

From: [John Weidl](#)
To: [Heather Boehm](#)
Cc: [Mason Becker](#); [Becky Magestro](#)
Subject: Fw: Stonehaven Development: Response Document
Date: Sunday, April 19, 2026 10:16:13 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[Stonehaven - Responses to Public Questions.pdf](#)

Heather,

On Monday, please amend the agenda packet to include both Mason's email below and the attached document from the developer.

Then please make sure to send that update out to the console and let them know what was added.

Best, - JSW

John S. Weidl, DBA (2027), CEcD, CPM
City Manager, City of Whitewater

312 W. Whitewater St., Whitewater, WI 53190
[262-473-0104](tel:262-473-0104) | jweidl@whitewater-wi.gov
www.whitewater-wi.gov

From: Mason Becker <mbecker@whitewater-wi.gov>
Sent: Sunday, April 19, 2026 9:11:49 AM
To: City Council <citycouncil@whitewater-wi.gov>
Cc: Rachelle Blitch <rblitch@whitewater-wi.gov>; Steven Chesebro <schesebro@whitewater-wi.gov>; John Weidl <jweidl@whitewater-wi.gov>
Subject: Stonehaven Development: Response Document

Council members, good morning.

Similar to the email John sent out to all of you this morning, Tim Vandeville from Stonehaven Development reached out to me yesterday, noting that there is quite a bit of misinformation circulating regarding their project and proposal. As a former local elected official, when I served on city council in Fort Atkinson, I often had to remind myself that social media is not always reflective of reality. Some scattered social media posts do not equate to a rigorous scientific poll, or more directly, they do not always correlate with the results in a local election.

I also must state that the reason many communities, including Whitewater, are turning to innovative “outside the box” concepts like the one proposed here are that we exist within a market failure for housing. In Whitewater, that failure most acutely applies to owner-occupied single-family housing.

There are economic reasons that explain why we are not seeing large amounts of developers knocking on our door to build. In Fort Atkinson, as a personal example, we heard for ten years from private developers that, “We know Fort Atkinson needs more housing, but we can make a quicker Return on Investment in places like Dane County and Waukesha County.” Private developers weren’t moving anything forward, and Fort Atkinson saw only a small trickle of housing development. We knew the need was there, and it was proven by third-party studies as well as feedback from residents and businesses. The city government finally had to take the step to purchase 75-acres of land, annex it into the city, create a new TID, and put out an RFP (which only received one developer response) in order to bring a developer to the table. If you drive up Banker Road in Fort Atkinson, you can see there is finally new housing construction happening. What is being proposed by Stonehaven, by comparison, is much more modest in scope and scale.

I could also bring up examples from my time working for the City of Watertown, but you would quickly get the picture that these problems and the seeking of creative solutions are not new or unique to Whitewater.

While in a perfect situation, the free market would solve our problems, when the same market fails to meet identified critical needs in the community, it can be prudent for local government to take action and come up with solutions.

The attached is 14 pages, but it is a quick read. You are already aware of many of the points. **Here is a quick summary:**

The developer emphasizes that the project is structured as a revolving loan fund model, not a grant or a “give away”, designed to create attainable, owner-occupied housing while recirculating funds back into the program as homes are sold.

The response is another reminder that the proposal has undergone extensive review by City staff, including the Finance Department and the City Attorney, financial advisors (Ehlers), the CDA, and Common Council, and includes financial safeguards, repayment mechanisms, and owner-occupancy protections.

Stonehaven also addresses key claims being pushed out, noting that:

- The project is intended to expand the tax base and increase owner-occupied housing supply, not raise property taxes or utility rates.
- A traditional “pay as you go” TIF structure could undermine affordability by increasing development costs and lengthening the pay-back timeline.
- The proposal aligns with a documented local housing need, particularly for attainable single-family ownership.

Overall, the document reinforces that the proposal should be evaluated based on its actual financial structure, risk protections, and long-term public benefits, rather than on incomplete or inaccurate characterizations.

Please note this was a developer provided document. I did not request it from the developer, and I have not edited it.

I look forward to a productive meeting tomorrow night focused on factual details of the proposed project and the items included in the Development Agreement and proposed internal borrowing. I hope you all enjoy the rest of your Sunday.

Sincerely,

Mason T. Becker

Community Development Director

City of Whitewater, WI

mbecker@whitewater-wi.gov

Office: 262.473.0148

Cell: 262.443.4458

