

**2010-2011 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW
PRELIMINARY LIST OF POTENTIAL TRACK 2 AMENDMENTS**

**AMENDMENT REQUESTED BY
UNIVERSITY RESEARCH PARK - VETTER PROPERTY/MIDTOWN NEIGHBORHOOD
[LOCATOR MAP 2]**

LIST OF COMMENTS RECEIVED:	DATE
Jeffery Sawyer	8-30-11
Lance Hall	9-6-11
Lance Hall	11-7-11
Jeffery Sawyer	11-7-11
Robbie Webber	11-7-11

11-8-11

Good afternoon Brian,

As a Linden Park (Veridian Homes) property owner, I'd like to make a formal request to be filed and considered as part of the land amendment for the property directly south of Valley View Road and just west of County Road M. I am unable to attend the public meeting scheduled for Thursday, September 8th @ 6:00 pm (at Blackhawk Church). We spoke on the phone earlier today in regards to my request.

As the property sits currently, there is approximately 250 feet (east-west) of tree line and green space directly east of our property (8808 Silkwood Trail). As was discussed on the phone today, I am under the impression that there will remain a minimum 100 foot 'buffer' of green space and tree line directly east of our property line. Furthermore, it will be strongly considered that this tree line and green space remain when University Park 2 goes into the planning, development and construction phase. As the property owner, I feel it goes without saying that a natural buffer and break from industry and commerce (University Park 2) to residential property is reasonable and standard. I ask the city of Madison planning commission and the town of Verona planning commission to take this into strong consideration when developing this property. Furthermore, it was discussed that there are currently no plans to extend Silkwood Trail to the east, toward County Road M. We are currently at the end of a dead-end on the northeast side of Silkwood Trail. My understanding after today's conversation is that this roadway will not be extended, that it will remain a dead-end, and will not be developed into a 'bulbed' cul-de-sac.

These are the wishes I would communicate at the public meeting scheduled for September 8th, if I was able to attend. Again, we appreciate any and all considering given to our property in terms of keeping industry and residential property separated. I feel it is best for the value of both properties to keep this green space remaining as a natural buffer of the properties.

Thank you for your consideration and the continued care and concern for our neighborhood and property.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Sawyer

Director Undergraduate Recruitment and Admissions Wisconsin School of Business

3129 Grainger Hall 975 University Avenue Madison, WI 53706-1323

Phone: (608) 263-6299

Fax: (608) 265-6041 jsawyer@bus.wisc.edu



Dear Mr. Grady,

This email is in reference to a mailing I received regarding a scheduled public meeting on September 8, 2011 on a Mid-Town plan ammendment to consider allowing the UW Research Park 2 to be constructed.

I am a property owner of 8807 Silkwood Trail which is immediately adjacent to the west border of the proposed ammendment area at the southwest corner of County M and Valley View Road. I will be out of town during this public meeting and thus would ask you to consider my email in lieu of my physical attendance at the public meeting. I have reviewed the letter and online information regarding the proposed ammendment and would like to submit my thoughts and concerns to you.

I purchased my property less than 2 years ago and at that time there was no indication the property adjacent to my property would ever be developed for commercial purposes. In fact, I was informed that the property potentially could only be developed for residential use in the future (as detailed in the extensive online documents referenced on the City of Madison website). Furthermore, I was advised that the greenspace/trees immediately adjacent to the east of my property was dedicated greenspace and could not be altered in the future. This information certainly affected my decision to purchase my current property, as one of the main reasons for purchasing this particular property over dozens of other properties I viewed was the peace and privacy offered by this dedicated green space.

The proposed ammendment area is currently farmland and the substantial remaining areas are residential and park/greenspace. The construction of a large commercial or industrial complex would greatly alter the residential neighborhood myself and many others currently enjoy. I also fear my property value could fall significantly as one of the factors increasing my property value compared to similar properties in my neighborhood is the presence of this greenspace (as reported on 2 separate appraisals). I have spoken with my neighbors on this issue and one in particular, Jeffrey Sawyer at 8808 Silkwood Trail, advised me that he had spoken with you directly and that he was informed the greenspace in question (currently approximately 250 feet east to west) would most likely remain in its entirety, or worse case approximately 100 feet of greenspace would remain.

