

From: [Charles Gervasi](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Cc: [Melinda Gustafson Gervasi](#); [Tishler, Bill](#)
Subject: Plan Commission July 7, 2025 Meeting
Date: Saturday, July 5, 2025 12:49:51 PM
Attachments: [image.png](#)

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

I am writing in support of agenda items 12, 13, and 14 at the [July 7, 2025 Plan Commission meeting](#).

Zoning Text Amendments

12. [88735](#) Amending Sections 28.135 and 16.23(6)(d) of the Madison General Ordinances related to Deep Residential Lots to facilitate easier development.
13. [88736](#) SUBSTITUTE: Amending various tables within Chapter 28 of the Madison General Ordinances to permit two-family twin and two-unit buildings in all districts where single-family dwellings are also allowed.
14. [88737](#) Amending Sections in Chapter 28 of the Madison General Ordinances related to Downtown and Urban Districts to allow more permitted uses within the districts.

I have lived at 218 S Whitney Way for 15 years. In the years before that I lived in a duplex in Hill Farms and an apartment in Hill Farms. The availability of dense housing benefitted my family when I was younger. With all the good jobs moving into this year, we could use more housing. Living on the BRT allows my family, including my two teenagers, to get downtown easily for events. We wouldn't be able to go to as many events downtown if it weren't for the BRT. I want this easy, environmentally-friendly transit to be available to more people, especially young families like mine 20 years ago. If building more housing is illegal, it forces people to pay more or live farther from downtown, where they are more car-dependent. This is a needless cost to residents. It's bad for the environment. It's bad for kids, who benefit greatly from being able to go to events without finding someone to drive them.

I categorically reject arguments that we cannot have more housing because of "procedural concerns" with how the measures legalizing more housing are introduced or because of water management issues. We need to do whatever work is required to support more housing in Madison.

I urge the Plan Commission to make it easier to build more housing units in Madison, especially in areas that provide easy accessibility to downtown.

Respectfully Yours,

Charles J Gervasi

JULY 5, 2025

Plan Commission

Legistar 88736 and 88737

I am writing to support Legistar items 88736 and 88737 as they seek to allow modest increases in density in areas zoned for single family residential. These measures provide opportunities for more families to enjoy Madison based housing and move us towards more sustainable land use patterns.

In February of 2025 I was able to present the History of Madison Transportation to the Common Council. In that presentation I contrasted a traditional central Madison neighborhood with a peripheral Madison neighborhood. The traditional near west neighborhood (near West Wilson) supported 9 times more households (families) per acre than the neighborhood on Madison's periphery (54 vs 6 dwellings per acre).



The drawbacks of the lower density neighborhood are hard to ignore. The lower-density neighborhood requires:

- 9 times more roadway, water, and sewer service to serve the same number of households.
- 9 times more street sweeping and maintenance activities to serve the same number of households.

- 9 times more bus travel to capture the same number of passengers.

Conversely, the slightly higher density of the traditional near west neighborhood, which includes flats, and duplexes, provides more housing, reduces infrastructure costs, and maintains the charm associated with Madison's neighborhoods.

Traffic impacts caused by these zoning changes are modest to negligible. For example, if 3 additional housing units on my street of 25 parcels were constructed over the next decade, the ITE Trip Generation Manual estimates it would result in no more than 3 trips on our street during the morning rush hour. 3 trips! This is not a traffic impact that will overwhelm our system.

My Madison neighborhood has seen a considerable housing increase over the past decade – much of it opposed. Yet this new housing has not diminished our neighborhood, but enhanced the number of families that can enjoy our neighborhood.

Therefore, I urge you to support these measures.



Thomas W. Lynch PE PTOE PTP AICP

From: [Nicholas Davies](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Support for Housing Forward (88735, 88736, 88737)
Date: Sunday, July 6, 2025 11:59:51 AM

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

Dear Plan Commission,

I strongly support these changes, but I'd hesitate to take up time at your meeting on something where I may have nothing unique to add (these issues are not so nuanced), and see no controversy. Even Paul Fanlund failed to come up with anything new or substantive to say about these items.

Allowing duplexes will not change anything overnight. Madison's ADU ordinance has been in play for a while now, and not much has changed. If anything, I wish we could go a step further, and fully combine TR-C1, TR-C2, TR-C3, and TR-C4 into one. However that would perhaps entail reconciling the various setback requirements (etc.) of those zones.

It's unlikely that anyone will tear down a single-unit house in good condition just to build a duplex in the same spot. That would cost a lot up front (and I'm not sure about the prospects of financing for it), and return relatively little over time.

However, owning a duplex can be a less risky prospect. With a single-unit house, the long-term value of it is entirely dependent on market inflation, while with a duplex, the owner could rent out the other half, so that as an investment it generates immediate returns, not just one big gamble on the future.

Flag lots on their own don't make a ton of difference to density, but they can help homeowners mitigate their ongoing tax burden and their long-term risk. A homeowner who is feeling overburdened by the assessment on their oversized lot could sell off the back half of it, and have a lower assessment next year, and cash to pay for it.

Combining these two changes, those flag lots could be opportunities to add duplexes without having to tear down a house to do so. These two things work in concert with each other.

The downtown changes are also a welcome increase in density, but if anything, I see this as a process change. Everyone is supportive of more density downtown, except in certain cases where it comes into conflict with other ordinance-defined factors like Capitol- or landmark views. Today, 5-6 story projects downtown come to you for approval, and you all don't need much convincing on that front (rightly so). In that case, the approval of these projects might as well be administrative.

Thank you,

Nick Davies
3717 Richard St

From: [Emmett Nolan](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Support for Items 12-14
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 9:07:18 AM

You don't often get email from emmettnolan04@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Hello,

I'm reaching out to convey my support for items 12-14 on the agenda for this week's Plan Commission meeting. I believe these changes will make it easier to build more housing in Madison--and at that, a more diverse array of different types of housing.

I'm currently twenty years old, and I'm hoping to live in Madison permanently after I graduate from college next spring. I know I'm not alone. Changing city code to promote the construction of greater numbers of housing units will help continue to make this city accessible and affordable for future generations. I hope that you will approve these agenda items in your meeting on Monday.

Best regards,

Emmett Nolan
District 13