

At the same time, as a land owner -- and as someone who didn't grow up here but moved here later (am from northern Michigan/U.P.) -- I am often surprised by the degree to which my fellow Madisonians assume they should get to control what other people do with their property. For what it's worth, I do not assume that I am entitled to tell my neighbors what they can do with their land, or to have a proposed project denied because I don't like it or because I am nervous about the change it will bring. We have many regulations on land use and construction in Madison and in our state, and we have public hearings when significant decisions warrant public feedback. If a proposed project will follow the applicable plans and ordinances, and it will not cause me a real "nuisance" such as noise/odor/contamination/flooding (which is the point of all the regulations!)...then I am satisfied to opine and let it go through the process. Cities must be allowed to grow and change, as living things. If they aren't, they stagnate or decline. And the resulting decline makes concerns over shiny new developments seem oh so small. Madison needs to have a reasonable balance when it comes to neighborhood input and property rights, so we do not stifle healthy growth or become as expensive as a coastal city.

On that note, I support eliminating single-family exclusive zoning, allowing ADUs by right in any district that allows residential, and eliminating owner-occupancy requirements. Let's try it and see if the sky falls!) The Tenney Lapham neighborhood that we moved from had serious issues with a small group of long-time, land-owning residents who used the neighborhood association to speak for all the residents, most of whom were not engaged in the Association. They balked at proposals as small as a replacement single-family home with an ADU over the garage, as if it would destroy our neighborhood. Which was located practically downtown, in a rapidly changing neighborhood in the fastest growing part of Wisconsin. The ADU was built; the sky did not fall.

2. West Area Plan and the proposed proactive rezoning

I am in favor of what the City is doing with the West Area Plan in general, and its outreach strategy, and I have participated to a limited degree. Specifically, I like (a) that the City is updating its old smaller-area neighborhood plans with broader-area plans, (b) that we are updating our land use and transportation plans at a critical time of big regional growth, as we are seeing more people move here and while our transit system is going through a major transition. So excited about BRT! And about our future with more "integrated" mixed-use neighborhoods and mobility options.

I am also in favor of the proactive rezoning of lands. It is reasonable to loosen up zoning restrictions in these areas, especially in places that are natural "hubs" for activity. (Actually I am surprised to see how few areas this is proposed in. With the public outcry I thought that 1/3 to 1/2 of the map would be proposed for rezoning!) Land development is complex, risky, and costly--so identifying and removing any unnecessary "red tape" is good. There will still be permits and public process. Fanlund's Cap Times opinion piece did our neighborhoods no favors by misrepresenting how this works and what the outcome might be.

3. Stone House Old Sauk Road development

I strongly support the redevelopment of this site. Thank you for your recap of the March meeting with resident questions, and city staff responses. Incredibly helpful! I understand many of the concerns of neighbors who live next to the site, who would notice the change the

most. At the same time I think Old Sauk Road really is an appropriate place for more dense development, as it is a major east-west corridor through the west side. While it is mostly low-density residential today, it is a busy road and a key transit route serving our area, and it can safely handle much more traffic than it has now. When I ride the bus I often catch it right next to this site - and I've often wondered when that property would develop into something new. I trust that ample thought will be given to all of the issues raised by neighbors, and do not wish to see the project limited in size or scope because it is different from what exists there today.

Thank you for your time and for reading my comments, and for all you do for our city and neighborhoods. If it would be more appropriate or helpful to send you the above comments in separate emails on each issue, I am happy to do so.

I am including Yannette Figueroa Cole on this as well (congrats on being selected Council President!) as some of my comments reflect city-wide concerns and Council decision-making.

Respectfully,

Rachel J. Holloway
6438 Shenandoah Way
racheljacques@gmail.com
(608)395-7929

From: [Guequierre, John](#)
To: annmacpack@gmail.com
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Re: [District 19] Objections to the StoneHouse Development
Date: Tuesday, April 30, 2024 12:42:43 AM

Hello, Ann,

I've been traveling in Europe and there was a delay in gaining access to my City email. Thanks for your input, which I'm entering in the public record for the Stone House project.

John Guequierre
district19@cityofmadison.com
608.571.3530

From: City of Madison <noreply@cityofmadison.com>
Sent: Friday, April 26, 2024 4:11 PM
To: Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: [District 19] Objections to the StoneHouse Development

Recipient: District 19: John P. Guequierre

Fri, 04/26/2024 - 16:10

Ann MacGuidwin

106 Blue Ridge Pkwy

Madison, Wisconsin. 53705 Yes, by email. annmacpack@gmail.com District 19 Objections to the StoneHouse Development I appreciated your blog on the missing middle of housing and look forward to your next blog on the motivation for the "no rezoning" movement on the west side. All of the objections I've heard relate to the scale of the project, both in terms of building size and increase of people and cars. Here are some data that help to explain perceptions related to the size of the building: The proposed project lies within 200 feet of 27 residential properties. 100% of the residences are less than 3 stories and the majority (56%) are less than two stories. The largest building adjacent to the project that is visible from Old Sauk Road is an 8-unit apartment building . The proposed project is 19.6 times larger than the apartment building (148,690 vs 7,600 sq ft) and absolutely enormous compared to the adjacent 26 houses, 12 of which are less than 2000 sq ft. The proposed quasi-urban behemoth will be an island amongst the 68 residential buildings that line Old Sauk from Old Middleton to Gammon. With such a large footprint, the proposed building and amenities exert a soil-sealing influence many, many times larger than the buildings in place now - a status quo with demonstrated runoff issues. The proposed project will have a negative impact on our entire community and a direct and profound effect on 27 current property owners. This is too high a price for a project devoted to efficiency and one-bedroom apartments; housing that does nothing for the "missing middle" you mentioned in your earlier blog. I've prepared an excel file with pertinent information from the assessor's office if you are interested in these data I cite.

Ann MacGuidwin

From: [Guequierre, John](#)
To: the-greens31@charter.net
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Re: District 19: Why is the Middle Missing (A Housing Mystery)?
Date: Tuesday, April 30, 2024 12:23:05 AM
Attachments: [image003.png](#)

Hello, Mike,

Thanks for your input. I've been traveling in Europe and only got access to your email today. I'm copying it to the official public comment file for the Old Sauk project.

John Guequierre
districty19@cityofmadison.com

From: the-greens31@charter.net <the-greens31@charter.net>
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2024 7:42 PM
To: Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: RE: District 19: Why is the Middle Missing (A Housing Mystery)?

You don't often get email from the-greens31@charter.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Alder Guequierre

Thank you for this description of ongoing thinking by the subcommittee of the Housing Strategy Committee and your own experiences and thoughts as well.

I see that you will have a follow up entitled "Why are there 'No Rezoning' yard signs on Old Sauk Road". Let me start with the latter.

Please talk with the folks that have these yard signs. Some have spent many person-weeks trying to learn about the ongoing process at hand, in detail, to understand how we got to here from there, what fits and doesn't fit, how matters could have been different, and what can or should be done going forward. Regarding pejorative and offensive references to "neighborhood character", NIMBY, "entitlement", "prejudice", etc. I think you will find the following. Neighborhood character is not prejudicial either economically, socially, or racially but, rather, an expression that permanency of residence, stakeholder ownership, community involvement and participation are valuable to a local community. I've yet to fathom what entitlement refers to; in our case the only entitlement we feel is that coming from a free society in which we prioritize neighborhoods as building blocks within the Madison we love ... just as "family values" are a fundamental structure in society. As to NIMBY: If a neighborhood wants more or fewer apartments, fine. In any event what neighborhoods individually prefer is not to infer it is appropriate somewhere else. Collectively, the yard signs oppose the apartment-only option, enabled by rezoning, and (in the OSR case) the attendant oversized footprint.

As to the missing-middle quandary: You say there are formidable obstacles, agreed; but beyond the City's ability to incentivize, there I expect much better of Madison's talent. At the two community meetings for the Stone House project the same resident-realtor has made the following point – A developer's bottom line is profit minus expenses; if the land's selling price is lower what can affordably

be built can be less. If up-zoning (non-technical verbiage) is permitted the developer can build more and a higher land purchase price can be sustained; in reverse, not upzoning means the developer must pay less ... and the seller must take less. Ergo, the City's control of zoning can, and does, affect the outcome. You mention "pre-approved repetitive planning" for missing-middle incentivization; together with not-upzoning ... explore it. And the Linden experience definitely needs to be understood.

You also mention "A Radical Thought Experiment" which doesn't strike me as radical at all. As one looks back on how the Pierstorff Farm project has evolved one thinks "if only there had been some RFP bidding/design process to have a more optimal outcome" and realize what you're suggesting could make sense, to them, not in financial terms but in rather in "getting it right". Alas, all the what-if, alternate scenarios are likely moot for the Pierstorff Farm.

Nevertheless, though it be of no immediate impact, I will continue to ask about where the larger dialog is going. Below, in the text box, I've clipped-in these thoughts which I've previously copied to you.

Mike Green
Madison, WI

Unfortunately, the entire topic of densification and City enactments in that pursuit raise a major point of sustainability which we have yet to hear addressed. Has a substantial, robust dialog been conducted (and, if so, where recorded?) which answer questions such as these:

- Does densification have an end-point? Or, does it continue ad infinitum?
- What will Madison look like?
- Is that the Madison we want?
- To what extent/limit can/should Madison absorb a greater population?
- How much of the influx is to be absorbed by the City vs the Madison-area vs the County?
- What is sustainable before the Madison we love evolves into an "urban jungle" (pardon hyperbole) via infill, loss of surrounding environment, and going vertical in the pursuit of sky's-the-limit higher-densification?
- What is a sustainable balance between the preferences of current residents vs the desire of incoming residents?
- What sacrifices should be made before we say enough is enough?
- Is the City producing the other outcomes professed in policy?
- At what level can/should these be decided ... neighborhood, sub-area, district, area, or city-wide?

From: Alder Guequierre <noreply@cityofmadison.com>

Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2024 2:13 PM

To: the-greens31@charter.net

Subject: District 19: Why is the Middle Missing (A Housing Mystery)?

[View this email in your browser](#)

Front entrance of the City-County Building on a sunny day



Why is the Middle Missing (A Housing Mystery)?

Seeking an Alternative

As the residents of District 19 grapple with building permit applications for multifamily apartment buildings, opponents of those projects, (most notably the Stone House Development proposal for 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd), often propose a less dense development similar to the many two- and four-unit condominium developments in the area built in the 1980's through early 2000's. This is an excellent and appropriate question. Madison's city government sees the low production of this category of housing as an urgent problem. Two- and four-unit buildings and townhomes and even some larger condominium developments are an historical first step to home ownership. After nearly two decades without significant new construction of this category of housing across the US, the absence is mourned and is now often referred to as "the missing middle".

I serve on a subcommittee of the Housing Strategy Committee which has been tasked with seeking out tools that Madison might employ to encourage more development of "missing middle" housing. To that end the subcommittee has taken testimony from Madison builders, developers, architects, and financial institutions, and reviewed numerous studies of the problem. The subcommittee concluded that the obstacles are formidable and almost completely beyond Madison's ability to incentivize. The subcommittee is now searching for creative tools and ideas for chipping away at those few obstacles within the City's control. While Madison is focusing on how to incentivize "missing middle" housing that would comprise that affordable first-step to home ownership, the findings of the subcommittee apply for the most part to the entire range of home prices. In the balance of this blog, I'll try to describe the obstacles and even offer a rather radical suggestion to residents who would prefer missing middle owned housing to larger rental projects.

Legacy of the Great Recession

The primary spark for the Great Recession of 2007 to 2009 was a near mindless explosion of real estate debt, which, when the poor quality of the collateral became apparent, led to an equally sudden implosion of the financial

institutions that had provided the funding. The Federal Reserve stepped forward to take radical actions to avoid the evaporation of credit and the money supply that prompted the Great Depression of the 1930's. While not well known, the construction industry, especially in the Midwest, actually suffered an even greater contraction than during the Great Depression. Congress and the regulatory agencies for banking and mortgage finance (FDIC, FNMA, FHLMC, FHA, VA) responded with new regulations and vastly more intensive inspections of bank assets.

Regulators noted that construction lending to developers of condos and other forms of "missing middle" housing were a particular source of bad loans. Regulators required a virtual halt to any construction lending for such projects. I remember bankers telling me at the time that at least one regulator was in their office every day telling loan officers what they could and couldn't approve. FNMA and FHLMC, the principal underwriters of mortgages, dramatically increased the number of condo units that had to be presold before they would approve any mortgages in a project. This regulatory noose around construction lending has only relaxed slightly in the intervening 1-1/2 decades.

Construction and mortgage lending are necessary oxygen for residential development. An essential lubricant is the construction period and related insurance, including liability insurance for related architectural and engineering services. Another dramatic casualty of the Great Recession was AIG, the insurance giant, which had underwritten a huge portion of development period coverage. AIG abandoned such coverage entirely. Other insurance giants did not rush in, noting that another result of the Great Recession was an acceleration of the trend of condo associations suing every entity involved in the development and condo residents suing their association. Court decisions that allowed condo associations to bring suit against the developer and other parties many years after construction, exploded premiums, and caused more insurers to leave the market. Again, this continues. For me, it's personal. I consult nationally on various aspects of construction technology, and my insurer will not permit me to consult on condo projects. I'm sure if I sought special coverage for a condo project, the sky-high premium would essentially rule out my participation.

In 2022, condominium development in Madison was 1/7 of the 2007 volume.

The Inflation of all Components

Disruption of long-standing supply-chain arrangements by US tariff policy, further damaged by the supply-chain impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent monetary and fiscal policy reactions resulted in hyperinflation of building materials, which has only partially receded. The long-expected retirement of "Boomers", who comprised an over-sized proportion of the construction trades, followed by the pandemic-related exit of construction workers, and an apparent growing aversion of younger cohorts to construction jobs have combined to create a labor shortage and inflation in construction wages.

Separate from material and labor inflation is the trend toward enhancing building codes to increase safety and especially to improve energy efficiency and less reliance on fossil fuels. The impact of greater economies-of-scale with increased use of sustainable materials has helped reduce the costs of sustainable buildings, but the overall effect is still an increase in up-front costs, fortunately often offset by long-term energy savings.

In summary, it costs much more to build any kind of housing today compared to a decade or two ago, and particularly more expensive to build missing middle housing.

Obstacles Peculiar to Wisconsin and Madison

Wisconsin is the only remaining state that has not adopted some version of the International Residential Code. Wisconsin did finally adopt a version of the International Building Code for commercial and larger multi-family structures, but it has clung to its Uniform Dwelling Code for one-and-two-family residences. Moreover, the International Residential Code covers one-and-two-family residences and townhouses, a favorite for of condominium development. Interpretations of Wisconsin's residential code push townhouses into the commercial code and its tougher requirements for all kinds of costly features including sprinkler systems.

Wisconsin also has a relatively tough statute for the creation of condominiums, adding time and investment to generating an acceptable document set.