While my personal preference would be to keep the future land use of the proposed ammendment area as it is today, I do recognize that land use does change and expansion of businesses can have benefits to others. If the planning commission and all affected parties do ultimately decide to allow construction of Research Park 2 at this location, I would respectfully ask you and other individuals involved in the decision to consider the residential property owner's concerns in this matter to minimize the impact of a large commerical complex, one of which would be to leave the current 250 feet of greenspace with the oak trees and other vegetation to remain. In fact, I would ask further to consider adding additional natural buffers such as evergreen trees that will remain green during the winter so that any view of and noise from an industrial complex could be minimized after leaves fall from the trees currently in place.

I appreciate your time and consideration of my concerns and hope all parties involved can come to a mutally acceptable solution.

Respectfully, Lance Hall, M.D.

From: Lance Hall [mailto:lancehallmd@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, November 07, 2011 2:42 PM
To: Greg Hyer; Sawyer, Jeffrey
Cc: Grady, Brian; Mark Bugher; Subeck, Lisa; Lance Hall
Subject: Re: URP 2 Expansion on Vetter Property -- City Committee Actions and Monday Meeting

To All,

My name is Lance Hall and I own and live at 8807 Silkwood Trail, a property immediately adjacent to the proposed UW Research Park 2 development. I have previously submitted a letter for discussion on this matter and would like to include this current letter to address recent updates to the working proposal as I will not be available to attend tonight's meeting.

First, I agree on all points submitted by Mr. Jeffrey Sawyer in his email below and will add a few of my own as follows.

Second, after reading the minutes from the most recent meeting (I believe it was the Long Range Transportation Commission, though it is not clear from the documents I have received), I have formed an opinion that some of the participants of the discussion are attempting to respect concerns of the existing residential neighborhood while others expressed a view that the neighborhood concerns should be minimized compared to the city's interest. If the latter assumption is true, this is completely unacceptable and offensive to those of us who live in this neighborhood. Perhaps everyone should remember that this area in question is zoned to be residential (agricultural in its current use) and many of us made personal and financial decisions to buy homes in this NEW subdivision based on this information. If another entity wishes to use this location for a different purpose (i.e. employment use), then they should be HIGHLY RESPECTFUL of the needs of the existing community whom they are asking for permission to change the intended use and in doing so causing significant disruption to the residential neighborhood.

Specifically, regarding the proposed addition of bike/pedestrian path with future potential conversion to a road extension at the eastern border of Silkwood Trail, I confirm Mr. Sawyer's points in his email below. We have been previously assured that the natural green buffer would remain in its entirety or at least to a significant degree. Furthermore, it does not make any sense geographically or financially to add any trail or road at this location as Valley View Road is only approximately 100 feet or so to the north and can handle the larger volumes of traffic and already has bike lanes and sidewalks. Furthermore, with the newly completed round about at Valley View and County M, I doubt Silkwood Trail could be easily or safely connected with Cty M in the future. With only 2 houses on this small cul-du-sac and a potential for only 2 more houses to be built, who exactly will this bike/pedestrian path and possible future road benefit? This is a residential neighborhood with low traffic volumes with houses extremely close to the streets, and children and pets frequently play in these streets. I did not purchase a property on a small dead end street because I wanted to have large volumes of traffic and noise at my front door.

As a resident of the City of Madison and employee of UW, I am fully supportive of the city's goal of expanding businesses and employment. However, any proposed expansion, must be performed in a manner considerate of the rights of all involved, particularly of existing homeowners who did not choose to live near a large employment center. I am confident the developers can design a plan that protects the integrity of the adjacent residential neighborhood without significant intrusion and still meet all of their own business needs. However, if homeowner's concerns cannot be adequately addressed, the land use in question should NOT be changed to employment and the Research Park should consider a more appropriate site. I urge everyone involved in this decision process to seriously consider these points.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Lance Hall, M.D.

From: Greg Hyer <GRHYER@WISC.EDU>
To: "Sawyer, Jeffrey" <jsawyer@bus.wisc.edu>
Cc: Brian Grady <bgrady@cityofmadison.com>; lancehallmd@yahoo.com; MARK D BUGHER <mdbugher@wisc.edu>; district1@cityofmadison.com
Sent: Monday, November 7, 2011 11:51 AM
Subject: Re: URP 2 Expansion on Vetter Property -- City Committee Actions and Monday Meeting

Jeff

These recommendations were not our idea. We agree with your reaction. The City Planning staff is also opposed to most of these recommendations --especially Silkwood extension.

