

From: chad troy <troyheatcool@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 19, 2024 4:55 PM
To: Planning & Development <plandev@danecounty.gov>
Cc: clerktreasuer@tnpleasantsprings.wi
Subject: Petition 12080 and Petition CUP 2631 Comments

Hello, My name Is Chad Troy and I own property adjacent to this proposed project. The relevant petitions are 12080 and CUP 2631 to add a second structure to 1722 Oakview Dr Stoughton WI 53589. I am in opposition to



this



and have enclosed commentary that I presented at the Town of Pleasant Springs Planning Commission meeting July 10, 2024 as well as comments in response to copies of the application for this project I received at this meeting. I also have a petition signed by neighbors in opposition to this project as well as a map showing the negative impact to our properties view of the river. If you have any questions please call me at my number below.

Thank you,,
Chad Troy
608.873.6455

Petition In Opposition To Additional Residential Structure and Rezoning

August 18, 2024

To: Town of Pleasant springs Planning Commission
Dane County Zoning and Land Regulation Committees

We, the undersigned, oppose the construction of the proposed additional structure or "tiny home" on the property of Torey Beyers and Lora Oliveri located at 1722 Oakview Dr. Stoughton, WI 53589. We, the undersigned, oppose any changes to current zoning included in petition 12080, and oppose the conditional use permit petition CUP 2631. Both Changes have been deemed necessary for completion of this project.

We believe this project to be unnecessary and that other avenues exist for the owner to accomplish their goals.

We believe this project would have a negative impact on an environmentally sensitive area.

We believe the requested rezone to TFR-08, the CUP, and subsequent construction, will fundamentally change the character of the neighborhood.

We believe the requested rezone to TFR-08, the CUP, and subsequent construction, will set a precedent that could have a countywide impact, weakening zoning protections enjoyed by all county property owners.

Names: CHAD TROY Signatures: 

Address: 1728 OAKVIEW DR STOUGHTON WI 53589

Names: JAMES + VIRGINIA CARRANO Signatures: James Carrano Virginia Carrano

Address: 1729 OAKVIEW DR., STOUGHTON, WI

Names: TJ Butler Signatures: TJ Butler

Address: 1727 Oakview Dr. Stoughton, WI 53589

Names: Jenna Butler Signatures: Jenna Butler

Address: 1721 Oakview Dr. Stoughton, WI 53589

Names: BEBE BRYANS Signatures: Bebe Bryans

Address: 1725 OAKVIEW DR STOUGHTON

Names: Mianne Collins Signatures: Mianne Collins

Address: 1720 OAKVIEW DR., STOUGHTON WI 53589

Names: Louise Kosholek Henry Signatures: Louise Kosholek +

Address: 1733 Oakview Dr Stoughton, WI

Names: Hans Kosholek Signatures: Hans Kosholek

Address: _____

August 19, 2024

To: Dane County Zoning and Land Regulation Committee
Town of Pleasant Springs Planning Commission

From: Chad Troy and Beth Ullring
1728 Oakview Dr
Stoughton, WI

re: Rezoning and Conditional Use Permit for 1722 Oakview Dr. Stoughton, WI
Petition 12080 and Petition CUP 2631

This letter is our original submission to Pleasant Springs Planning Commission on July 10, 2024. At this meeting we received a copy of the CUP application for this project. We would like to explain how the CUP standards for approval are not met by this project based on info received at that meeting.

We are against the construction of an additional residence at 1722 Oakview Dr Stoughton, WI. Here are some of our questions and concerns.

- 1) Environment. Building of a second home in an environmentally sensitive area. Structure will be located adjacent to a waterway. Shore land-wetland zoning will apply. Erosion mitigation, changes to drainage, and setback from the high water mark will be concerns.
- 2) Nonconforming use. Building a second home on an already occupied lot in a single family subdivision should be a no go.
- 3) Detailed plan. No detailed site plan has been available for review. Where will the structure be located on the property? What additional things are needed to support this structure? How will the sewer be hooked up? Is a separate lateral required? Is separate electrical service needed and how will that be routed? Present feeds to existing house are underground and through an adjacent property. Water service from the well? Will there be a separate driveway and or sidewalk? If accessibility needs exist how will they be addressed? What is the area of these impervious structures? Is on street parking a consideration?
- 4) Long term purpose. After its initial use, will the structure become rental property in a residential neighborhood?
- 5) Hardship. Where is the hardship? According to Realtor.com, the existing home at 1722 Oakview Dr. is a 3180 sqft, 4 bedroom, 2.5 bath home. To our knowledge, it is currently occupied by 3 people.