Madison's permit approval process is infamous as a gauntlet that adds multiple layers of risk for the developer and frequent redesigns, at least compared to other cities and states. Multiple staff departments and various committees, boards, and commissions evaluate every aspect of a building proposal. This includes the intense civil engineering exercise of meeting Madison's stormwater ordinance that was toughened after the 2018 flood event. Then there is the frequent uprising of concerned residents that any kind of development in their neighborhood should be avoided as negatively impacting the character of the neighborhood. Famously, developers and contractors who work in multiple Dane County municipalities say they add 15% to 30% to their bids for projects to compensate for the extra difficulty and risk of doing business in Madison. That may not be exactly true, but it is probably partially true, despite some concerted efforts by the City to streamline the permitting process.

Bottom Line

A developer of apartment buildings which plans to hold the project in its portfolio, can amortize the high costs over 30 or 40 years. A developer of for-sale (ownership) housing needs to charge enough to generate a profit immediately. The bottom line of the testimony taken by the Housing Strategy subcommittee on owned housing is that the risks are too high and the assurance of a reasonable return on the effort too low to attract developers and contractors to missing middle housing. It's just too hard.

The Housing Strategy Committee will probably make some recommendations on a few things the City might do to incentivize missing middle housing at the

affordable end of the scale, such as pre-approved repetitive plans. Its suggestions will take time to evaluate and implement, and may or may not be effective.

What Happens if a Rental Development is Thwarted?

The eruptions of objections to multi-family rental projects in historically low-density single-family neighborhoods is not new, but appears to be more frequent and more boisterous, garnering news coverage. The forces pushing for more housing and more density are enormous, much broader than just a small group within the Planning Department. Advocates note that it isn't just a matter of boosting supply to meet demand and provide affordable housing, it's also a matter of reducing urban sprawl and reducing the carbon footprint of housing development. It's easy to conclude from social media posts that advocates of greater density are at least as energized and boisterous as the opponents.

What would happen, if an energetic citizens' effort persuaded a developer of a large multi-family project to withdraw its application? We can only speculate.

Based on our Housing Strategy study, one of the least likely results would be a developer stepping forward to propose a "missing middle" project. Even less likely in this moment of municipal austerity would be Madison's acquisition of the property as a park, given the costs of development and ongoing maintenance. Perhaps more likely is the possibility that mounting pressure for development would encourage a developer to come forward for an even larger project with even less responsiveness to neighborhood desires.

The Linden Experience

There is an exception to this grim prognosis for the missing middle. Linden Cohousing was successfully completed just a few years ago on Madison's East Side. Located at 107 Linden Court, it contains 45 one-to-three-bedroom units in a particular form of condominium in which the owners not only share common ownerships of the building's basic structure and exterior amenities, but also some interior common amenities such as kitchen and dining. The project faced all of the other obstacles of missing middle projects, especially condominiums. Yet, it's complete and successful. Madison's Housing Strategy Committee wanted to understand the source of that success. The solution was "de-risking".

De-risking is a process in which some parties in a project (or even an outside but interested party) find ways to reduce the risk for the other necessary parties to the project, thus eliminating the obstacles to moving forward. In the case of Linden Cohousing, most of the ultimate purchasers were motivated to live in a cohousing environment and effectively guaranteed the purchase of the units. That eliminated the risk of the construction lender and the mortgage providers, and provided assurance to the developing contractor that the project would be completed.

A Radical Thought Experiment

Could a group of neighbors concerned about a large multifamily rental project

proposed for their neighborhood (such as the project proposed for Old Sauk Road) effectively substitute a lower density missing middle project using de-risking? From the perspective of my personal experience in housing and development over decades I would say it's at least theoretically possible. It would take a heavy dose of courage by the neighbors and perhaps an excessive level of financial foolhardiness. I think it would look something like this:

1. The neighbors would form a corporation, each diverting some of their current investments or even mortgaging their homes to raise a substantial fund.
2. Their corporation would make a competitive offer to the current property owner, taking it off the market.
3. The corporation would engage architects and engineers knowledgeable of Madison's codes and zoning to design a project that was acceptable to the neighbors.
4. The corporation would engage an experienced Madison developer, to generate realistic cost estimates, and commit to the general contractor to de-risk its involvement.
5. The corporation, with the assistance of the general contractor, would then seek construction financing and ultimate mortgage lenders, again making any necessary commitments to de-risk the lenders.
6. This de-risking could include some of the neighbors committing to purchase some of the living units. After all, they may have already been considering downsizing, thwarted by the lack of availability of such units in Madison, and with the added incentive of spending more years in the neighborhood they love.

I'm guessing this isn't likely to happen either for the Old Sauk project or similar projects that will continue to come forth in Madison in coming years. I wouldn't personally invest in anything like this. Nevertheless, it's at least one possible solution. I hardly possess all the expertise to address every aspect of the missing middle, so gladly encourage others to correct any errors I have made and propose other potentially viable solutions.

Stay tuned. I'm working on a blog titled "Why are there 'No Rezoning' yard signs on Old Sauk Road"?

[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: Old Sauk <friendsofoldsauk@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2024 7:41 PM

To: Mayor <Mayor@cityofmadison.com>

Cc: Lzellers@cityofmadison.com; Fruhling, William <WFruhling@cityofmadison.com>; pcommission@cityofmadison.com; Parks, Timothy <TParks@cityofmadison.com>; Zellers, Benjamin <BZellers@cityofmadison.com>

Subject: Slow Down Satya

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

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

Dear Mayor Rhodes-Conway,

Friends of Old Sauk is a group of neighbors who oppose a proposal to escalate density on a 3.77 acre parcel of land on Old Sauk Road to allow the construction of a 3 story, 138 unit, 400 foot long apartment complex that would sit in the middle of one and 2 story single and multi-family housing of much smaller dimension. This shouldn't happen, and we are confident that it won't happen, if the City slows down and studies the project and the harm it will do. Speaking to the importance of slowing down, or rather singing to it, we are sharing our anthem "Slow Down Satya," written and performed by Dan Stier. That's all we're asking for. Slow the process down. Invite common sense, balanced collaboration, cooperation, and innovation rather than a rush to construction.

Please enjoy and consider slowing down..

<https://vimeo.com/940118075?share=copy>

Friends of Old Sauk

Diane Sorensen, Member

From: [Grace Kwon](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: 100% Opposition to Legistar 82950, 82972 and 82979
Date: Thursday, April 18, 2024 8:19:23 PM

You 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 City of Madison,

I wish to express my 100% Opposition to Legistar:

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

82972-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.

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

There are several significant concerns regarding this project, including its density, exterior design, height, flood risk, watershed issues, light pollution, traffic, and street congestion.

While I understand the importance of development, the current plan is deeply flawed and incompatible with our neighborhood.

I oppose the city's consideration of changing the designation to TR-U2 accommodate this plan.

All along Old Sauk Rd, these low density multi unit properties are in close proximity to the proposed development. They average 7.9 units per acre and 1-2 stories.

Stonefield Terrace Condominium on Pebble Beach Road 35 units on 7.2 acres.

The Woodlands Condominiums on Pebble Beach Road 41 units on 6.1 acres.

Sauk Woods Court Condominiums, on the corner of Sauk Ridge Trail, and Old Sauk Road 8 units on 2 acres.

Hidden Hollow Condominiums off of Ponwood Circle 30 units on 5.4 acres.

Ponwood Condominiums off of Gammon Road 26 units on 2.2 acres.

Coachlight Condominiums off of Gammon Road Ponwood 48 units on 5.8 acres.

Wyndemere Condominiums on the corner of Old Sauk Road, and Gammon 50 units on 3.9 acres.

Saukborough Square Apartments 32 apartments on 2.32 acres.

A more suitable alternative would be a 2-story 52 unit apartment, adhering to zoning regulations and preserving the neighborhood.

Thank you for considering my concerns. I hope you will prioritize the well-being of our community and reject the current proposal in favor of a more considerate and appropriate approach to housing development.

Sincerely,
Grace Kwon
District 19 Resident

From: [Connie Brown](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd proposed development
Date: Thursday, April 18, 2024 12:43:29 PM

[You don't often get email from cmbrown710@icloud.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.

We are 100% opposed to the project as presented. It's large size and appearance doesn't fit the neighborhood. There is no sense of place and completely ignores the history of the farm.

We have concerns about the project creating impacts on stormwater management, traffic, and parking. We have additional concerns over noise and light pollution into neighboring yards. It will change the micro climate of neighboring residential yards.

We are not opposed to a smaller scale development especially if it would provide the opportunity for the pride of ownership.

Thank you,

District 19 Residents
Connie and Jeff Brown
1 Sauk Woods Ct
Madison, WI 53705

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Fun to Build](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Parks, Timothy](#)
Subject: 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, Legistar 82950, 82972 and 82979
Date: Tuesday, April 16, 2024 8:55:53 AM

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

I would to request this letter be added to the Public Comments for each and all three of the following Legistar documents. Thank you.

Demo Permit - 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, 82950
Cond Use - 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, 82972
CSM - 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, 82979

Hello, my name is Gary Foster and my wife Barb and I live at 6506 Old Sauk Rd about an 1/8 mile east of the proposed Stone House development at 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd. At the Second Proposal pre-application meeting on Wednesday night, 3/13/24 I spoke out in opposition to this development. It is not usually in my nature to speak out, but I did because this development is just Wrong. I'm not sure if you are aware of this, but there were many, many speakers last night who came forward and not one voiced support for this development.

I also had an opportunity to speak at the first Stone House presentation on 10/24/23 and since then I have learned a lot about both the Plan Commission's and the Common Council's processes and their desire to maximize housing density to the fullest extent possible. Our concern in October and it remains today, too many housing units crammed onto this 3.70 acre site will be a poor fit and a disservice to the surrounding neighborhood.

While we are 100% opposed to the project as presented, we are not opposed to development. We believe this is a golden opportunity for the City to create something very special for our neighborhood, but what is being proposed is a disappointment.

Back on 10/24/23, I said we are in the center of approximately 4 square miles of suburban neighborhoods, mostly single-family homes, no more than 2 stories high and I calculate the surrounding neighborhood average a density of about 5 DU/ac. This proposed project is 37 DU/ac, that's a huge 740% increase in density when compared to its surrounding and at 3 stories will tower over the surrounding neighbors. Not only is its density excessively high, the sprawling, industrial urban appearance of the building does not fit our suburban setting.

This property is not zoned for what is being proposed and requires not only rezoning but using the City's amended 2023 Comprehensive Plan LMR designation and the little or never used Escalator Clause. I would argue if you want to use the Escalator Clause you need to also follow what that same Plan says on page 21, and that is "newly developing LMR areas should be seamlessly integrated with surrounding

development". What is being proposed does not offer a seamless integration, it's going to stick out like a sore thumb.

I would also argue since using the Escalation Clause is required for the 30 DU/ac maximum LMR designation how could that be that possible given that Old Sauk Rd is a two lane, minor arterial road, not a Principal arterial road, not on or close to the BRT corridor, not in the Regional Corridor and Growth Priority Area, not in the Preferred Transit Oriented Development Area, not in the West Area Plan Preferred Housing Fund Targeted Area, does not have a sidewalk, surrounded by mostly single family homes at an average density of approximately 5 du/ac and no more than 2 stories high, surrounded by Low Residential (LR) category designation and not close to any amenities which are generally 2 miles away and not practical to walk, ride a bicycle or take the bus to?

We, like our neighbors, have many other concerns how this development will impact the surrounding neighborhood and to name just a few: increased stormwater runoff and flooding, safety issues with increased traffic, safety issues with overflow parking into neighboring streets, blocking neighbors sunlight to their homes, deforestation of an existing 100% tree canopy, day and night noises, nighttime light pollution and the use of the Escalator Clause that will set a precedent that could lead to Old Sauk Rd someday being lined by apartments buildings.

In closing, I would like to ask the Plan Commission (and Stone House Development) to go back to the drawing board and come up with a proposal that would be significantly lower in density and something special for our neighborhood and the City of Madison.

Sincerely, Gary and Barb Foster

From: [Fun to Build](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Parks, Timothy](#)
Subject: 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, Legistar 82950, 82972 and 82979
Date: Tuesday, April 16, 2024 9:10:00 AM

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

I would to request this letter be added to the Public Comments for each and all three of the following Legistar documents. Thank you.

Demo Permit - 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, 82950

Cond Use - 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, 82972

CSM - 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, 82979

Dear Chair Zellers,

This letter is in regards to the potential Pierstorff property development at 6610 - 6706 Old Sauk Rd and I would like to share with you some analysis that have been generated by neighboring residents. My name is Gary Foster and I am pleased to be part of a group of engineers that have developed this analysis, Ever since Stone House Development presented their initial proposal for the property back on 10/24/23 and then again on 3/13/24 it has been apparent that given the limited size and shape of the Pierstorff property, the proximity to adjacent neighbors and Old Sauk Rd, the local soil conditions and the area's propensity for flooding Stone House Development's proposed large apartment complex will not fit the site. Please see below for that detail analysis.

Because we anticipate the current proposed design will not adequately control surface and subsurface flooding to surrounding properties and that the proposed design is too large for the site we have retained the services of Charles Nahn of Nahn & Associates to work with the City of Madison Stormwater Engineering Division and to completely and thoroughly review all forthcoming designs.

Sincerely, Gary Foster

6506 Old Sauk Rd

-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

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 exiting 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

From: [Joe Hanauer](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road: Demo Permit - 82950, Cond Use- 82972, CSM - 82979
Date: Wednesday, April 17, 2024 9:13:08 AM

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

I am 100% opposed to the project as presented. It's large size and appearance doesn't fit the neighborhood. It is another "anywhere USA Apartment" with no sense of place and completely ignores the history of the farm.

I have concerns about the project creating impacts on stormwater management, traffic, and parking. I have additional concerns over noise and light pollution into neighboring yards. This building will rob neighbors to the north of sun and natural light. It will change the micro climate of these residential yards.

I am not opposed to smaller scale development especially if it would provide the opportunity for the pride of ownership.

Thank you,

District 19 Resident
Joe Hanauer
6437 Antietam Lane
Madison, WI 53705

From: [Jeff Western](#)
To: [Guequierre, John](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Wolfe, James](#)
Cc: [Stouder, Heather](#); [Wolfe, James](#)
Subject: Comments on Old Sauk Proposal – Parking and Site Access
Date: Monday, April 1, 2024 10:13:51 AM

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

Below are my Parking and Site Access comments on the Old Sauk proposal:

-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 a sandy soil requires special shoring, water protection and continuous inspection and maintenance.

Jeffrey L. Western, PE, SE

From: [Guequierre, John](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Fw: 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road Project.
Date: Thursday, April 25, 2024 2:20:09 PM
Attachments: [4F806B135CA14E16AAAE19FA125A4DFA.png](#)

From: Diane Sorensen <dianesorensen1@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2024 12:55 PM
To: Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Fwd: 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road Project.

You don't often get email from dianesorensen1@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear Alder Guequierre,

A neighbor shared your recent email with me. After giving it much thought, I've decided that I owe it to you and my neighbors and friends to write you .

When you applied to be appointed as our alder, you made the following promise: I'm dedicated to making your voices heard. Even when my priorities and values lead me in a different direction, your positions and opinions deserve to be in front of department staffs, committees, and the full Common Council. I write now to ask you to keep that promise.

