From: <u>Jinger Schroeder</u>

To: Plan Commission Comments
Subject: Comment on Agenda Item 68079
Date: Monday, November 8, 2021 1:33:47 PM

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

Dear Council Members,

I am writing to support the ADU proposed changes for agenda item #68079. My husband and I researched this option five years ago and determined it was just too expensive for us to invest in at the time with the restrictions and size limitations. In order to make it worth building we needed to be able to accommodate a 2 bedroom structure and have the option to exceed the 800 sq ft allowance. Also, in order to make it more affordable the architectural details required with roof pitch and matching window and style added extra costs and limitations as well. We do however want to be able to match our existing structure with color and style, but were concerned about added costs that might be imposed if it didn't exactly match.

I would also like to suggest a waiver on the parks fee that is imposed for a time being to help spur the development of these units. If that is not an option, please consider reducing the fee or make it clear what that fee is or what it's based on. I spoke to a number of people who built ADUs and it seemed the parks fee ranged quite a bit (\$3500-4500). Also, please understand in many areas where these might be built many people already have only one car and use public transportation and/or the bike path to get to work. So the impact might not be as big as you'd imagine as the reason why so many of us choose to live close to downtown is because we don't want to spend more time in our cars.

Thank you so much for considering this and we really appreciate the work of Alder Tag Evers, Foster and Heck as well as the planning staff in crafting the ordinance change.

Best, Jinger Schroeder

JINGER SCHROEDER
Freelance Art Direction & Graphic Design

P 608.442.7296 E jinger@jingerschroeder.com

E jinger@jingerschroeder.com jingerschroeder.com From: Matt Lazio

To: <u>Plan Commission Comments</u>

Subject: ADU proposal

Date: Monday, November 8, 2021 11:21:32 AM

I support the ADU proposal. The one that is near us in the Vilas neighborhood is very well done. Thank you for voting to update the zoning to help modernize Madison. Matt Lazio

1812 Adams St, Madison, WI 53711

--

Matt Lazio, MD FAWM

"Keep close to Nature's heart... and break clear away, once in awhile, and climb a mountain or spend a week in the woods. Wash your spirit clean."

John Muir

From: <u>Nicholas Davies</u>

To: <u>Plan Commission Comments</u>

Cc: <u>Foster, Grant</u>

Subject: Yes on ADUs, with modifications

Date: Sunday, November 7, 2021 4:17:33 PM

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

Dear Plan Commission members,

Yes on ADUs--but also other "multi-family" configurations

I live in Eastmoreland. It's a wonderful neighborhood with schools and parks and libraries and cafes and groceries and restaurants and bars and pharmacies and transit all within walking distance.

More people would live here if they could! And with a city-wide housing shortage, I wish they were allowed to. It's disappointing that much of the neighborhood still has an exclusive single-family-only zoning designation. This is a relic of racist redlining practices, but I have seen its impacts on families and households of all backgrounds.

A lot of Eastmoreland homes were built during the same wave of construction in the 1950's and still have a very standard floorplan. This means that as soon as a family has two older kids, or tries to fit another generation into the house, it becomes a very tight fit. This forces people into the housing market, contributing to the inflation in housing prices.

I support allowing the natural densification of neighborhoods across Madison. For a variety of reasons, including equity, affordability, sustainability, and tax revenue, we need to curb urban sprawl and close the housing shortage.

To maintain the status quo is to artificially suppress that natural densification. Again, that's a policy rooted in the racism of decades past, and it's been detrimental to our city, its current residents, and the people who will live here in decades to come, if we give them a chance.

Allowing ADUs as a permitted use does not mean abolishing single-family-only zoning (I wish!), but it is a step in the right direction. It would mean that people in Eastmoreland wouldn't necessarily be forced out merely due to the size and configuration of their family.

Much of Eastmoreland is TR-C1/C2/C3, which are all exclusively single-family. Part of the neighborhood is TR-C4, which also allows duplexes and small-scale apartment buildings. Without consulting the zoning map, you would hardly notice the difference in character.

There's really no reason that the current TR-C1/C2/C3 areas couldn't support the occasional duplex or two-up-two-down, and allow infill in parts of the neighborhood that are actually more walkable and complete. And it wouldn't mean that anyone's current use of their property is out of code.

One modification, please

According to the staff presentation, an ADU will only be a permitted use if the owner of the primary structure lives on the property. That's the rule today, and currently that wouldn't change. But that's completely arbitrary.

Whether the main house is occupied by the owner vs. family vs. renters makes no difference to the effect of that house on the character of the neighborhood or its impact on city services. So if there's also an ADU on the property, why should it suddenly matter who's living in the house? It seems completely arbitrary, and written from a limited, orthodox perspective of possible living arrangements.

Accessory commercial next?

As we allow Madison neighborhoods to naturally densify, as there's demand to do so, we should also be considering how to allow for commercial amenities within these neighborhoods.

For example, mixed and commercial zones in Eastmoreland are currently limited to the periphery: Cottage Grove Rd, Milwaukee St, Fair Oaks, Monona Dr, with none in the interior. That scarcity has a real impact. We've had to put the breaks on some very popular, beneficial residential development plans because it meant sacrificing scarce commercial space. That's another impact we can attribute to the single-family-only zoning that blights our neighborhood, with its racist history.

In addition to accessory residential, we could be allowing accessory commercial spaces as well. Perhaps one neighbor could open a small bike shop. A house across from the school could set up an ice cream stand. The neighbor who grows mushrooms or keeps chickens could open a farm stand with produce from other local growers. Someone could convert garage space into a corner store, and save their neighbors a 10 minute drive for that one last dinner ingredient. We also have a shortage of veterinary practices nearby, with months-long waitlists. Imagine if an independent vet could open a small practice, in an ADU-scale structure.

These are only a few of the possibilities. Think of the things that you have to drive for today. Surely there are at least a few, right? What would it take to eliminate those car trips?

This would be a key component in making Madison's neighborhoods more self-sufficient and walkable. It would give small businesses a more cost-effective way to open a public storefront, it would give neighborhood residents local alternatives to big box stores. Ultimately it would mean more tax revenue for Madison, which we can turn into all the things that matter to us as a community.

Summary

I urge you to recommend passage of this item. I hope that you'll also remove the arbitrary restriction about who lives on the property. And I hope you won't stop here--Madison could be so much more vibrant and affordable without single-family exclusive zoning.

Thank you for all that you do,

Nick Davies 3717 Richard St