The Plan Commission is meeting tonight at 5:30pm and will either incorporate, reject or modify Long Range Transportation's suggestions. I have copied the alder on your concerns. URP told Long Range Transportation that the neighborhood would be concerned. Essentially, some of the members said that their planning principals should override any neighborhood objection. One of our concerns is that three members of long range transportation are on the Plan Commission.

The City web site has email addresses for all Plan Commission members. You can email them if you cannot attend.

I hope this helps. You can call my cell if you would like --320-3243.

Greg

On Nov 7, 2011, at 11:35 AM, Sawyer, Jeffrey wrote:

Hello Greg,

Please allow me to introduce myself. My name is Jeffrey Sawyer, current resident of 8808 Silkwood Trail. I have been in some contact with Brian Grady, of the Department of Planning & Community & Economic Development, Planning Division--hence, receiving this email update. Please read and respond to some questions and concerns voiced below.

My first question is related to some confusion of connectivity. With Valley View Road being one block (to the north) from Silkwood, I'm curious to know how or why extending Silkwood would "enhance the connectivity of the neighborhood." To me, it seems like it would be a total waste of resources and green space to connect Silkwood any further--again, with Valley View one block to the north. As for the connectivity of a pedestrian or bike path, I have the same concern. There is already an established path on Valley View, so again, it seems fairly redundant. I have been told throughout this process that extending Silkwood Trail would not be part of the planning process and that it would remain a cul-de-sac free, dead end.

Throughout this process, I have heard talk of preserving the green space as a buffer between Silkwood and UW Research Park 2. Unless I'm reading this update incorrectly, it looks as though that notion of saving and salvaging the green space as a buffer has been compromised for other plans. I read on the bottom that the amendments were passed unanimously, which obviously illustrates that Silkwood will be extended.

To be clear, I am vehemently against this option. If the goal is to provide connectivity, I do not see how this accomplishes that goal with the connectivity very obviously being available at Valley View Road, to the north. In the report, it is stated that there is a goal: **"To create a strong buffer between the neighborhood (to the west) and the employment uses in the research park, noting that this wooded buffer zone would be compromised by a new street."** In the good-nature of this development, it seems as if this thought and notion are being completely disregarded. As I understand it, the green space is going to be diminished from 250 feet (currently) to approximately 100 feet. Furthermore, extending Silkwood Trail (either with a full road or a bike/pedestrian path) further compromises the plan of providing a buffer. The mixed messages and hollow statements are concerning to me as a purchaser of that property.

I do not want to assume too much, too quickly, but can you please respond to these concerns and questions as soon as possible? The property my wife and I purchased was largely made because of our understanding that Silkwood trail would not be extended and that Silkwood would dead end. To say that the extension of that road would compromise our property value is genuine and real. Throughout the entire process of purchasing our home, we heard from both Veridian Homes and the Planning Commission that Silkwood would remain "Dead-ended."

I will look forward to your response.

Jeffrey Sawyer Director Undergraduate Recruitment and Admissions Wisconsin School of Business

3129 Grainger Hall 975 University
Avenue Madison, WI 53706-1323

Phone: (608) 263-6299 Fax:
(608) 265-6041
jsawyer@bus.wisc.edu

-----Original Message-----From: Greg Hyer [mailto:grhyer@wisc.edu] Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 5:58 PM To: familykeegan@tds.net; cbrasel033@gmail.com; thejuliusfamily@hotmail.com; acoastrchum@hotmail.com; waunakee.brandon@gmail.com ; Sawyer, Jeffrey; lancehallmd@yahoo.com Cc: Subject: URP 2 Expansion on Vetter Property -- City Committee Actions and Monday Meeting

All

Attached are the minutes from the City of Madison Long Range Transportation Commission (LRTC). Their recommendations will be heard by the Plan Commission this Monday November 7th at 5:30 in the City County Building, Room 201. The Plan Commission will make recommendations to the Council.

LRTC recommends several additional auto, pedestrian and bike connections to the neighborhood -- including a future road through the existing park at end of Greenside Circle. University Research Park indicated to the Committee that we were trying to minimize the number of connections to the neighborhood and we felt the neighborhood would prefer fewer connections. Committee members indicated that their planning principles should supersede neighborhood concerns. Three LRTC members are on the Plan Commission.

It would be helpful if you could let your alder and Plan Commission member know how you feel about LRTC recommendations.