I must begin with the fact that, as proponents of reasonable development, we are in agreement with certain key City initiatives. One prominent draft West Area Plan objective is to "incentivize" Missing Middle housing. The draft specifically points to LMR property near schools, parks and transit as the most appropriate setting for Missing Middle housing. The Old Sauk parcels are near schools, parks and transit. We agree with developing appropriate Missing Middle housing for the Old Sauk parcels. Too, city planners recently coined the term "gentle density" in relation to the goal of increasing housing density. We agree with this approach too. Gently increasing housing density on the Old Sauk parcels would add a significant number of dwelling units and simultaneously enrich the mixture of housing in our neighborhood. From Day 1, we have been open to such development.

We all believe that the housing shortage calls for increasing density and that doing it right calls for wisdom, discretion, common sense, compromise and innovation. It calls for a true collaboration between the City and its citizens. Sadly, at this point in time, we feel cut out of the process with regard to the proposed development of the Old Sauk parcels. There are many reasons why we feel excluded.

We know that even before the plan was presented to us, the City planners had met with and advised Stone House Development; we believe this advice was that escalated development of the Old Sauk parcels could be found consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. We believe that Stone House acted on this advice escalating the density of its proposal. (We know that Stone House met with you privately, but no one shared anything about what was discussed.) We believe that the City Planning Division's Tim Parks will recommend approval of the proposed escalated development. We believe that the City Planning Division exists to carry out the City's wishes; that the City wants to encourage developers to work with its Planning Division and, therefore, that the City gives deference to its Planning Division's recommendations. Our experience so far is that the City has not bothered to respond to any of our input, no matter how articulately and courteously presented. You and former Alder Slack have both advised us to expect Stone House Development to succeed in getting its proposal approved. Finally, the City's reputation is that it approves high density housing regardless of how reasonably or passionately such development is opposed or how many citizens oppose it. In fact, we fear that the only end result of strong opposition will be alders and others calling us NIMBY, privileged, etc..

Unfortunately, housing development in the City of Madison has been cast in black and white terms. This characterization is wrong. It's an oversimplification that ill-serves the community by creating false polar opposites. We do not oppose all development in our neighborhood. We also don't accept all urban high density development anywhere. We're not NIMBY's or YIMBY's. We can't be described with an acronym or cartoon labels. We're thoughtful, reasonable people, capable of nuance, compromise and innovation.

Perhaps you already support our moderate position, however, some of your statements give me pause, most significantly, your report that some of our neighbors view us as **bullies**. Did it ever occur to you that we are not bullies, but rather the bullied? In a classic bullying situation, the bully has more power than the bullied. When it comes to housing development, the mayor, city alders, planning commission, and planners have all of the power. We homeowners have little or no power. In the typical bullying situation, the more powerful bully belittles and demeans the weaker victim. In the school yard, bullies use insults like "fat and ugly"; in liberal Madison, the powerful pro-density bullies have turned to terms like "rich and entitled" or "white and privileged", or "racist" and the great catchall of all times, "NIMBY's." In Madison, it appears to be culturally acceptable to belittle homeowners using all of those terms unless the homeowners accept escalated development. Speaking for myself, I feel bullied.

You observe that "strident" voices (presumably those raised at the draft West Area Plan meeting) may lose the cause for speakers whom many alders will then call out

for being “rich and entitled”. As a former circuit court judge, I appreciate decorum. I worked hard to listen well, to make it clear that my courtroom was a level playing field, not a kangaroo court. I would certainly never demean any of the parties before me. I found that when people felt that they had the court’s full attention and that their case was not pre-judged, no one needed to raise his or her voice. With that experience in mind, I ask you to consider this simple question: what do people do when they aren’t heard? Simple answer: they raise their voices. Our precious country has a long tradition, going back to the Boston Tea Party, of challenging exclusion (No taxation without representation!) and unfairness by raising voices or other protest action. I’m not saying this is a good state of affairs, just stating my understanding of the primary reason for the anger displayed at the meeting.

Third, you refer to meeting nice people who feel strongly “entitled to avoid change.” I honestly don’t know whom you are talking about here. However, this line seems to adopt the view of those who would divide citizens into two groups, those “for” and those “against” increasing housing density. As I said earlier, I am deeply concerned that this way of framing the discussion, via labels and polarization, hurts everyone. Instead of bringing people together to enter a dialogue or negotiation, it puts us in opposing battle camps. I ask you to reason with those alders, and others, who are inclined to label and polarize this community.

In closing, we are asking for your help. We ask you to forcefully represent our balanced, common sense approach to development. We ask that you push back against name-calling and other practices that polarize this community and marginalize citizens. We believe that the whole city is well-served by the voice of reason, balance, common sense, civility and inclusion. We are asking you to be that voice.

Thank you,

Diane Sorensen

Subject: Fwd: [6610-6706 Old Sauk Road](#) Project.

From: "Guequierre, John"

[<district19@cityofmadison.com>](mailto:district19@cityofmadison.com)

Date: March 24, 2024 at 8:28:53 PM EDT

Subject: Re: [6610-6706 Old Sauk Road Project](#)

I'm going to do what my job does require -

1. I'm collecting all of the emails I receive regarding this project and, before it goes before the Plan Commission (if it gets that far), enter them into the public record, noting the number for and against (yes, you have neighbors that approve of this project and wish to remain silent to avoid bullying).
2. I will be closely following the Engineering review of stormwater management and Traffic Engineering review of traffic issues, noting if we should be concerned about the ability of the infrastructure to manage those important issues.
3. I will make sure that residents are well informed of the many meetings that will take place before this project ever comes before the Common Council.

There are a few alders who will support whichever voices are most strident. I'm like the vast majority. I took an oath to the whole city, not a neighborhood, and I will make up my mind about this based on all the available information and public input if and when it comes before the Council. I'm not sure it matters. Watching the voting on projects of this type over the last several years, it appears that there is a solid majority supporting greater density again and again regardless of the vote from District 19. I'm not aware of any other alders declaring how they might vote on this, but there is certainly strong reaction to the shouting at the last West Area Plan meeting and the comments in the chat from the last Old Sauk meeting. I tried to gently point this out in my blog summarizing the last Old Sauk meeting, but

opponents of the project may have already lost this battle with what many alders see as evidence of the entitlement of rich people.

I actually do care about you and all those concerned about this development. I wish with my whole heart that economic conditions created by the federal government didn't create such huge obstacles to the kind of "missing middle" lower density ownership housing which this City actually does want.

John Guequierre
district19@cityofmadison.com

From: [Firchow, Kevin](#)
To: [Cleveland, Julie](#)
Cc: [Parks, Timothy](#); [Fruhling, William](#)
Subject: Fw: 6614 - 6706 Old Sauk Rd, Potential Stone House Development
Date: Wednesday, April 3, 2024 5:57:13 PM

Julie, FYI. We don't yet have an application or Legistar file for this one, but could you attach this if/when it comes in per the Chair's request. Thanks.

From: Ledell Zellers <ledell.zellers@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 3, 2024 5:32 PM
To: 'Fun to Build' <foster07cn@gmail.com>
Cc: 'JeffWestern' <jwestern@chorus.net>; Fruhling, William <WFruhling@cityofmadison.com>; Firchow, Kevin <KFirchow@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: RE: 6614 - 6706 Old Sauk Rd, Potential Stone House Development

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

Thank you for your interest in and thoughts about items which may come before the Plan Commission. I have copied staff and ask that they make your communication part of the public record so it can be seen by all Plan Commission members.

Best,
Ledell Zellers

From: Fun to Build [mailto:foster07cn@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 2, 2024 8:31 PM
To: Ledell.Zellers@gmail.com
Cc: JeffWestern <jwestern@chorus.net>
Subject: 6614 - 6706 Old Sauk Rd, Potential Stone House Development

Dear Chair Zellers,

This letter is in regards to the potential Pierstorff property development at 6614 - 6706 Old Sauk Rd and I would like to share with you some analysis that have been generated by neighboring residents. My name is Gary Foster and I am pleased to be part of a group of engineers that have developed this analysis. Ever since Stone House Development presented their initial proposal for the property back on 10/24/23 and then again on 3/13/24 it has been apparent that given the limited size and shape of the Pierstorff property, the proximity to adjacent neighbors and Old Sauk Rd, the local soil conditions and the area's propensity for flooding Stone House Development's proposed large apartment complex will not fit the site. Please see below for that detail analysis.

Because we anticipate the current proposed design will not adequately control surface and subsurface flooding to surrounding properties and that the proposed design is too large for the site we have retained the services of Charles Nahn of Nahn & Associates to work with the City of Madison Stormwater Engineering Division and to completely and thoroughly review all forthcoming designs.

Sincerely, Gary Foster
6506 Old Sauk Rd

-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

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 exiting 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

From: [Guequierre, John](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Cc: [Helen Bradbury](#)
Subject: Fw: Potential Rezoning of Property on Old Sauk Road
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2024 4:47:52 PM

From: CharLynn Wood <charlynn.wood@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2024 12:40 PM
To: Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Potential Rezoning of Property on Old Sauk Road

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

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

Dear Mr. Guequierre,

I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the potential rezoning of the property on Old Sauk Road adjacent to the Owen Conservation Park.

Having resided in various cities before settling in Madison, I have come to greatly appreciate the unique character of this city, particularly its abundant green spaces, conservation areas, and micro-forests. These natural habitats not only provide essential refuge for wildlife but also contribute to what makes Madison a truly special place to call home.

It is with this sentiment in mind that I ask you to oppose any efforts to rezone this area. Given the increased number of apartment complexes and established residences in Madison, there is simply no justification for further encroachment upon our remaining undeveloped spaces. Doing so would not only disrupt local ecosystems and wildlife but also detract from the overall quality of life for residents in our community, exacerbating issues such as traffic congestion and noise pollution.

Preserving the integrity of our green spaces is not just a matter of environmental stewardship but also a reflection of our commitment to maintaining the unique charm and allure of Madison. I urge you to take a stand against rezoning and ensure that future generations can continue to enjoy the natural beauty that sets our city apart.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

CharLynn Wood
6826 Harvest Hill Rd.

From: jan.lehman7795@gmail.com
To: [Guequierre, John](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Cc: ckarasov@gmail.com; patschubert@gmail.com
Subject: 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road Project.
Date: Thursday, March 14, 2024 10:11:04 AM

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

We are homeowners at 10 Saint Andrews Circle and strongly object to the proposed project in our neighborhood. Our objections start with the zoning change so that this developer can override what currently exists in the area. As our alderman, Mr. Guequierre should be instrumental in stopping this zoning change based on the complete objections to the project by homeowners (tax paying voters). Not only is the project too large for the subdivision there are major concerns about traffic/parking, water/flooding of surrounding property, loss of wildlife, decreased property values and noise and light pollution.

There is NO reason to build this project in our neighborhood given the already existing multi-family housing that adheres to the current zoning! Our Mayor and alderman cannot shove this idea down our throats.

The people that live here do not want it and we must be heard! The property should be developed with one or two story condos or duplexes and look like the surrounding structures instead of an office building. This whole thing really is all about the money and the disrespectful city government and developer (representative was chewing a huge wad of gum during the entire meeting!).

Pat and Corliss, please share this with other neighbors. I encourage all in the area to send emails to help discourage this distasteful and unnecessary project!

Jan and Ernie Lehman

Sent from my iPad

From: [Jeff Western](#)
To: [Guequierre, John](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Cc: [Stouder, Heather](#); [Wolfe, James](#)
Subject: Comments on Old Sauk Proposal – Watershed
Date: Monday, March 25, 2024 10:23:15 AM

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

Comments on Old Sauk Proposal – Watershed

Below are my Watershed comments on the Old Sauk proposal. These comments are in complement to the questions provided by Gary Foster on Watershed following the Stone House (SH) presentation on [March 13](#).

-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 exiting 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

From: [Planning](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: FW: 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road Project
Date: Thursday, March 28, 2024 8:43:08 AM

From: Serguei Denisov <sdenissov@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 27, 2024 8:17 PM
To: Planning <planning@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road Project

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

Dear Planning Division,

I am a resident of West Madison, living not far from the proposed 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road Project. The suggested project contradicts the current zoning of our neighborhood and creates hazards both for traffic and potential flooding. The infrastructure we have is simply not enough for projects of that size. The zoning rules we had in Madison for decades were designed to preserve the comfortable living of Madison taxpayers. The suggested rezoning goes against these principles and will make many residents leave for a better place.

Cordially,
Sergey Denisov
14 Court of Brixham, Madison, WI, 53705

From: [Dino Lucas](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: 100%
Date: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 1:08:50 PM

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

I am 100% opposed to the apartment project on Old Sauk rd. It's going to create much too much traffic for this residential area

$$\begin{array}{r} \\ - \sqrt{} \\ \hline \end{array}$$

(+) / (+)

From: [Terri Neider](#)
To: [Mayor](#); [Slack, Kristen](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: 6610 Old Sauk Road Development
Date: Friday, November 3, 2023 7:12:09 AM

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

I am writing not in opposition to a multi-family development on the land but in opposition to the size/scale of the project. It is not appropriate for this neighborhood. Homes in this neighborhood were purchased based upon current zoning, and Traffic is already an issue on Old Sauk. If you now want to grant multi-family, please strongly consider reducing the size of the project. There must be room for compromise-no?

Terri Neider
802 Sauk Ridge Trl

From: [Carol Spiegel](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd construction proposal
Date: Friday, November 3, 2023 11:43:47 AM

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

I am a resident of Wexford Village adjacent to the address above and am strongly opposed to the plan to build an 180 unit on that property. These neighborhoods have single family dwellings and a 4 story apartment complex with it's necessary parking would severely detract from the neighborhood and likely decrease the value of the homes. I urge the city to select another site.

Thank you,

Carol Spiegel

Cleveland, Julie

From: Eileen Goode <eileen@goodesolutions.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 4, 2023 3:17 PM
To: Mayor; Slack, Kristen; Parks, Timothy; Plan Commission Comments
Subject: Opposition to development of 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road_Eileen Goode

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

Mayor and Alders,

For several reasons mentioned in the last city meeting the development proposed at the above address is not sensical and should not move forward. I do think this type of development can be done at a better location in a less residential setting.

****Known issues with flooding in this area.** The flood of 2018 on the west side of Madison dumped 12” in 6 hrs and the immediate neighborhoods (Parkwood Hills, Walnut Grove) suffered mightily.

****School and UW traffic.** Old Sauk is heavily used for access to UW and downtown. Crestwood school has a challenging situation with the present traffic situation. Picturing the density of 500 residents and possibly 500-750 additional cars pouring onto Old Sauk would easily create a backup when the school drop starts at 7:45am. Currently it backs up to Ozark Trail at times and could stretch further to San Juan and Everglade Dr. Cars would start racing through Parkwood Hills neighborhood to get to work on time.

****There is no existing sidewalk on the north side of Old Sauk.** Would the developer create some infrastructure to deal with that and would a traffic signal be installed? If not, there would be some nasty accidents from residents exiting the large complex to turn left and head downtown.

I have no issues with multi-family housing and the need for affordable housing is real. I think the City needs to take into consideration a location with better access and safety issues. With the redevelopment of Odana Rd. has that been considered as an alternative location? If not it should be.

