

From: [Beth Sluys](#)
To: [All Alders](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Agenda Item 7
Date: Monday, April 26, 2021 2:57:38 PM

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

To: Plan Commission, City of Madison
City of Madison Common Council Alders

Date: 4/26/2021

Re: Agenda Item 7

Dear Alders,

I am writing in opposition to the proposed rezoning of the tiny house village site located at 1901 Aberg Avenue. I am actually a supporter of the creation of tiny house villages, and advocate for a **Village in Every District**. Why not include a tiny house village that is sponsored by each Alder in their District? If we put a village in each district, at a maximum of 22 per village, then we could house many of our currently homeless neighbors. If we put the 3 million dollars from the highly contentious Savers Building on the far East side, and commit to locating and supporting a village in every district, we could solve the homelessness issue with grace, speed and with a well supported program that already has the support of the Mayor, the county and several Alders. It is likely less expensive and offers the level of freedom and integrity that makes it work at the Third Street village.

In reading the municipal code for the PD zone designation, it appears that this zoning is not designed for this type of development. It actually is recommended that it not be used, or rarely. This village does not meet the requirements of PD:

The Planned Development (*PD*) District is established to provide a voluntary regulatory framework as a means to facilitate the unique development of land in an integrated and innovative fashion, to allow for flexibility in site design, and to encourage development that is sensitive to environmental, cultural, and economic considerations, and that features high-quality architecture and building materials. In addition, the Planned Development District is intended to achieve one or more of the following objectives:

- (a) Promotion of green building technologies, low-impact development techniques for stormwater management, and other innovative measures that encourage sustainable development.
- (b) Promotion of integrated land uses allowing for a mixture of residential, commercial, and public facilities along corridors and in transitional areas, with enhanced pedestrian, bicycle and transit connections and amenities.
- (c) Preservation and enhancement of important environmental features through careful and sensitive placement of buildings and facilities.
- (d) Preservation of historic buildings, structures, or landscape features through adaptive reuse of public or private preservation of land.
- (e) Provision of more adequate, usable, and suitably located open space, recreational amenities, and other public facilities than would otherwise be provided under conventional land development techniques.

(f)

Facilitation of high-quality development that is consistent with the goals, objectives, policies, and recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan and adopted neighborhood, corridor or special area plans.

Because substantial flexibility is permitted in the base *zoning* districts, the *PD* option should rarely be used. It is intended that applicants use the *PD* option only for situations where none of the base *zoning* districts address the type of development or site planning proposed. Examples include redevelopment, large-scale master planned developments, projects that create exceptional employment or economic development opportunities, or developments that include a variety of residential, commercial, and employment uses in a functionally integrated mixed-use setting.

Approval of a Planned Development District requires a *zoning* map amendment, which shall result in the creation of a new site-specific *zoning* district, with specific requirements that are unique to that planned development. In the Planned Development District, there shall be no predetermined requirements for lot area, lot width, height, floor area ratio, yards, usable open space, signage, or off-street parking and loading, but such requirements may be made a part of a planned development during its approval and recorded against the *PD*-zoned property as regulations to be enforced as a part of this ordinance.

I am mostly opposed to this development because it places some of our most vulnerable citizens next to and on top of plumes of toxic waste. There is known subsurface contamination next to the site at Oscar Mayer, highly toxic trichloroethylene. A Cancer causing chemical. TCE vapors are known to travel via storm sewer and sanitary sewers. This village site was previously a car wash and gas station. To date, NO environmental site assessment was completed to determine any risks, and to my knowledge, none of the residents were notified of this contamination potential, both at the village site and that of the contamination at Oscar Mayer. The transfer station has subsurface contamination and is right next to this village site. Large diesel buses roar right next to the site and the air pollution is another source of pollution for the residents of this village.

It seems that we can find better locations for the poor and homeless than car repair garages and near toxic waste sites. I ask for environmental justice for our neighbors at the OM village at 1901 Aberg Avenue.

I ask that we be kinder to those we look to serve.

Please vote no on this site for this village and look to find a better location for a second village. One that offers no risk to human health and safety, is peaceful, beautiful and offers a respite for the stewards who live there.

We can do better.

Thank you,

Beth Sluys
District 18

From: [Tanya Mudrick](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: OM village tiny house community
Date: Monday, April 26, 2021 1:46:13 PM

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

Hello,

We are neighbors of the OM Village tiny house community and we are in support of permanent zoning for the village. We are happy to have this community in our neighborhood.

Thank you,

The Knight Mudrick Family

Tanya Mudrick

1934 Kropf Ave

Madison, WI 53704

Two blocks from OM Village

From: [Amy Owen](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Please support item 7 and oppose item 12 for 4/26 meeting agenda
Date: Monday, April 26, 2021 1:08:14 PM

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

Dear Alders,

I am writing to request that you support item 7 and oppose item 12 on today's (4/26) meeting agenda. Allowing tiny houses is one of many solutions to a crushing affordable housing and homelessness crisis in our community and I request that you please support all permitting and zoning changes related to allowing tiny houses to be built and approved.

Additionally, the neighborhoods around the Garver Feed Mill include residential areas that have been disrupted quite a bit from the three massive construction projects we've had here. More noise from outdoor patios and their inevitable piped out stereo or live music is not wanted, and yes, the noise from this area does travel to the nearby homes. Plenty of outdoor seating areas are already available at the current establishments in the Garver Feed Mill and we do not need to add more sources of noise and drunken disruption at sites on the lower floor of the new apartment buildings. One of the issues with the process of development in this area is that the impacts to the neighborhood tend to sneak in without discussion with and consent of the community - requests for music on the outdoor patios at Garver came later and that was never a part of the original community discussions. We as a neighborhood now have to experience these impacts that someone else is making a profit on (i

t's not as though Garver Events sends any portion of their profits to the immediate community that is impacted by them). Worse, our property taxes skyrocket because we are located near these developments with their accompanying noise and crowds and dangerous driving. Despite repeated requests, the city also refused to consider the compound impact of the multiple developments there on traffic and driving patterns, insisting on only considering each of the 3 developments separately, and I request that this stop happening because impacts from development do not occur in an individual silo. Please deny the request for outdoor seating for this business, who has not even shown that they can be a good neighbor with their indoor business activities yet. Our neighborhood has been mined enough for private profit. The costs to the neighborhood in traffic, taxes, and peace and quiet are already enough.

Thank you,
Amy Owen
3129 Buena Vista Street
Madison, WI 53704