As previously stated, we are against this construction. We would encourage the owners to pursue another option such as an addition to the existing structure if they feel strongly about needing extra space. This might be a better solution and would avoid the need for zoning and conditional use permits and the construction of a nonconforming structure.

STANDARDS FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS

Please explain how the proposed land use will NOT meet the following standards :

1. The establishment maintenance or operation of the conditional use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, comfort or general welfare:

We feel that an additional 16' x 40' structure to this property will disrupt drainage and create additional runoff in an environmentally sensitive area and is therefore detrimental.

2. The uses, values, and enjoyment of other property in the neighborhood for purposes already permitted shall be in no foreseeable manner substantially impaired or diminished by establishment, maintenance or operation of the conditional use:

Applicant, " this tiny home will be located 4 feet off the lot line on the NW corner and 8 feet off the NE corner..." This is closer than the normal lot line set back to our property. This will adversely effect the use of our property and possibly be a factor if we choose to build on this sewered buildable site which we currently use as our yard. If it has to be this close to the lot lines to meet adjacent structure, well and waterfront setbacks, is this really a buildable site? This 16' x 40' structure is in the direct sight line of our river and nature views. It will be the equivalent of adding a shipping container to our beautiful view from our home and deck. No one would want that.

3. The establishment of the conditional use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district:

Again, concerned about how these nonconforming property line setbacks will negatively impact future use of our property and it's value.

4. Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and other necessary site improvements have been or are being made to accommodate the conditional use:

The structure will sit in and/or near the existing drainage path for the NE corner of the cul de sac and fronting properties. Sidewalk access to this structure (possibly ADA compliant?) will directly cross drainage path and could divert water with undesired results.

5. Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets:

No additional driveway space is planned. Roadside parking is the only option. Existing lot has only enough cul de sac frontage for one car resulting in spill over onto adjacent properties or the center of the cul de sac.

7. The conditional use is consistent with the adopted town and county comprehensive plans.

Is this non conforming use in this single family residential subdivision consistent with town and county comprehensive plans?

I am enclosing a petition circulated among adjacent property owners. There have been some representations that "all the neighbors are for this", so I thought some clarification was necessary. I've also included a map showing the properties of the signatories and their position on this project. To be fully transparent I had one signatory, Alan Collins, ask me to remove his signature after signing, citing potential damage to his relationship to his next door neighbor, and his hope that the structures presence would be short term and removed promptly after said purpose was completed. His spouse remains on the petition as a signatory.

Commentary on the letter of intent.

I am not unsympathetic to the cause of taking care of a loved one. We recently said goodbye to both my mother and my aunt, watching as dementia slowly took them both over the last 5 years or so. I had originally moved them together, but as is often the case their journeys differed. Increasing incompatibility necessitated moving my aunt to her own apartment for a time before her inevitable nursing home and hospice stays. If memory serves, my aunt's stay at Rosewood Senior Apartments was around \$950, per month. In a recent call, their current rates are @\$1350. for regular and \$1250. for section 42 income qualified. Not cheap, but from reading my neighbor's letter they may have found something priced less.

I am having problems with the mathematics of this whole project. They have stated this is a temporary house for her brother who is disabled and I believe to be terminally ill. They have said that after his passing they would no longer need this structure and would be removing it. This seems impractical and improbable. A tiny home this size could run anywhere from \$20,000 to \$60,000. Site preparation, concrete, utilities, and sidewalks not included. That's a lot of expense upfront. Removal and restoration of the lot is another expense. Resale of the structure another. Once its there, I don't see it going anywhere. If something were to precipitate this property changing hands, it would remain for purposes unknown.

I believe there are more inexpensive and practical approaches. The most economical is to convert square footage in their 3180 sqft. home to another bedroom. They currently have 3 people living in a 3 bedroom home and a first floor office (represented on online real estate listings as a 4th bedroom) that could be repurposed. Another option is to build an addition to their house over the garage. Third, and probably the most practical, subsidize the rental of an apartment for the length of time it is necessary. It is uncomfortable for me to do this deep dive, weighing my neighbor's choices. Most of us like our privacy, but when other peoples choices negatively affect you, you have to speak up. In their letter, my neighbor's state regarding this project, "This would be the least disruptive to our neighbors whose peaceful environment we respect." To me, and those who have signed our petition, it would appear to be the most disruptive.