Regards,

Eileen Goode
21 Southwick Circle
Madison WI
608-438-8906

Cleveland, Julie

From: Liz Enright <lenright01@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 6, 2023 1:23 PM
To: Plan Commission Comments
Subject: City of Madison plans for Pierstorff property on Old Sauk Rd.

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

To the Planning Commission,

Thank you for publishing your email address on the City of Madison website.

I want you to know that I support a two-story apartment building with tenant and visitor parking on the Pierstorff farm.

I oppose a three-story building and a four-story building on the site.

I also oppose a building with commercial space on the ground floor and two or three stories of apartment housing above the commercial space.

Thank you,

Elizabeth Enright

7464 Old Sauk Rd, Madison 53717-1215

From: [Connie Brown](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Extending Appalachian Way to Sauk Ridge Trail
Date: Sunday, December 3, 2023 3:24:39 PM

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

Regarding this proposal to extend Appalachian Way. What purpose does this serve? How will this benefit traffic?
This doesn't really solve a problem because no problem exists at this time.

If this is supported to alleviate traffic caused by the addition of a housing project on Old Sauk Rd, than there is an assumption that those new residents are going to be parking on Sauk Ridge Trail instead of their own property and need additional access to Old Sauk Road.

Connie and Jeff Brown
1 Sauk Woods Ct.

Sent from my iPad

Cleveland, Julie

From: Audrey Silverman Foote <asilverfoote@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 4, 2023 10:35 PM
To: Mayor; Slack, Kristen; Parks, Timothy; Plan Commission Comments
Subject: Proposed apartment building on 6610-6676 Old Sauk Rd.

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

To Whom It May Concern,

I would like to add my concerns about the audacious attempt to build a 4-story apartment building on Old Sauk Road. Although I understand there is the need for more affordable housing in Madison, there was no mention by the company presenting this that these apartments would have affordable housing units. Nor is this the place to build ANY 4-story apartment building, affordable or not.

I found myself looking at the drawing they presented and the proximity to the houses that are 100 feet away from this planned monstrosity. I then took a walk the next day and looked at the houses on the courts that back up to Old Sauk Road. This doesn't affect me personally, but I kept thinking how I would feel if I had put my life savings into a home, expected to raise my family and or retire there, and suddenly, a huge building that blocks light, eliminates beautiful trees, creates noise and artificial light is a massive obstruction to my home. It is entirely unfair and inappropriate.

There are places, even further down on Old Sauk that are more appropriate to build a building such as this. But this proposal for this location is nuts. What is this fantasy that the people moving into 180 apartments would be satisfied with one parking space/home? Where would they park their 2nd cars? Old Sauk is a narrow street, and is wonderful and works well for the quiet neighborhood we live in. It is not meant for a high-density apartment building. The people proposing the building also talked about the walking and biking that people would do on Old Sauk. It is a busy road, without sidewalks on one side, and it has obstructions in spots that makes it hard for cars to see pedestrians crossing. Again, I think they are fantasizing that it will be walkable for the potential residents to make the building proposal look good, but it isn't reality. I walk a lot, and I love the neighborhood, but walking on Old Sauk isn't the safest part of the neighborhood to walk.


The scale of this apartment building is out of character for our neighborhood. We bought a home in this neighborhood because it is bucolic and peaceful. Our property taxes and the cost of our house were high, and we pay this extra money, like so many others, so that we can live in this beautiful area. This apartment doesn't fit with the neighborhood and would cause undo hardship to many of the current residents.

The noise from the HVAC systems, the nighttime lights, the removal of trees, the blocking of sunlight are all untenably impactful for the current residents, let alone for the wildlife in our area. There are condos nestled among the houses here, and they work beautifully. They fit in and don't create any of the problems that this proposed apartment building will cause. One or two story condos or townhouses seem like a much more appropriate use of the land on Old Sauk.

I encourage the powers that be to nix this project immediately and to come up with something that fits in the neighborhood, doesn't ruin other people's homes, and is a project that will not create an eyesore unfitting for the area, harm the natural environment, and cause light and noise pollution for the people and animals who already live here.

Thank you for your attention to these concerns,

Audrey Silverman Foote
930 Sauk Ridge Trail, Madison
Audrey Silverman Foote

 925-519-3673

 asilverfoote@gmail.com

From: [Anna Schryver](#)
To: [Mayor](#); [Slack, Kristen](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Cc: [Joe Hanauer](#); [Ann MacGuidwin](#); [Jason Verhelst](#)
Subject: Lack of a long term plan for Parkwood Hills Neighborhood
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 9:16:21 PM

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

Dear Madison leaders,

Madison is a city built on the strength of its neighborhoods. Parkwood Hills is one of those neighborhoods. But our weakness is we are a neighborhood that lacks any sort of long term plan and so we need your help and vision to keep this neighborhood vibrant.

We know that our area is ripe for development, we're just asking for more involvement in the development plan. Could you slow down the process of what to do with the 4-acres on Old Sauk before you change the zoning? To give us a voice in this plan?

Over 200 people attended the neighborhood meeting. But we all realize we have no plan to address the pressures on Gammon, the already-problematic traffic light on Gammon, and Old Sauk, and more. And I don't see any stance from our alderperson or our neighborhood association -- we're just not as experienced as some other neighborhoods are, such as Dudgeon-Monroe. We're learning to lead. We're not anti-development, just anti-rushing into a short term decision. Could you be patient and help us learn so together we can shape this awesome city for the long term?

Could we know what are next steps, who could help us lead, and how can we proactively work with the City and the developer to be sure we have a voice? Is there someone who can guide us through this process?

Thank you for your consideration.

Anna Schryver
110 Blue Ridge Parkway
Madison, 53705

From: [Connie Kolpin](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Old Sauk Rd Developement
Date: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 10:33:35 PM

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

I'm writing to strongly oppose the 4 story 180 unit apartment building with at least 200+ vehicles entering in and out of a residential neighborhood with multiple schools full of kids crossing streets! It is just not the right area to squeeze in that many apartments and vehicles. Duplexes or 4 unit condo buildings similar to the neighboring homes would be welcomed, safer, and much better suited to blend in with the surroundings. Old Sauk Road is extremely busy all day especially at rush hour/school times and getting out of the side streets onto Old Sauk is dangerous now...only to become more so if the zoning changes to allow this. The current zone is there for a reason!

Connie Kolpin
6605 Carlsbad Dr.

Sent from my iPad

From: [Kathleen stark](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Old Sauk Road Development Plans
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 9:21:01 AM

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

Good Day City of Madison,

We are passionately opposed to any development plans that are being considered for our neighborhood on Old Sauk Road.

We are home owners at 809 Sauk Ridge Trail and our reasons for opposing this project are obvious--increased traffic, increased water use, increased noise, more trash, more crime, more accidents, less trees all leading to a crowded unpleasant place to be.

Regards,

Thomas and Kathleen Stark
809 Sauk Ridge Trail
Madison WI 53717

From: [Lori Devoti](#)
To: [Mayor](#); [Slack, Kristen](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed development of 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 5:27:12 PM

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

This email is in regards to the proposed development of 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road. We are 100% opposed to this development for a number of reasons.

- The intersection of Old Sauk and Pebble Beach Drive, with current traffic, is already risky with a blind curve and speeding vehicles on Old Sauk. Without some plan to improve Old Sauk or slow traffic, this large of a development and the corresponding traffic would make both Old Sauk in general and the Pebble Beach Drive intersection specifically hazardous.
- The parking planned for this size building is insufficient for the number of units and adults who would live there. This is made worse by the fact that there is no safe parking near this proposed development.
- The building itself, at four stories, would be completely out of place for the surrounding neighborhood.

Thank you for your time.

Lori and Steve Devoti
942 Pebble Beach Drive
Madison, WI 53717

From: [Sandra Esrael](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed Development of 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road.
Date: Friday, November 3, 2023 4:01:33 PM

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

Dear Staff:

Proposed Development of 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road. I am opposed to this project. Please send me information on any public hearing regarding the proposal as I wish to register a “no” vote. Thank you.

Sandra Esrael
41 Apple Hill Circle
Madison, WI 53717

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Debi Forrestal](#)
To: [Mayor](#); [Slack, Kristen](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed Stone House Development on Old Sauk Road
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 4:17:46 PM

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

Hello, my name is Deborah Forrestal and I reside at 21 Saint Andrews Circle and I have resided here for 26 years. My property is directly adjacent to the land being considered for development. I want to go on the record as being 100% opposed to the current proposal.

As you have most likely heard from other neighbors in the area, most of us always expected that this land would be developed at some point, but never in my wildest dreams did I expect a massive structure such as what is being proposed. Single family homes or other two-story structures (e.g., condos, apartments, townhomes) would be welcome. I am hoping that Stone House would consider some kind of compromise in size and density.

In terms of rezoning this property, what is the point of having zoning in the first place? How can a homeowner make a decision to buy if adjacent property zoning can be changed? No "protection" is provided.

Your home is most possibly your biggest investment. No one wants to see that investment diminished. How would neighbors who are directly impacted/adjacent be compensated? Would our property taxes be reduced?

A partial list of my concerns are:

- Sunlight. A four story structure would block my sunlight for a portion of each day.
- Water run-off. My home is significantly lower than the property. I have never had an issue with water in my basement, but am very concerned that this will change.
- Noise pollution.
- Parking. With 175 units consisting of studios to 3-bedrooms, many unit residents could have more than one vehicle. Where will these residents park?
- Traffic. Old Sauk Road is two-lanes. I can imagine this will be a congested nightmare at certain times of the day. And, with Owen Conservancy down the road, wild life will also be endangered.

Another important concern is safety/crime. This past weekend, I spoke to a gentleman who lives next to a Stone House Development apartment complex in the Garver Feed Mill area. He told me the police are literally there everyday (sometimes multiple times per day) for one reason or another. His home has been broken into twice. The residents throw trash over the fence into his yard. He has found it necessary to install a 15-camera security system. I am a 70-year old widow and find this extremely frightening.

I hope you will take my concerns and those of my neighbors into consideration. Thank you for listening.

Sent from my iPad

“Above all, the city and its committees should respect the wishes of neighborhoods in the planning process and not simply roll over them like an armored vehicle. Begin and end with neighborhoods, not committees. online participant.” Comprehensive Plan p. 50

My name is Diane Sorensen. I appreciate this opportunity to share my views with the Plan Commission. Numerous people have told that the scenario described by the anonymous online participant has come true: in its haste to build more and more housing, the City and its Committees are simply rolling over neighborhoods like an armored vehicle. I am, nevertheless, here to speak. I hope to prove them all wrong.

I live in Parkwood Hills, near Old Sauk Road, where there are two parcels that can be developed. Though these parcels are currently zoned SR-C1 and SR-C3, or Low Residential Use, as is surrounding property, I’ve always expected them to be developed to a higher density.. When I saw that the City’s future land use plan put this land in the LMR category this made sense. LMR development would allow the construction of housing that would fill a longstanding housing need referred to as the Missing Middle gap. What I didn’t see coming was the use of the “escalator” the allows the construction of massive 4 story apartment complexes..

As shocking as this is, City planners have made it clear that this is exactly what the City plans to allow and we should expect the properties to be re-zoned accordingly.

Statement to the Plan Commission

I think this is a wrong strategy and a wrong result. As I stated earlier, I support development of this property. It is the perfect place for building housing units that fit the “Missing Middle” gap. As noted in the recent WSJ coverage of the Bayview’s new townhouses, Missing Middle housing gives individuals and families, young and old, a precious and unique opportunity to put down roots, nest securely and join in the neighborhood experience.

As the planning memo before the Commission today makes clear, there is an inverse relationship between Medium residential density and Missing Middle development.

“ ..., staff raises the following tradeoffs/considerations for the Plan Commission to keep in mind when determining the language to open up possibilities for Medium Residential (MR) densities if (re)development is considered on these sites:

a. Potential loss of opportunity for future missing middle housing development. If language is changed to broadly allow MR, it is unlikely that LMR (missing middle) redevelopment will be proposed. Staff anticipates that instead of considering redevelopment with townhomes and/or small multifamily buildings, many developers and institutional partners may initially assume development intensities at the upper end of the MR range.”

Statement to the Plan Commission

The Commission should think long and hard before it gives up an opportunity to foster Missing Middle housing. If the City is serious about filling the Missing Middle gap, it will foster such development by designating appropriate parcels LR and LMR.

I am asking the Plan Commission to slow down enough to consider using this opportunity to support Missing Middle housing. I am also asking the Commission to give me and my neighbors an opportunity to participate meaningfully on this issue.

I request the following Commission Action.

1. Defer all action involving the LMR escalator until the West Side Plan is presented in January.
2. Direct that West Side planning staff hold meetings seeking resident and stakeholder input on the plan, with particular attention to parcels considered for LMR and the escalator or MR.
3. Alternatively, defer any action on the language defining “select conditions” until residents and stakeholders have a meaningful opportunity for input.

Statement to the Plan Commission

Thank you,

Diane Sorensen

From: [David Ruhly](#)
To: [Mayor](#); [Slack, Kristen](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: 100% Opposed to Proposed Development of 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 7:58:10 AM

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

Why on Earth would a plan be approved in a residential neighborhood?

Way too many of these plans are being approved and disjointing our Madison neighborhoods, all I ask is, what's the point?

Maybe create more plans that renovate existing areas/buildings in Madison or block these developers from making fist full's of \$\$ at a neighborhood's expense.

Thanks for your ear on this issue.

Make it a great day,

Dave Ruhly
Life long Westside resident

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Stuart Lloyd Gilkison](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road.
Date: Friday, October 27, 2023 10:00:14 PM

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

I am totally in favor of this apartment. I own two homes in 53705:

110 Glen Highway

502 N Midvale

We need more apartments.

Stuart Gilkison

Cleveland, Julie

From: GARY FOSTER <foster8434@prodigy.net>
Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 3:21 PM
To: Slack, Kristen; Parks, Timothy; Plan Commission Comments; Mayor
Subject: Proposed Development at 6614-6706 Old Sauk Rd

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

My name is Gary Foster and my wife Barb and I own a 110 year old farm house at 6506 Old Sauk Rd about 1/4 mile East of this proposed project. Our home is listed on the Wisconsin Historical Society's Wisconsin Architecture and History Inventory (AHI) and we feel blessed to not only own this home, but to live in this very nice West Madison neighborhood.

Let me be clear, we are 100% opposed to this project, it is unprecedented in size, it doesn't fit our neighborhood, it offers no benefits to us or our neighbors, just more traffic to Old Sauk Rd (which is only 2 lanes), more noise and possible unwanted criminal activity.

It's pretty obvious what's going on here, someone got lucky to be able to purchase this old family farm site and now they want to cram onto the site as many apartment units as they can with no regard to our neighborhood or the folks who live here.

If you look at a satellite view we are in the middle of about 4 square miles of mostly single family homes, some apartments and condominiums, but nothing more than 2 stories high. What is proposed is an excessively huge 175-180 door urban style complex and twice as tall at 4 stories, right in middle of our 4 square miles of suburban neighborhoods and it just doesn't fit.