Greg Hyer University Research Park

From: Sawyer, Jeffrey [mailto:jsawyer@bus.wisc.edu]
Sent: Monday, November 07, 2011 2:44 PM
To: Murphy, Brad
Cc: lancehallmd@yahoo.com; Grady, Brian; Waidelich, Michael
Subject: Inquiry concerning Silkwood Trail to Vetter Property

Good afternoon Sir(s),

Please accept this brief statement as consideration for the future use of Silkwood Trail, running east west from Sundance Rd, off of Valley View Rd.

In short, sir, I would like to propose that Silkwood Trail remain dead-ended and as-is. The reason(s) for this recommendation and desire is multi-faceted.

- 1 I do not see the benefits of connectivity, by extending Sundance Trail. With Valley View being approximately 100 feet to the north and the extension of Ancient Oak toward Pleasant View Rd, several hundred feet to the south—again, I do not see how the resources and connectivity would justify the extension of Silkwood Trail.
- 2 If Silkwood were extended to the east, I question how much use that extension would receive. My assumption for extending and continuing roads is for future use. If Silkwood were extended, I question if the use would outweigh the resources required to extend that road.
- 3 Finally, I firmly believe a necessary buffer between residence and business is necessary. I'm quite excited about the Vetter property being used for the University Research. As a UW employee, I appreciate and support UW business and research. However, with it being business, and being quite close to residential—I also feel that a natural buffer would be compromised by extending Silkwood.

Thank you all for your time—you have been extremely helpful. I will be present for this evening's meeting and I look forward to making your acquaintance.

Jeffrey Sawyer

Director Undergraduate Recruitment and Admissions Wisconsin School of Business

3129 Grainger Hall 975 University Avenue Madison, WI 53706-1323 Phone: (608) 263-6299 Fax: (608) 265-6041
jsawyer@bus.wisc.edu



From: porchchat@gmail.com
On Behalf Of Robbie Webber
Sent: Monday, November 07, 2011 4:29 PM
To: Waidelich, Michael; Nan Fey; Eric Sundquist
Subject: Comments on amendment to Midtown Neighborhood Development Plan

As one of the alders that served on the LRTPC and Council when we passed the ordinance banning cul-de-sacs (except in very limited circumstances), and being familiar with the purpose of that ordinance, I would like to point out that we have an opportunity to correct bad decisions of the past. I do not feel staff comments adequately weighed the needs of all road users when rejecting some of the LRTPC's recommendations.

Saying that Hawks Landing does not have good connectivity now, so adding connections is not needed when there is an amendment to the neighborhood plan, is simply missing the point. Do we want to fix the problems we created in the past, or perpetuate them? Do we assume, and therefore plan for everyone to drive to all destinations, or do we want to provide future residents and future generations with the infrastructure needed to chose to leave the car at home, especially for those short trips within their neighborhood?

As a professional bicycle safety educator, I know that many people are hesitant to bike on major roadways, such as Cty Hwy M or Valley View, even when there are bike lanes. One purpose of neighborhood connections via smaller, low traffic streets and paths is to encourage these novice or inexperienced bicyclists to use their bikes (or feet) more for short trips. We do not teach teenagers to drive by starting off on the Interstate through Milwaukee. We teach them to drive and become competent drivers by working up to complicated and stressful driving experiences situations. The connections the LRTPC recommended would provide these routes.

Another reason for adding these connections close together, besides giving non-motorized traffic an alternative to busy roads, is to provide direct routes instead of insisting that everyone access an arterial to move from one area of the neighborhood to another, or from one neighborhood to another. Directing a motorist to take a quarter mile detour in each direction (say onto Valley View or Pleasant View and then back into the neighborhood) is a minimal problem. However, for a pedestrian, this amounts to an extra one-half mile walk, or an extra ten minutes. If we want to encourage walking and bicycling, we have to be aware that lack of connections often translate into much longer routes for some.

In the case of the recommended street between Nelson Crossing and Greenside Circle, there is no other way for even motorists to move between these two streets without using Valley View and Cty Hwy M. This does not make sense, and forces additional traffic onto these two arterials, even for a relatively short trip. This is the reason that there was a north-south roadway connection in the original neighborhood plan.

I urge you to carefully consider the recommendations of the LRTPC for this neighborhood plan amendment. We did not make the recommendations lightly, but instead considered the needs of all current and future neighborhood residents, as well as those that might work in the research park or need to traverse this area of the city to access other developments.

If we are concerned about impacts of paving, perhaps the road expansions are what should be scraped, not the minimal accommodations for non-motorized traffic.

Robbie Webber
LRTPC Chair