

**Lee, Chris**

---

**From:** Bauman, Robert  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 15, 2025 7:32 AM  
**To:** Lee, Chris  
**Subject:** Fwd: Support for Files #240999 and #240997

Add to file  
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Cade Thomas <cade.gerlach@gmail.com>  
**Date:** April 15, 2025 at 7:00:21 AM CDT  
**To:** "Bauman, Robert" <rjbauma@milwaukee.gov>  
**Subject:** Support for Files #240999 and #240997

Hello Alderman Bauman,

I'd like this letter to be on the files.

File #240997:

- While, it is my overall preference that the zoning code be simplified to allow more to be built by right (i.e. simply zoning for residential without reference to density), an additional zoning category that allows more middle-density housing is a good thing. There are many benefits of higher population density for the city.

- For example, higher population density is financially beneficial for the city. Denser population density and the development that supports that population allow the city to achieve a higher rate of property tax per acre and a lower cost per resident cost to deliver services. This is an enormous financial boon. Denser populations also support the local commercial sector and make otherwise unfeasible business ventures feasible. This provides both sales tax revenue and jobs for local residents.

- Denser populations are better at supporting amenities. This was mentioned previously, but high population densities promote the creation and sustainability of local, lively commercial districts. They also support better parks and a wider range of recreational programs through larger tax collections.

- Denser populations decrease local transportation costs. Allowing greater population density makes it so people can live closer to their jobs. It also supports public transit like MCTS, bikability, and walkability. These all decrease the amount of money people need to spend on transportation, allowing them to spend money on things they actually want to spend money on.

Something that I don't like about this change is that no zoning changes are paired with it. However, this makes the opposition to it all the more confusing. This file only creates a new zoning type; it doesn't change any current zoning for any parcel, anywhere in the city. If you don't like this type of zoning in your neighborhood, you can oppose it via the planning commission.

File #240999

- I mostly support this file with exception to the owner occupancy requirement.

- At least to me (a renter), a unit is a unit. Under normal circumstances with better tenant protections, we benefit from more rentals. But especially considering the state legislature weakened its and Milwaukee's tenant protections, we benefit from even more from the addition of new rental units. A surplus of rentable units is associated with lower rents and better conditions while a shortage of units is associated with the inverse. Renters absolutely do not benefit from the restriction of rental units. Landlords and incumbent property owners benefit from housing shortages in some regards as it deprives renters and prospective home buyers of negotiating power thus driving up rents and home prices. But this also leads to higher assessments which can be to the formers detriment.

- However, this file simply legalizes for what the most part already exists in the City of Milwaukee. ADUs can be found in almost every neighborhood of the old city. They're a part of our history. They also sustain or allow the slow increase of population density without fundamentally changing the character of neighborhoods which may be objectionable to some people. All of the benefits of higher population density mentioned in my support of File #240997 are pertinent to this file as well.

- However, in addition, ADUs can also be used to provide a home for adult children who are starting to build a life for themselves, but also grandparents who need a smaller place, but maybe also a bit of help. ADUs can help enable the transference of traditions between generations and the building of community.

-Also, the legalization and streamlining of the permit process for ADUs creates jobs. Currently, there is no company that specializes in the construction of ADUs. It was the same in California prior to legalization there. It's only been a few years and ADUs constitute a pretty sizable percentage (something like 20%) of all new units built in CA. That's an entire new portion of the construction sector that hadn't existed prior. We can do that here as well.

NOTE: There has been some conversation about AIRBNB and other short rentals, their effects on the neighborhoods, and concern that these files would allow the creation of more short-term rentals. The prevalence of short-term rentals has a lot more to do with the absence of their natural predators in much of the city: hotels, long-stay hotels, motels, and hostels. In areas where these exist, short term rentals are much less prevalent. One can look for themselves. For example, in downtown where there is an abundance of lodging, most of the short term rentals listed are being listed by the hotels themselves. The Common Council should direct DCD to undertake a hotel study and develop a hotel plan to see where hotel development is feasible in areas where hotels don't currently exist which is much of the city. That would be a more effective way to tackle AIRBNBs.

Much thanks,  
Cade Gerlach