To all of you that are part of this decision making process we ask that you stop this project now and not let it go a step further.

Thank you, Gary and Barb Foster

Sent from my iPad

From: [Planning](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Old Sauk Road Zoning Concerns
Date: Thursday, October 26, 2023 10:41:00 AM

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

From: Karly Klagos <karklagos@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 10:30 PM
To: Planning <planning@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Old Sauk Road Zoning Concerns

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

Hello,

My name is Karly Curtin and I attended the meeting this week about the proposed property on Old Sauk Road. I was hoping to share some thoughts with you that were not touched on during the meeting.

My grandparents built a home in Parkwood Hills back in the 60s, when this land was still farmland. My parents bought the house from my grandparents in the 80s and it is where I grew up. I now live with my husband and 2 sons (4y/o and 1y/o) on Court of Brixham, off of Sauk Ridge Trail. My parents still live in their home in Parkwood Hills and my sister and her family are moving in across the street from them next week. This area is my home and is the home of my family for multiple generations.

My family and I are extremely concerned about this proposal. The addition of potentially 400 cars to the area is frankly terrifying as a mother who walks her young children across Old Sauk road to visit their grandparents.

My property backs up to the path that leads from Sauk Ridge Trail to Appalachian Trail. We enjoy watching our neighbors walk on this path every day. There is a pretty constant flow of residents who use this path all day, every day. If you look for this area on a map, you can see that taking this path down to Blue Ridge is the easiest way for people to get from our neighborhood across Old Sauk Road. Neighbors are walking to Owen Conservatory, Crestwood School, John Muir School, nearby parks, Parkcrest Pool and family and friends in Parkwood Hills. It can take quite awhile to cross the street safely with current traffic. Adding additional cars who will be driving and likely parking on Old Sauk Road has me extremely nervous. I would imagine bumper to bumper traffic, erratic driving, issues with school drop off, back ups from turkey crossings, biking and pedestrian accidents, fast drivers cutting through our neighborhoods and countless issues with people turning left onto the various streets that run along Old Sauk Road.

I am aware there is a housing crisis in Madison. I am 32 years old and one of the only people my age I know who own a home. I am extremely blessed. When my son was born we lived in a small apartment and could not find affordable housing suited for our family. We were constantly looking for townhomes in Madison, which would be perfect for a small family, but we couldn't find any anywhere. It's extremely rare to find townhomes for rent in Madison. I am really hoping that townhomes could be developed in this area instead of a large apartment complex. Yes, it would not have the density of the current proposal, but it would be serving a portion of our community, young families. Families who are not ready to buy homes but would like more space than an apartment with easy outdoor access for their children. There are other areas zoned for the proposed complex in our city, with easy street access. This area on Old Sauk Road is a perfect area for townhomes.

I am asking you to please not allow a zoning change to occur. Zoning is in place for a reason, and allowing this to change simply because our city is in a housing crisis is irresponsible. There are other forms of housing which would work on this lot and would help out our housing crisis, while not creating a safety hazard. This is our home and we

want our children to be safe. We are not asking for something unreasonable.

I know you have many emails to read through from my concerned neighbors. Thank you for giving this issue your time and attention.

Karly Curtin
Court of Brixham

Sent from my iPhone

Cleveland, Julie

From: Karen Gibson <karengibson.studio@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2023 9:55 AM
To: Mayor; Slack, Kristen; Parks, Timothy; Plan Commission Comments
Subject: Opposition to the development of 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd

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

Dear officials,

My name is Dan Jaeger. My wife, Karen Gibson, and I live at 14 Torrey Pines Ct. and our home borders the proposed apartment complex at 6614-6706 Old Sauk Rd. We appreciated the opportunity to be heard and to participate in such a well organized virtual meeting.

When we moved to Madison 11 years ago from Chicago, we fell in love with this neighborhood and home. We knew it was where we wanted to raise our children and become part of Madison's amazing culture and progressive approach to people and the environment. We were also realistic and knew the land and barn over our fence would someday be sold and developed, but we counted on the neighborhood being zoned for single family homes to be upheld. We are not against the development of this land, but this 175 unit apartment complex is so outside of anything we would have imagined that we are compelled to oppose it in all ways possible.

Therefore, we'd like to outline our opposition to this proposed project. We are coordinating our response with our neighbors so there is no doubt as to where we stand on this proposed project. Our neighbors Paul and Mary Umbeck recently sent you an outline of their concerns and cited where the project appears to be inconsistent with the approval criteria under the conditional use section of the code.

Concerns / Objections to the Project:

- We agree with the concerns outlined by Mary and Paul Umbeck where the project appears to be inconsistent with the approval criteria under the conditional use section of the code.
- When we bought the home we experienced significant backyard flooding due to the farm house higher elevation and steep grade to our property. Even with the high absorption rate of the wooded and grassed area, heavy rains sent torrents toward us. We worked to landscape and address the problem. The proposed development would significantly reduce the amount of absorption, and even with proposed green space, will significantly increase the runoff from the building area.
- These four acres are an amazing green space that includes first growth trees and animal habitat. Native and migratory birds, horned owls, turkeys, foxes, frogs, deer, and many others call this area home. It is really an extension of Owen Conservatory and any development should be sensitive to this fact.
- The scale of the project would create apartments with a view directly into our property and possibly home as these units would be built at a height of 40-50 ft

- The need for a wrap around road for fire and service vehicles creates an opportunity for headlights to shine directly on our home as well as create noise pollution at undetermined times of the day.
- We have two children 8-10 who are students at Crestwood Elementary School. Old Sauk is already very heavily used and the intersection of Pebble Beach and Old Sauk has been the scene of several accidents, as has Old Sauk near Owen Conservancy. The assumption that car use would be 1:1 per unit is unrealistic as there are very limited walkable areas for groceries, restaurants, retail or bars nearby. Even if only 50% of the units have two vehicles that's 262 additional vehicles accessing this road multiple times a day. Without the introduction of stoplights, cross walks with traffic lights, and the addition of turn lanes this puts our children at a higher risk.
- The barn was built in the 1850's and is a jewel from Madison's past. It should have been registered as a historical site years ago. There is a great chance to develop this land around a theme using this beautiful barn vs tearing it down and losing it to history.

I urge you to align to your support and actions with the residents in the area.

- Listen to residents and neighborhoods and seek input before decisions are made.
- Ensure we are protecting our environment and unique ecosystems
- Address Madison's housing crisis with collaborative approaches that emphasize affordability and home ownership, with a land stewardship-minded approach.

We'd also like to specifically call out the fact that this project would neither be affordable for most middle income families, AND offers no opportunity for home ownership, the number one asset families need to gain financial security.

We are therefore against the proposed development of this property under the plan outlined on 10-24-23

Thank you.

Dan Jaeger and Karen Gibson

From: [Brian S.](#)
To: [Mayor](#); [Slack, Kristen](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: No to Proposed Development of 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road
Date: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 7:13:48 PM

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

I am opposed to this project. I am not sure which is worse, this or BRT.

Brian

From: [ABIGALE MARGARET NICHOLSON](#)
To: [Mayor](#); [Slack, Kristen](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Old Sauk Rd Proposed Development
Date: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 5:35:10 PM

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

To whom it may concern,

I am writing in support of the proposed development on the 6600 block of Old Sauk Road by StoneHouse Developments. I have excellent experiences with StoneHouse developments in the past, and cannot understand why people would be opposed to well-designed, well-managed apartments in their neighborhood.

I understand this development has become a pretty heated topic with a large portion of the vocal citizens adamantly opposing it. I just wanted to take a minute to let the folks in charge know that I think this building is an excellent idea. There's already a great bus route through the area, it's almost a 15-minute walkable space, and there's great schools in the area. It seems to me like those in opposition have very short-sighted, NIMBY-esque reasons for opposing and are unable to offer solutions. I can imagine that can be very frustrating for you to deal with.

Finally, I think that this specific lot is great for development as this neighborhood has the capacity to handle an 180-unit building. Many other places, like near other 180-unit buildings, would not be as equipped to handle the increased density.

I appreciate you time, the effort you put into planning, and the patience you must have for your constituents. I hope to hear news of this development moving forward and including many affordable units.

Thank You,
Abby Nicholson

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: [Vergene Rodman](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Old Sauk
Date: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 6:07:59 PM

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

I cannot believe the city would even consider this project??

I served on a planning commission for 20 years in another state and you do not make decisions to destroy a lovely residential area in your city.

Please reconsider.
Vergene Rodman

Sent from my iPad

From: [Rosemary Neu](#)
To: [Slack, Kristen](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Mayor](#)
Subject: Proposed Development at 6614-6706 Old Sauk Rd
Date: Saturday, October 28, 2023 1:30:10 PM

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

My name is Rosemary Neu and I reside in the Settlers Woods condominiums.

I am oppose to this development as it does not fit our neighborhood. My major concern is the traffic that will be generated on Old Sauk Road, as we already experience heavy volumes of traffic through out the day.

I understand that Madison has a housing problem but I am hoping that you consider the neighborhoods and their needs before constructing a project like this.

Thank you for listening and I hope that you will see fit not to proceed with this project.

Rosemary Neu

From: [Charles G. Spetland](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed Development of 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road.
Date: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 8:43:15 PM

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

RE: Proposed Development of 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road.

Hello,

I am 100% opposed to this proposed development, for all of the reasons that you have heard from others.

Thank you for your time,
cgs

Cleveland, Julie

From: Jane Nelson Worel <jnelsonworel@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 7:22 AM
To: Plan Commission Comments
Subject: Fwd: proposed development on Old Sauk Road

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

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jane Nelson Worel <jnelsonworel@gmail.com>
Subject: proposed development on Old Sauk Road
Date: October 25, 2023 at 7:21:00 AM CDT
To: district19@cityofmadison.com, tparks@cityofmadison.com

Hi, Alder Slack and Planner Parks,

I attended the meeting last night and was pleased to see so many neighbors raise the same concerns I have regarding the proposed very large, high density apartment complex on Old Sauk Road. I am deeply concerned about the traffic, safety, noise, light, and environmental habitat loss in our neighborhood if this proposal moves forward. In a nutshell, the quality of life that we have developed over 36 years in this neighborhood will be gone. I challenge the basic premise that “Madison needs more housing”. With this premise, the city seems hell bent to build massive apartment complexes wherever they can be jammed in without regard to maintaining the quality of living that drew most of us to the city, and our neighborhood, in the first place. At what point do we say, “Madison is at capacity? We can no longer continue to add living units willy nilly and continue to be a city that offers the quality of life that Madison has prided itself on.

The land owner and the developers are driven by greed and the almighty dollar. I am not sure what drives the city planners and leadership to even consider this proposal. I don’t understand the need for continued growth of the city. Please consider the sustainment of quality of life for long-term Madison residents when making decisions regarding future building projects. Along with my neighbors who attended the meeting last night strongly oppose this proposal.

Jane Nelson Worel
717 Pebble Beach Drive
Madison, WI 53717

From: [Kim Bunke](#)
To: [Guequierre, John](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Old Sauk Road
Date: Wednesday, April 3, 2024 8:42:46 AM

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

Hello,

I live on the 6800 block of Harvest Hill Road, of Woodland Hills, just off Old Sauk Road. Back when we built our house, a neighbor who had been among the original purchasers of the lots in the subdivision, said between the time they bought the lots and the time the street actually went in, the City lowered the street level by twenty feet. That neighbor further excavated his land down to the street level and built on flat ground, with substantial rock terracing behind. He was Anthony Brown, whom we lost some years ago, but his wife Brenda still lives in their house. Another neighbor, Ron Howard, an architect, adjusted by building his house into the hill. We couldn't afford further excavation and set our house at the higher soil level as determined by City Engineering.

Before starting construction, we went to the City Engineer's office to find out if we had to get flood insurance. We were told our neighborhood was "high and dry," being subject only to a 100-year flood, and flood insurance wasn't needed. As is commonly known, we are now subject to 500-year floods. In 2018, Harvest Hill Road, the main drainage for the entire neighborhood, flooded up over the sidewalks. Despite the higher elevation of my house, my basement flooded to 16" deep, and my next-door neighbor's house flooded to the level of its kitchen countertops. Their entire first floor had to be gutted and rebuilt.

My point is that City Engineering made a decision about drainage when the subdivision was opened, i.e. that the soil of the area was glacial till, sandy and unstable, and couldn't be built upon as it was. This type of soil remains full-depth on the Pierstorf property and elsewhere in the area.

It seems to me the City must not only respect the determination our engineering division made when the subdivision was opened for development, but must also update the stormwater plan for the entire area to take current climate conditions into account, before any further development can be considered. The Pierstorf property may not be able to accommodate much more than it has on it now in terms of housing, and any further development along Old Sauk Road may not be possible. The safety and security of current homeowners, who trusted our City planners and engineers and have been paying Madison property taxes for decades, must rank first in City priorities.

Thank you for your consideration,
Kim Bunke

From: [Serguei Denissov](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Guequierre, John](#)
Cc: [Parks, Timothy](#)
Subject: Opposition! Demo Permit - 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, 82950
Date: Tuesday, April 16, 2024 10:34:42 PM

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

Hello,

I am a resident of this neighborhood, and I am 100% opposed to the proposed development because it violates the local zoning rules and creates a flooding hazard. If our rights are violated, there will be legal consequences.

Sergey Denisov, 14 Court of Brixham, Madison, 53705

From: jan.lehman7795@gmail.com
To: [Guequierre, John](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Cc: ckarasov@gmail.com; patschubert@gmail.com
Subject: 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road Project.
Date: Thursday, March 14, 2024 10:11:04 AM

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

We are homeowners at 10 Saint Andrews Circle and strongly object to the proposed project in our neighborhood. Our objections start with the zoning change so that this developer can override what currently exists in the area. As our alderman, Mr. Guequierre should be instrumental in stopping this zoning change based on the complete objections to the project by homeowners (tax paying voters). Not only is the project too large for the subdivision there are major concerns about traffic/parking, water/flooding of surrounding property, loss of wildlife, decreased property values and noise and light pollution.

There is NO reason to build this project in our neighborhood given the already existing multi-family housing that adheres to the current zoning! Our Mayor and alderman cannot shove this idea down our throats.

The people that live here do not want it and we must be heard! The property should be developed with one or two story condos or duplexes and look like the surrounding structures instead of an office building. This whole thing really is all about the money and the disrespectful city government and developer (representative was chewing a huge wad of gum during the entire meeting!).

Pat and Corliss, please share this with other neighbors. I encourage all in the area to send emails to help discourage this distasteful and unnecessary project!

Jan and Ernie Lehman

Sent from my iPad

From: [Jeff Western](#)
To: [Guequierre, John](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Cc: [Stouder, Heather](#); [Wolfe, James](#)
Subject: Comments on Old Sauk Proposal – Watershed
Date: Monday, March 25, 2024 10:23:15 AM

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

Comments on Old Sauk Proposal – Watershed

Below are my Watershed comments on the Old Sauk proposal. These comments are in complement to the questions provided by Gary Foster on Watershed following the Stone House (SH) presentation on [March 13](#).

