

January 15, 2023

To the Dane County ZLR:

I am a resident of the town of Rutland and I'm writing to express my opposition to CUP 02582. This CUP was considered and rejected by the Town of Rutland in 2020. The 2020 Town Action Report details the evidence for doing so. Nothing about this application has substantially changed – the only real change has been the Town Chair, who transparently supports the quarry and has refused to explain how it meets the Standards. Her bias is why this CUP is not being evaluated at the Town level. You asked at your working meeting why residents thought she was biased. Here is just one example – **the sign in her driveway** promoting the pit owner as a candidate for Town Supervisor, a completely inappropriate action by someone who claims to be objective.



My objections are as follows:

1. This is not an “expansion”, but a new and much larger site. “Expansion” has been used by the applicant to argue that the pit predates most residents. The old, small pit does – but the larger 37-acre site has been a farm field until the owner purchased and excavated it for a DOT project two years ago.
2. The argument in this new application is that residents should be glad to have the old pit subjected to the same regulations as a new pit. **This is not a tradeoff residents welcome.** We have all learned to live with the old, small pit and are not willing to have conditions applied to it in exchange for the larger pit.
3. Residents of this end of Rutland already live with a 160+ acre NC pit (Northwest Stone, who has been a better neighbor) right around the corner from this new site. It generates a great deal of truck traffic on the same Town roads used by the Hahn pit. An increase of this level of gravel truck traffic will be intolerable to residents, and **turn this residential neighborhood into a mining district.** Residents are concerned about surrounding properties falling to the same fate as the farm field, as they become increasingly undesirable for residential use and enjoyment.
4. There is emphatically **NO neighborhood acceptance** of this CUP, in fact just the opposite. It has been the most contentious issue in the 23 years I have lived here, occupying the discussion period of nearly every Town meeting and generating a years-long trail of complaints (documented). The owner of the pit has behaved in an antagonistic manner to residents, many of whom have documented hostile encounters with him in the neighborhood. If you examine his list of supporters you will see that they are overwhelmingly NOT Rutland residents, but business associates and family members. A new petition opposing this CUP signed by 180+ neighbors has been submitted to you.
5. This CUP still does not meet the 8 standards and 5 FP standards and is not compatible with our Comp Plan, and **we residents deserve an explanation of why you think it does.** If you

decide it doesn't, the applicant deserves an explanation as to why not. We request a complete account of each of the Standards and your reasons for determining whether they are met. Our Town Board's failure to address the standards has caused a lack of trust in its leadership. Please restore our trust in our elected representatives by carefully reviewing this evidence and offering your conclusions to residents. **You have the chance to make one person happy and ruin the quality of life for hundreds of residents, or you can do what's right for hundreds of people and leave one person with 38 acres of valuable Dane County farmland to do something else with.**

With Regards,
Gail Simpson
673 Center Rd., Town of Rutland
Stoughton WI 53589