-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 exiting 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

From: [Planning](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: FW: 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road Project
Date: Thursday, March 28, 2024 8:43:08 AM

From: Serguei Denisov <sdenissov@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 27, 2024 8:17 PM
To: Planning <planning@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road Project

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

Dear Planning Division,

I am a resident of West Madison, living not far from the proposed 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road Project. The suggested project contradicts the current zoning of our neighborhood and creates hazards both for traffic and potential flooding. The infrastructure we have is simply not enough for projects of that size. The zoning rules we had in Madison for decades were designed to preserve the comfortable living of Madison taxpayers. The suggested rezoning goes against these principles and will make many residents leave for a better place.

Cordially,
Sergey Denisov
14 Court of Brixham, Madison, WI, 53705

From: [Dino Lucas](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: 100%
Date: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 1:08:50 PM

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

I am 100% opposed to the apartment project on Old Sauk rd. It's going to create much too much traffic for this residential area

$$\begin{array}{r} \\ - \sqrt{} \\ \hline \end{array}$$

(+) / (+)

From: [Terri Neider](#)
To: [Mayor](#); [Slack, Kristen](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: 6610 Old Sauk Road Development
Date: Friday, November 3, 2023 7:12:09 AM

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

I am writing not in opposition to a multi-family development on the land but in opposition to the size/scale of the project. It is not appropriate for this neighborhood. Homes in this neighborhood were purchased based upon current zoning, and Traffic is already an issue on Old Sauk. If you now want to grant multi-family, please strongly consider reducing the size of the project. There must be room for compromise-no?

Terri Neider
802 Sauk Ridge Trl

From: [Carol Spiegel](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd construction proposal
Date: Friday, November 3, 2023 11:43:47 AM

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

I am a resident of Wexford Village adjacent to the address above and am strongly opposed to the plan to build an 180 unit on that property. These neighborhoods have single family dwellings and a 4 story apartment complex with it's necessary parking would severely detract from the neighborhood and likely decrease the value of the homes. I urge the city to select another site.

Thank you,

Carol Spiegel

Cleveland, Julie

From: Eileen Goode <eileen@goodesolutions.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 4, 2023 3:17 PM
To: Mayor; Slack, Kristen; Parks, Timothy; Plan Commission Comments
Subject: Opposition to development of 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road_Eileen Goode

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

Mayor and Alders,

For several reasons mentioned in the last city meeting the development proposed at the above address is not sensical and should not move forward. I do think this type of development can be done at a better location in a less residential setting.

****Known issues with flooding in this area.** The flood of 2018 on the west side of Madison dumped 12" in 6 hrs and the immediate neighborhoods (Parkwood Hills, Walnut Grove) suffered mightily.

****School and UW traffic.** Old Sauk is heavily used for access to UW and downtown. Crestwood school has a challenging situation with the present traffic situation. Picturing the density of 500 residents and possibly 500-750 additional cars pouring onto Old Sauk would easily create a backup when the school drop starts at 7:45am. Currently it backs up to Ozark Trail at times and could stretch further to San Juan and Everglade Dr. Cars would start racing through Parkwood Hills neighborhood to get to work on time.

****There is no existing sidewalk on the north side of Old Sauk.** Would the developer create some infrastructure to deal with that and would a traffic signal be installed? If not, there would be some nasty accidents from residents exiting the large complex to turn left and head downtown.

I have no issues with multi-family housing and the need for affordable housing is real. I think the City needs to take into consideration a location with better access and safety issues. With the redevelopment of Odana Rd. has that been considered as an alternative location? If not it should be.

Regards,

Eileen Goode
21 Southwick Circle
Madison WI
608-438-8906

Cleveland, Julie

From: Liz Enright <lenright01@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 6, 2023 1:23 PM
To: Plan Commission Comments
Subject: City of Madison plans for Pierstorff property on Old Sauk Rd.

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

To the Planning Commission,

Thank you for publishing your email address on the City of Madison website.

I want you to know that I support a two-story apartment building with tenant and visitor parking on the Pierstorff farm.

I oppose a three-story building and a four-story building on the site.

I also oppose a building with commercial space on the ground floor and two or three stories of apartment housing above the commercial space.

Thank you,

Elizabeth Enright

7464 Old Sauk Rd, Madison 53717-1215

From: [Connie Brown](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Extending Appalachian Way to Sauk Ridge Trail
Date: Sunday, December 3, 2023 3:24:39 PM

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

Regarding this proposal to extend Appalachian Way. What purpose does this serve? How will this benefit traffic?
This doesn't really solve a problem because no problem exists at this time.

If this is supported to alleviate traffic caused by the addition of a housing project on Old Sauk Rd, than there is an assumption that those new residents are going to be parking on Sauk Ridge Trail instead of their own property and need additional access to Old Sauk Road.

Connie and Jeff Brown
1 Sauk Woods Ct.

Sent from my iPad

Cleveland, Julie

From: Audrey Silverman Foote <asilverfoote@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 4, 2023 10:35 PM
To: Mayor; Slack, Kristen; Parks, Timothy; Plan Commission Comments
Subject: Proposed apartment building on 6610-6676 Old Sauk Rd.

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

To Whom It May Concern,

I would like to add my concerns about the audacious attempt to build a 4-story apartment building on Old Sauk Road. Although I understand there is the need for more affordable housing in Madison, there was no mention by the company presenting this that these apartments would have affordable housing units. Nor is this the place to build ANY 4-story apartment building, affordable or not.

I found myself looking at the drawing they presented and the proximity to the houses that are 100 feet away from this planned monstrosity. I then took a walk the next day and looked at the houses on the courts that back up to Old Sauk Road. This doesn't affect me personally, but I kept thinking how I would feel if I had put my life savings into a home, expected to raise my family and or retire there, and suddenly, a huge building that blocks light, eliminates beautiful trees, creates noise and artificial light is a massive obstruction to my home. It is entirely unfair and inappropriate.

There are places, even further down on Old Sauk that are more appropriate to build a building such as this. But this proposal for this location is nuts. What is this fantasy that the people moving into 180 apartments would be satisfied with one parking space/home? Where would they park their 2nd cars? Old Sauk is a narrow street, and is wonderful and works well for the quiet neighborhood we live in. It is not meant for a high-density apartment building. The people proposing the building also talked about the walking and biking that people would do on Old Sauk. It is a busy road, without sidewalks on one side, and it has obstructions in spots that makes it hard for cars to see pedestrians crossing. Again, I think they are fantasizing that it will be walkable for the potential residents to make the building proposal look good, but it isn't reality. I walk a lot, and I love the neighborhood, but walking on Old Sauk isn't the safest part of the neighborhood to walk.


The scale of this apartment building is out of character for our neighborhood. We bought a home in this neighborhood because it is bucolic and peaceful. Our property taxes and the cost of our house were high, and we pay this extra money, like so many others, so that we can live in this beautiful area. This apartment doesn't fit with the neighborhood and would cause undo hardship to many of the current residents.

The noise from the HVAC systems, the nighttime lights, the removal of trees, the blocking of sunlight are all untenably impactful for the current residents, let alone for the wildlife in our area. There are condos nestled among the houses here, and they work beautifully. They fit in and don't create any of the problems that this proposed apartment building will cause. One or two story condos or townhouses seem like a much more appropriate use of the land on Old Sauk.

I encourage the powers that be to nix this project immediately and to come up with something that fits in the neighborhood, doesn't ruin other people's homes, and is a project that will not create an eyesore unfitting for the area, harm the natural environment, and cause light and noise pollution for the people and animals who already live here.

Thank you for your attention to these concerns,

Audrey Silverman Foote
930 Sauk Ridge Trail, Madison
Audrey Silverman Foote

 925-519-3673

 asilverfoote@gmail.com

From: [Anna Schryver](#)
To: [Mayor](#); [Slack, Kristen](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Cc: [Joe Hanauer](#); [Ann MacGuidwin](#); [Jason Verhelst](#)
Subject: Lack of a long term plan for Parkwood Hills Neighborhood
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 9:16:21 PM

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

Dear Madison leaders,

Madison is a city built on the strength of its neighborhoods. Parkwood Hills is one of those neighborhoods. But our weakness is we are a neighborhood that lacks any sort of long term plan and so we need your help and vision to keep this neighborhood vibrant.

We know that our area is ripe for development, we're just asking for more involvement in the development plan. Could you slow down the process of what to do with the 4-acres on Old Sauk before you change the zoning? To give us a voice in this plan?

Over 200 people attended the neighborhood meeting. But we all realize we have no plan to address the pressures on Gammon, the already-problematic traffic light on Gammon, and Old Sauk, and more. And I don't see any stance from our alderperson or our neighborhood association -- we're just not as experienced as some other neighborhoods are, such as Dudgeon-Monroe. We're learning to lead. We're not anti-development, just anti-rushing into a short term decision. Could you be patient and help us learn so together we can shape this awesome city for the long term?

Could we know what are next steps, who could help us lead, and how can we proactively work with the City and the developer to be sure we have a voice? Is there someone who can guide us through this process?

Thank you for your consideration.

Anna Schryver
110 Blue Ridge Parkway
Madison, 53705

From: [Connie Kolpin](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Old Sauk Rd Developement
Date: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 10:33:35 PM

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

I'm writing to strongly oppose the 4 story 180 unit apartment building with at least 200+ vehicles entering in and out of a residential neighborhood with multiple schools full of kids crossing streets! It is just not the right area to squeeze in that many apartments and vehicles. Duplexes or 4 unit condo buildings similar to the neighboring homes would be welcomed, safer, and much better suited to blend in with the surroundings. Old Sauk Road is extremely busy all day especially at rush hour/school times and getting out of the side streets onto Old Sauk is dangerous now...only to become more so if the zoning changes to allow this. The current zone is there for a reason!

Connie Kolpin
6605 Carlsbad Dr.

Sent from my iPad

From: [Kathleen stark](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Old Sauk Road Development Plans
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 9:21:01 AM

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

Good Day City of Madison,

We are passionately opposed to any development plans that are being considered for our neighborhood on Old Sauk Road.

We are home owners at 809 Sauk Ridge Trail and our reasons for opposing this project are obvious--increased traffic, increased water use, increased noise, more trash, more crime, more accidents, less trees all leading to a crowded unpleasant place to be.

Regards,

Thomas and Kathleen Stark
809 Sauk Ridge Trail
Madison WI 53717

From: [Lori Devoti](#)
To: [Mayor](#); [Slack, Kristen](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed development of 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 5:27:12 PM

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

This email is in regards to the proposed development of 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road. We are 100% opposed to this development for a number of reasons.

- The intersection of Old Sauk and Pebble Beach Drive, with current traffic, is already risky with a blind curve and speeding vehicles on Old Sauk. Without some plan to improve Old Sauk or slow traffic, this large of a development and the corresponding traffic would make both Old Sauk in general and the Pebble Beach Drive intersection specifically hazardous.
- The parking planned for this size building is insufficient for the number of units and adults who would live there. This is made worse by the fact that there is no safe parking near this proposed development.
- The building itself, at four stories, would be completely out of place for the surrounding neighborhood.

Thank you for your time.

Lori and Steve Devoti
942 Pebble Beach Drive
Madison, WI 53717

From: [Sandra Esrael](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed Development of 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road.
Date: Friday, November 3, 2023 4:01:33 PM

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

Dear Staff:

Proposed Development of 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road. I am opposed to this project. Please send me information on any public hearing regarding the proposal as I wish to register a “no” vote. Thank you.

Sandra Esrael
41 Apple Hill Circle
Madison, WI 53717

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Debi Forrestal](#)
To: [Mayor](#); [Slack, Kristen](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed Stone House Development on Old Sauk Road
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 4:17:46 PM

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

Hello, my name is Deborah Forrestal and I reside at 21 Saint Andrews Circle and I have resided here for 26 years. My property is directly adjacent to the land being considered for development. I want to go on the record as being 100% opposed to the current proposal.

As you have most likely heard from other neighbors in the area, most of us always expected that this land would be developed at some point, but never in my wildest dreams did I expect a massive structure such as what is being proposed. Single family homes or other two-story structures (e.g., condos, apartments, townhomes) would be welcome. I am hoping that Stone House would consider some kind of compromise in size and density.

In terms of rezoning this property, what is the point of having zoning in the first place? How can a homeowner make a decision to buy if adjacent property zoning can be changed? No "protection" is provided.

Your home is most possibly your biggest investment. No one wants to see that investment diminished. How would neighbors who are directly impacted/adjacent be compensated? Would our property taxes be reduced?

A partial list of my concerns are:

- Sunlight. A four story structure would block my sunlight for a portion of each day.
- Water run-off. My home is significantly lower than the property. I have never had an issue with water in my basement, but am very concerned that this will change.
- Noise pollution.
- Parking. With 175 units consisting of studios to 3-bedrooms, many unit residents could have more than one vehicle. Where will these residents park?
- Traffic. Old Sauk Road is two-lanes. I can imagine this will be a congested nightmare at certain times of the day. And, with Owen Conservancy down the road, wild life will also be endangered.

Another important concern is safety/crime. This past weekend, I spoke to a gentleman who lives next to a Stone House Development apartment complex in the Garver Feed Mill area. He told me the police are literally there everyday (sometimes multiple times per day) for one reason or another. His home has been broken into twice. The residents throw trash over the fence into his yard. He has found it necessary to install a 15-camera security system. I am a 70-year old widow and find this extremely frightening.

I hope you will take my concerns and those of my neighbors into consideration. Thank you for listening.

Sent from my iPad

“Above all, the city and its committees should respect the wishes of neighborhoods in the planning process and not simply roll over them like an armored vehicle. Begin and end with neighborhoods, not committees. online participant.” Comprehensive Plan p. 50

My name is Diane Sorensen. I appreciate this opportunity to share my views with the Plan Commission. Numerous people have told that the scenario described by the anonymous online participant has come true: in its haste to build more and more housing, the City and its Committees are simply rolling over neighborhoods like an armored vehicle. I am, nevertheless, here to speak. I hope to prove them all wrong.

I live in Parkwood Hills, near Old Sauk Road, where there are two parcels that can be developed. Though these parcels are currently zoned SR-C1 and SR-C3, or Low Residential Use, as is surrounding property, I’ve always expected them to be developed to a higher density.. When I saw that the City’s future land use plan put this land in the LMR category this made sense. LMR development would allow the construction of housing that would fill a longstanding housing need referred to as the Missing Middle gap. What I didn’t see coming was the use of the “escalator” the allows the construction of massive 4 story apartment complexes..

As shocking as this is, City planners have made it clear that this is exactly what the City plans to allow and we should expect the properties to be re-zoned accordingly.

I think this is a wrong strategy and a wrong result. As I stated earlier, I support development of this property. It is the perfect place for building housing units that fit the “Missing Middle” gap. As noted in the recent WSJ coverage of the Bayview’s new townhouses, Missing Middle housing gives individuals and families, young and old, a precious and unique opportunity to put down roots, nest securely and join in the neighborhood experience.

As the planning memo before the Commission today makes clear, there is an inverse relationship between Medium residential density and Missing Middle development.

“ ..., staff raises the following tradeoffs/considerations for the Plan Commission to keep in mind when determining the language to open up possibilities for Medium Residential (MR) densities if (re)development is considered on these sites:

a. Potential loss of opportunity for future missing middle housing development. If language is changed to broadly allow MR, it is unlikely that LMR (missing middle) redevelopment will be proposed. Staff anticipates that instead of considering redevelopment with townhomes and/or small multifamily buildings, many developers and institutional partners may initially assume development intensities at the upper end of the MR range.”

Statement to the Plan Commission

The Commission should think long and hard before it gives up an opportunity to foster Missing Middle housing. If the City is serious about filling the Missing Middle gap, it will foster such development by designating appropriate parcels LR and LMR.

I am asking the Plan Commission to slow down enough to consider using this opportunity to support Missing Middle housing. I am also asking the Commission to give me and my neighbors an opportunity to participate meaningfully on this issue.

I request the following Commission Action.

1. Defer all action involving the LMR escalator until the West Side Plan is presented in January.
2. Direct that West Side planning staff hold meetings seeking resident and stakeholder input on the plan, with particular attention to parcels considered for LMR and the escalator or MR.
3. Alternatively, defer any action on the language defining “select conditions” until residents and stakeholders have a meaningful opportunity for input.

Statement to the Plan Commission

Thank you,

Diane Sorensen

From: [David Ruhly](#)
To: [Mayor](#); [Slack, Kristen](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: 100% Opposed to Proposed Development of 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 7:58:10 AM

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

Why on Earth would a plan be approved in a residential neighborhood?

Way too many of these plans are being approved and disjointing our Madison neighborhoods, all I ask is, what's the point?

Maybe create more plans that renovate existing areas/buildings in Madison or block these developers from making fist full's of \$\$ at a neighborhood's expense.

Thanks for your ear on this issue.

Make it a great day,

Dave Ruhly
Life long Westside resident

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Stuart Lloyd Gilkison](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road.
Date: Friday, October 27, 2023 10:00:14 PM

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

I am totally in favor of this apartment. I own two homes in 53705:

110 Glen Highway

502 N Midvale

We need more apartments.

Stuart Gilkison

Cleveland, Julie

From: GARY FOSTER <foster8434@prodigy.net>
Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 3:21 PM
To: Slack, Kristen; Parks, Timothy; Plan Commission Comments; Mayor
Subject: Proposed Development at 6614-6706 Old Sauk Rd

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

My name is Gary Foster and my wife Barb and I own a 110 year old farm house at 6506 Old Sauk Rd about 1/4 mile East of this proposed project. Our home is listed on the Wisconsin Historical Society's Wisconsin Architecture and History Inventory (AHI) and we feel blessed to not only own this home, but to live in this very nice West Madison neighborhood.

Let me be clear, we are 100% opposed to this project, it is unprecedented in size, it doesn't fit our neighborhood, it offers no benefits to us or our neighbors, just more traffic to Old Sauk Rd (which is only 2 lanes), more noise and possible unwanted criminal activity.

It's pretty obvious what's going on here, someone got lucky to be able to purchase this old family farm site and now they want to cram onto the site as many apartment units as they can with no regard to our neighborhood or the folks who live here.

If you look at a satellite view we are in the middle of about 4 square miles of mostly single family homes, some apartments and condominiums, but nothing more than 2 stories high. What is proposed is an excessively huge 175-180 door urban style complex and twice as tall at 4 stories, right in middle of our 4 square miles of suburban neighborhoods and it just doesn't fit.

To all of you that are part of this decision making process we ask that you stop this project now and not let it go a step further.

Thank you, Gary and Barb Foster

Sent from my iPad

From: [Planning](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Old Sauk Road Zoning Concerns
Date: Thursday, October 26, 2023 10:41:00 AM

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

From: Karly Klagos <karklagos@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 10:30 PM
To: Planning <planning@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Old Sauk Road Zoning Concerns

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

Hello,

My name is Karly Curtin and I attended the meeting this week about the proposed property on Old Sauk Road. I was hoping to share some thoughts with you that were not touched on during the meeting.

My grandparents built a home in Parkwood Hills back in the 60s, when this land was still farmland. My parents bought the house from my grandparents in the 80s and it is where I grew up. I now live with my husband and 2 sons (4y/o and 1y/o) on Court of Brixham, off of Sauk Ridge Trail. My parents still live in their home in Parkwood Hills and my sister and her family are moving in across the street from them next week. This area is my home and is the home of my family for multiple generations.

My family and I are extremely concerned about this proposal. The addition of potentially 400 cars to the area is frankly terrifying as a mother who walks her young children across Old Sauk road to visit their grandparents.

My property backs up to the path that leads from Sauk Ridge Trail to Appalachian Trail. We enjoy watching our neighbors walk on this path every day. There is a pretty constant flow of residents who use this path all day, every day. If you look for this area on a map, you can see that taking this path down to Blue Ridge is the easiest way for people to get from our neighborhood across Old Sauk Road. Neighbors are walking to Owen Conservatory, Crestwood School, John Muir School, nearby parks, Parkcrest Pool and family and friends in Parkwood Hills. It can take quite awhile to cross the street safely with current traffic. Adding additional cars who will be driving and likely parking on Old Sauk Road has me extremely nervous. I would imagine bumper to bumper traffic, erratic driving, issues with school drop off, back ups from turkey crossings, biking and pedestrian accidents, fast drivers cutting through our neighborhoods and countless issues with people turning left onto the various streets that run along Old Sauk Road.

I am aware there is a housing crisis in Madison. I am 32 years old and one of the only people my age I know who own a home. I am extremely blessed. When my son was born we lived in a small apartment and could not find affordable housing suited for our family. We were constantly looking for townhomes in Madison, which would be perfect for a small family, but we couldn't find any anywhere. It's extremely rare to find townhomes for rent in Madison. I am really hoping that townhomes could be developed in this area instead of a large apartment complex. Yes, it would not have the density of the current proposal, but it would be serving a portion of our community, young families. Families who are not ready to buy homes but would like more space than an apartment with easy outdoor access for their children. There are other areas zoned for the proposed complex in our city, with easy street access. This area on Old Sauk Road is a perfect area for townhomes.

I am asking you to please not allow a zoning change to occur. Zoning is in place for a reason, and allowing this to change simply because our city is in a housing crisis is irresponsible. There are other forms of housing which would work on this lot and would help out our housing crisis, while not creating a safety hazard. This is our home and we

want our children to be safe. We are not asking for something unreasonable.

I know you have many emails to read through from my concerned neighbors. Thank you for giving this issue your time and attention.

Karly Curtin
Court of Brixham

Sent from my iPhone

Cleveland, Julie

From: Karen Gibson <karengibson.studio@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2023 9:55 AM
To: Mayor; Slack, Kristen; Parks, Timothy; Plan Commission Comments
Subject: Opposition to the development of 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd

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

Dear officials,

My name is Dan Jaeger. My wife, Karen Gibson, and I live at 14 Torrey Pines Ct. and our home borders the proposed apartment complex at 6614-6706 Old Sauk Rd. We appreciated the opportunity to be heard and to participate in such a well organized virtual meeting.

When we moved to Madison 11 years ago from Chicago, we fell in love with this neighborhood and home. We knew it was where we wanted to raise our children and become part of Madison's amazing culture and progressive approach to people and the environment. We were also realistic and knew the land and barn over our fence would someday be sold and developed, but we counted on the neighborhood being zoned for single family homes to be upheld. We are not against the development of this land, but this 175 unit apartment complex is so outside of anything we would have imagined that we are compelled to oppose it in all ways possible.

Therefore, we'd like to outline our opposition to this proposed project. We are coordinating our response with our neighbors so there is no doubt as to where we stand on this proposed project. Our neighbors Paul and Mary Umbeck recently sent you an outline of their concerns and cited where the project appears to be inconsistent with the approval criteria under the conditional use section of the code.

Concerns / Objections to the Project:

- We agree with the concerns outlined by Mary and Paul Umbeck where the project appears to be inconsistent with the approval criteria under the conditional use section of the code.
- When we bought the home we experienced significant backyard flooding due to the farm house higher elevation and steep grade to our property. Even with the high absorption rate of the wooded and grassed area, heavy rains sent torrents toward us. We worked to landscape and address the problem. The proposed development would significantly reduce the amount of absorption, and even with proposed green space, will significantly increase the runoff from the building area.
- These four acres are an amazing green space that includes first growth trees and animal habitat. Native and migratory birds, horned owls, turkeys, foxes, frogs, deer, and many others call this area home. It is really an extension of Owen Conservatory and any development should be sensitive to this fact.
- The scale of the project would create apartments with a view directly into our property and possibly home as these units would be built at a height of 40-50 ft

- The need for a wrap around road for fire and service vehicles creates an opportunity for headlights to shine directly on our home as well as create noise pollution at undetermined times of the day.
- We have two children 8-10 who are students at Crestwood Elementary School. Old Sauk is already very heavily used and the intersection of Pebble Beach and Old Sauk has been the scene of several accidents, as has Old Sauk near Owen Conservancy. The assumption that car use would be 1:1 per unit is unrealistic as there are very limited walkable areas for groceries, restaurants, retail or bars nearby. Even if only 50% of the units have two vehicles that's 262 additional vehicles accessing this road multiple times a day. Without the introduction of stoplights, cross walks with traffic lights, and the addition of turn lanes this puts our children at a higher risk.
- The barn was built in the 1850's and is a jewel from Madison's past. It should have been registered as a historical site years ago. There is a great chance to develop this land around a theme using this beautiful barn vs tearing it down and losing it to history.

I urge you to align to your support and actions with the residents in the area.

- Listen to residents and neighborhoods and seek input before decisions are made.
- Ensure we are protecting our environment and unique ecosystems
- Address Madison's housing crisis with collaborative approaches that emphasize affordability and home ownership, with a land stewardship-minded approach.

We'd also like to specifically call out the fact that this project would neither be affordable for most middle income families, AND offers no opportunity for home ownership, the number one asset families need to gain financial security.

We are therefore against the proposed development of this property under the plan outlined on 10-24-23

Thank you.

Dan Jaeger and Karen Gibson

From: [Brian S.](#)
To: [Mayor](#); [Slack, Kristen](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: No to Proposed Development of 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road
Date: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 7:13:48 PM

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

I am opposed to this project. I am not sure which is worse, this or BRT.

Brian

From: [ABIGALE MARGARET NICHOLSON](#)
To: [Mayor](#); [Slack, Kristen](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Old Sauk Rd Proposed Development
Date: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 5:35:10 PM

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

To whom it may concern,

I am writing in support of the proposed development on the 6600 block of Old Sauk Road by StoneHouse Developments. I have excellent experiences with StoneHouse developments in the past, and cannot understand why people would be opposed to well-designed, well-managed apartments in their neighborhood.

I understand this development has become a pretty heated topic with a large portion of the vocal citizens adamantly opposing it. I just wanted to take a minute to let the folks in charge know that I think this building is an excellent idea. There's already a great bus route through the area, it's almost a 15-minute walkable space, and there's great schools in the area. It seems to me like those in opposition have very short-sighted, NIMBY-esque reasons for opposing and are unable to offer solutions. I can imagine that can be very frustrating for you to deal with.

Finally, I think that this specific lot is great for development as this neighborhood has the capacity to handle an 180-unit building. Many other places, like near other 180-unit buildings, would not be as equipped to handle the increased density.

I appreciate you time, the effort you put into planning, and the patience you must have for your constituents. I hope to hear news of this development moving forward and including many affordable units.

Thank You,
Abby Nicholson

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: [Vergene Rodman](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Old Sauk
Date: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 6:07:59 PM

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

I cannot believe the city would even consider this project??

I served on a planning commission for 20 years in another state and you do not make decisions to destroy a lovely residential area in your city.

Please reconsider.
Vergene Rodman

Sent from my iPad

From: [Rosemary Neu](#)
To: [Slack, Kristen](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Mayor](#)
Subject: Proposed Development at 6614-6706 Old Sauk Rd
Date: Saturday, October 28, 2023 1:30:10 PM

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

My name is Rosemary Neu and I reside in the Settlers Woods condominiums.

I am oppose to this development as it does not fit our neighborhood. My major concern is the traffic that will be generated on Old Sauk Road, as we already experience heavy volumes of traffic through out the day.

I understand that Madison has a housing problem but I am hoping that you consider the neighborhoods and their needs before constructing a project like this.

Thank you for listening and I hope that you will see fit not to proceed with this project.

Rosemary Neu

From: [Charles G. Spetland](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed Development of 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road.
Date: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 8:43:15 PM

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

RE: Proposed Development of 6610-6706 Old Sauk Road.

Hello,

I am 100% opposed to this proposed development, for all of the reasons that you have heard from others.

Thank you for your time,
cgs

Cleveland, Julie

From: Jane Nelson Worel <jnelsonworel@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 7:22 AM
To: Plan Commission Comments
Subject: Fwd: proposed development on Old Sauk Road

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

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jane Nelson Worel <jnelsonworel@gmail.com>
Subject: proposed development on Old Sauk Road
Date: October 25, 2023 at 7:21:00 AM CDT
To: district19@cityofmadison.com, tparks@cityofmadison.com

Hi, Alder Slack and Planner Parks,

I attended the meeting last night and was pleased to see so many neighbors raise the same concerns I have regarding the proposed very large, high density apartment complex on Old Sauk Road. I am deeply concerned about the traffic, safety, noise, light, and environmental habitat loss in our neighborhood if this proposal moves forward. In a nutshell, the quality of life that we have developed over 36 years in this neighborhood will be gone. I challenge the basic premise that “Madison needs more housing”. With this premise, the city seems hell bent to build massive apartment complexes wherever they can be jammed in without regard to maintaining the quality of living that drew most of us to the city, and our neighborhood, in the first place. At what point do we say, “Madison is at capacity? We can no longer continue to add living units willy nilly and continue to be a city that offers the quality of life that Madison has prided itself on.

The land owner and the developers are driven by greed and the almighty dollar. I am not sure what drives the city planners and leadership to even consider this proposal. I don’t understand the need for continued growth of the city. Please consider the sustainment of quality of life for long-term Madison residents when making decisions regarding future building projects. Along with my neighbors who attended the meeting last night strongly oppose this proposal.

Jane Nelson Worel
717 Pebble Beach Drive
Madison, WI 53717

From: [Diane Sorensen](#)
To: [Parks, Timothy](#)
Cc: [Fun to Build](#); [Guequierre, John](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Re: 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, Posting Public Comments and Escalator Clause Process?
Date: Monday, April 29, 2024 7:59:32 AM

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

Dear Alder Guiquierre and Tim Parks.

I would like to add these questions to Gary Foster's questions 1) and 2). I begin at 3). These questions all relate to the above property which I may refer to as either the Pierstorff Property or the Old Sauk site. References to meetings are all to the October 5th and 11th meetings unless otherwise specified. If any of my questions duplicate questions asked by Gary Foster, please just identify the Foster question you previously answered. I begin with question 3)

Question 3). Who was present at Stone House Development Team/Madison Planning Division meetings held on October 5th and October 11th 2023? Was any homeowner present?

Question 4) What advice and assistance did you and other staff of the Planning Division give to representatives of Stone House Development teams?.

Question 5. At either the October 5th or the October 11th meeting was Stone House was advised by you or other Planning Division staff that density on the Pierstorff parcels could be "escalated"?

Question: 6) Is it correct that at one of these meetings Stone House development was advised by you or other Planning Division staffers that a 4 story, 180 unit apartment complex would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? In other words, was Stone House Development advised that the City would likely approve a project of this size?

Question: 7) What advice was given in regard to rezoning the parcels at these meetings?

Question 8) Had you or other Division staffer been on the Pierstorff property before meeting with Stone House team on October 5th and 11th?

Questions 9). Had you or any other staffer been to Old Sauk Road and made photos, notes or any other kind of record describing the property uses along Old Sauk road between Gammon Road and Old Middleton Road.

Question 10). Before the October 5th and 11th meetings, had you or any other staffer ever been on any of the property adjacent to and directly north of the Pierstorff property?

Question 11). Before the October 5th and 11th meeting, what knowledge did you have of soil content, stormwater drainage and other environmental issues?

Question 12). Before the October 5th and 11th meetings, what data did you have about the density of the residential housing surrounding the parcel?

Question 13). At the October 5th or 11th meeting did you any other staffer directly or tacitly advise the Stone House development that the Planning Division will recommend escalation density on the Old Sauk Parcels?

Question 14). What was the advice given to Stone House Development regarding rezoning? At the October 5th or 11th meeting did you or another other staffer directly or tacitly advise Stone House Development that the Planning Division would recommend or otherwise support a rezoning to TR-U2? Did you advise Stone House Development that that was the property rezoning.? Was Stone House given any assurances regarding

Question: 15) Do you intend to recommend to the Planning Commission that density on the Pierstorff parcels should be “escalated”?

Question: 16). When, if ever, has the escalator clause been applied to increase density of LMR property? Be specific about the development and its location?

Question 17) Is it correct that the Planning Commission ordinarily defers to the Planning Division’s interpretation of the terms used in the Comprehensive Plan?

Question 18): Has the application of the escalator clause ever been challenged successfully by homeowners?

Question 19). Do you agree that there is correspondence or overlap between properties identified for possible escalation and properties identified for Missing Middle housing: the draft West Area Plan specifies that that Missing Middle housing development should be considered for LMR properties that are near parks, schools and transit and the Comprehensive Plan refers to possibilities escalation of LMR properties near parks, schools and transit?

Question 20). Do you agree that Madison has succeeded in greatly increasing the number of high density apartment buildings?

Question 21). Do you agree that Madison has failed to achieve a comparable increase in Missing Middle housing?

Question 22). Do you agree that escalating density on infill parcels makes it more likely that they will be developed for high density apartment complexes.

Question 23). Are you aware that escalation density on property makes it more valuable to developers because there is a correlation between density and profit - in other words, they escalate together?

Question 24). Is it fair to say that by escalating density on property the City incentivizes the development of high density apartment complexes over other less dense types of property?

25). Is it correct that there is no TR-U2 zoned property within mile of the Old Sauk site?

26) Question: The Zoning Code state that zoning “districts” are created to “stabilize and protect” areas with different densities and different lifestyles. What does the term “district” mean?

27). Please identify any other large apartment complexes constructed or approved by the City that back up directly to homeowners back yards and that are surrounded by one and two story residential housing?

28). The Comprehensive Plan requires that infill development be seamlessly integrated with existing housing. What data do you have today about the surrounding existing housing?

I know I have asked many questions, however, I believe that many are “yes” or “no” questions that can be quickly answered. We appreciate your cooperation. Like Gary, I appreciate your answers in advance.

Respectfully,
Diane Sorensen

On Mon, Apr 29, 2024 at 1:23 AM Fun to Build <foster07cn@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Tim,

I have two questions for you and appreciate your answers in advance.

1) I sent two emails to pccomments@cityofmadison.com approximately April 12-16 referencing [6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd](#) and 82950, 82972, 82979 that have yet to be posted as public comments in Legistar. Could you please see that both emails are posted immediately to all three Legistar locations? Also, if any other residents submit emails for public comments could you see that they are posted immediately as well?

2) On April 10 I asked the following: could you please address the first sentence of 19) What is the process that will be used to determine if the Escalator Clause is allowable? To

which you answered: That will be addressed as part of the analysis in the staff report issued prior to the Plan Commission meeting currently scheduled for June 10 – probably on June 6. Could you please be more specific about the process of analyzing/reporting and how it will be shared with the public in advance of the Plan Commission meeting? Also could you please describe how residents will have a chance for input on this matter both prior to and during the scheduled Plan Commission meeting? My concern is that the Plan Commission only states that Escalation is allowed and gives no reasons as to why. To me this is extremely important that this process is done correctly for everyone, especially given the precedents that could be set surrounding the 8 select condition factors recently adopted.

Thank you, Gary Foster
[6506 Old Sauk Rd](#)

From: [Guequierre, John](#)
To: [Beth Robinson](#)
Cc: [Tim Burns](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Helen Bradbury](#)
Subject: Re: City of Madison - File #: 82972 Old Sauk rezoning
Date: Friday, April 19, 2024 1:43:07 PM

Hello, Beth,

One of the many requirements that Stone House Development would need to satisfy for the project to get a building permit is meeting the stormwater management requirements that the City toughened up after the 2018 flood event. I've been advised that the developer has submitted a plan, which will be carefully reviewed by the Stormwater Management staff within Madison's Engineering Department. I understand that some of the area residents have engaged an independent engineer to also review the developer's plan and the report that Engineering will generate. What we all hope for is that the project, if approved, would reduce the potential for flood damage to neighboring homes compared to the current conditions. There will be a lot of eyes on this. I'm not an expert on the applicable law, but I believe that for the developer to be liable for flood damage to the property of others it would need to be proved that their plan did not meet the new law.

I hope that's helpful. As with all comments on the project, favorable and unfavorable, I make sure that they are entered into the public record and shared with the developer.

All the best,

John Guequierre
district19@cityofmadison.com
608.571.3530

From: Beth Robinson <robinson.beth@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 19, 2024 11:24 AM
To: Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: Tim Burns <tjburns@fastmail.com>
Subject: City of Madison - File #: 82972 Old Sauk rezoning

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

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

I live at 17 E Spyglass Ct, Madison, WI 53717. I'm very concerned about flooding at my home if the apartments and parking that has been proposed replaces the natural water drainage. Will the developers cover the cost of flooding to my house because a building and concrete will just shed water instead of absorbing it? There are already known flooding problems in this area. This development will make it worse. The City has documented the flooding potential for this area but apparently doesn't have funds to mitigate. At least, do not add additional flood water with this development.

Beth Robinson
17 E Spyglass Ct

From: jan.lehman7795@gmail.com
To: [Jeff Western](#)
Cc: [Guequierre, John](#); [Parks, Timothy](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Wolfe, James](#); [Stouder, Heather](#)
Subject: Re: Comments on Old Sauk Proposal – Parking and Site Access
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2024 4:03:27 PM

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

Thank you Jeff for the detailed email regarding the “proposed “ disaster to be built on Old Sauk Road. City Officials and Alderman, are you listening???? We will want to save these emails for future reference when our homes and yards are destroyed due to water issues that we’re not heard or acted upon. Our attorneys will need them!

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 1, 2024, at 11:13 AM, Jeff Western <jlwestern444@gmail.com> wrote:

Below are my Parking and Site Access comments on the Old Sauk proposal:

-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 a sandy soil requires special shoring, water protection and continuous inspection and maintenance.

Jeffrey L. Western, PE, SE

From: [Guequierre, John](#)
To: mikehbridwell@icloud.com
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Helen Bradbury](#)
Subject: Re: Cond Use - 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, 82972 CSM - 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, 82979
Date: Thursday, April 18, 2024 8:30:05 PM

Hello, Mike,

Thank you for your comments. As with all comments on this project I'm making sure that they are part of the public record and shared with the developer.

All the best,
John Guequierre
district19@cityofmadison.com

From: mikehbridwell@icloud.com <mikehbridwell@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2024 6:58 PM
To: Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>; Parks, Timothy <TParks@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Cond Use - 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, 82972 CSM - 6610-6706 Old Sauk Rd, 82979

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

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

My wife and I are 100% opposed to the approval of these items. The property should not be re-zoned. Rezoning will negatively impact the surrounding properties and neighborhoods which have been fully developed based on the presumption that this property would continue to be zoned single family residential. In reading the application letter the developer would have you think they've acquired full support from the surrounding residents. Nothing could be further from the truth. A quick drive around the various neighborhoods would dispel such notions given the dozens and dozens of red "No Rezone" yard signs that have been placed.

The misrepresentations in the application letter don't stop at implying neighborhood support. There are numerous others, including;

1. The map showing multi family units in close proximity. None of the units shown on the map exceed 8 units. Most of the them are 2 units. All of the units are built to a residential style architecture with hip roofs and relatively low densities. To suggest that this development fits in according to surrounding development is intellectually misleading at best.
2. The letter indicates that the proposed development is adjacent to an arterial street is also intellectually misleading. While the MPO shows this stretch of Old Sauk Road as a minor arterial, it is not designed or built to arterial street standards, including significant deficiencies that impact safety. Its designation as an arterial is based only on use, which in this case could be further characterized as overuse. If the roadway does not meet arterial standards by design, it should not be considered an arterial for planning and development purposes.
3. The letter indicates a school within walking distance. It fails to indicate that there is no sidewalk on that side of Old Sauk Road between the school and the proposed development.

As such students would have to cross this under-designed and overused collector street twice to get to school, further increasing an already high risk of an impending tragedy. Without this sidewalk it would be more likely that students would be bused from this location. The school bus stop pick up and drop off would be incredibly disruptive to the excessive rush hour traffic. Again, intellectually misleading.

4. The letter indicates, "The architecture of the building is designed to reflect the character of the surrounding suburban residential neighborhood". Nothing could be further from the truth. There is no building within a mile of this site that looks anything like it. Again, intellectually misleading.

5. The letter indicates the use of a 3 story building. In the neighborhood discussions it was noted that the first floor would be approximately a half story above grade. Add to that the utility shack on the roof along with solar panels and the building will be very near a 4 story height. Again, intellectually misleading.

If you place any value on the concerns of existing residents, do not be misled by the developer's characterizations, and reject the proposal.

From: [Guequierre, John](#)
To: [Kristi Jones](#)
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Helen Bradbury](#)
Subject: Re: Opposition to massive proposed apartment building on Old Sauk Road
Date: Wednesday, April 24, 2024 11:36:15 AM

Hello, Kristi,

I wanted to let you know that I received and read your email regarding the Old Sauk project. I'm copying it to the public record for Plan Commission matters and to the developer.

All the best,

John Guequierre
district19@cityofmadison.com
608.571.3530

From: Kristi Jones <kfj1228@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 23, 2024 8:49 PM
To: Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>; hstrouder@cityofmadison.com <hstrouder@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Opposition to massive proposed apartment building on Old Sauk Road

You don't often get email from kfj1228@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing in strong opposition to the Stone House Development proposal for a massive, urban, high-density apartment building on Old Sauk Road.

While I am realistic enough to know that something will be built, I hope the City will listen to the opinions of many neighborhood residents who feel the focus should be on a smaller, lower density apartment building.

Crestwood Elementary School is located on Old Sauk Rd, near the proposed site of this apartment building. I am very concerned for the safety of Crestwood children, should the proposed apartment building be built as planned. Crestwood already has an unsafe pickup/drop-off situation. Parents who drive their children to school must park on the side of street, and children must cross the road. This is made more even less safe by the massive Old Sauk hill. Car traffic from a 180-unit apartment building would create significantly more safety risks for Crestwood school children—especially because morning rush hour coincides with school dropoff.

A lower density apartment building would cause less additional traffic and would mean a safer situation for Crestwood school children. The City of Madison needs to find other solutions to

the housing problem than allowing massive apartment buildings to be built near schools, in primarily residential housing areas. The City needs to listen to, and engage, residents in thinking about housing solutions.

I would strongly urge that the focus be on a smaller, lower density apartment building. The safety of school children needs to be a priority.

Sincerely,
Kristi Jones

From: [Guequierre, John](#)
To: [karen schlough](#)
Cc: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Re: Stone house project (Old Sauk Road)
Date: Thursday, April 18, 2024 4:05:00 PM

Hello, Karen,

I just wanted to let you know that I received and read your email and am entering it into the public record for this project.

All the best,

John Guequierre
district19@cityofmadison.com
608.571.3530

From: karen schlough <karen_schlough@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2024 1:09 PM
To: Guequierre, John <district19@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Stone house project

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

I am sending this letter in opposition of the proposed changes to the proposed housing project in Sauk Road area. Such a large project scares me regarding the safety of this area. Just the amount of increased traffic will be dramatic. Please consider something smaller and more appropriate for the space so things won't start out as a battle in such a nice neighborhood.

Thank you. Karen Schlough
7813 Tree Lane

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

From: [Kathleen stark](#)
To: [Parks, Timothy](#); hstrouder@cityofmadison.com; [Guequierre, John](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: response to Stonehouse Proposal on Old Sauk Road
Date: Saturday, April 20, 2024 5:35:57 PM

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.

To whom it concerns:

It is with profound sadness and disbelief that our neighborhood community experiences repeated hammering by the 'Stone House development proposal for the Pierstoffs parcels on Old Sauk Road. This project does not belong in our backyards. Our objections are not NIMBYISM, but rather, wisdom. Creating density does not enhance living for any human. Note the number of people now overturning their lives to leave the big cities of the United States, for example New York, San Diego, San Francisco and Chicago. The kind of rezoning you propose has happened in San Diego, and it is devastating once charming neighborhoods. Litter, filth, crime and their attendant citizen disgust and disillusion are now the dominant tones of the affected neighborhoods.

All the reasons for this development opposition are obvious and have been clearly elucidated in print and in person by many members of our west side community. And so again for emphasis;

It is rare to have what we have in Madison: our eclectic neighborhoods, civic pride, political discourse, educational opportunities, theater, art, music, festivals, cleanliness, friendliness, order, music, great food, lakes, trees, wildlife, glorious seasons... Do you really think uncontrolled development with the inevitable increasing pressure on our invaluable resources fosters good living? You, the urban planners, are preparing for 110,000 new residents by 2050? Then get ahead of the game with your developers by building new roads and new schools, expanding the health care, city and police forces, trash pickup, new landfills, water protection and charging stations. Citizens, ask yourselves: who really benefits from this development, and where do such profiteers themselves live?

Instead of adding more cement and 110,000 new residents, add 110,000 new trees. Live and vote with passion and wisdom.

NO, NO, NO TO REZONING AND MOVING FORWARD WITH THE STONE HOUSE PROPOSAL FOR THE PIERSTOFF PARCELS ON OLD SAUK ROAD. IF THE developer IS EAGER TO CONTRIBUTE TO OUR COMMUNITY THEY CAN DONATE THEIR SERVICES AND CONVERT THIS SPACE INTO A PARK AND WE WILL BE HAPPY TO MAINTAIN IT FOR OUR COMMUNITY.

And again 'WE THE PEOPLE' say no to the Stone House Proposal/Pierstoffs parcel on Old Sauk Road.

Tom and Kathleen Stark