

From: Stouder, Heather
Sent: March 05, 2018 12:43 PM
To: 'Ken Fitzsimmons'; Rummel, Marsha <district6@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: Maggie Fitzsimmons; Parks, Timothy <TParks@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: RE: Grandfamily Housing

Thank you, Ken-

With this response, I've cc'd Planner Tim Parks, who reviewed the proposal. we'll make sure to share your comments with the Plan Commission this evening.

Best-

Heather

Heather Stouder, AICP
Director, Planning Division
City of Madison Department of Planning &
Community & Economic Development
126 S Hamilton Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53703
P: 608-266-5974
F: 608-267-8739
hstouder@cityofmadison.com

From: Ken Fitzsimmons
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2018 12:41 PM
To: Stouder, Heather <HStouder@cityofmadison.com>; Rummel, Marsha <district6@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: Maggie Fitzsimmons
Subject: Grandfamily Housing

Heather,

I have a couple of comments to put on the record regarding the proposed Grandfamily Housing at Union Corners. I'm not sure how much of this is germane to the Planning Commission versus other entities, but I will include them here just in case.

I support the Grandfamily Project and have the following comments and recommendations:

1. Like Marsha has said in her comments, I support adding angled parking spaces to increase parking for retail, provided that it's safe for pedestrians and bicycles.
 1. If I understand correctly, the proposed angled parking spaces are being reviewed by the Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission. One interesting proposal that came up in our community meeting was to put a bike path between the parking and the sidewalk, kind of like the path on

- University Ave (with the exceptions that the University Ave path travels in the opposite direction of traffic and there is no parking of course).
2. Although there are community gardens proposed, I support removing these from the plan. The reasons being:
 1. From the community meeting on Feb. 21, it became clear that this site should be used to support the 60 families living there as much as possible. The community gardens serve the greater community more than the residents. If they were meant solely for the residents, I would feel differently.
 2. Based on comments on the SASYNA list serv I think that many area residents will have reservations about gardening on the former site of a battery factory despite previous remediation. My opinion on this was reinforced when I read the following staff comment (listed under Recommendations): "11. Based on historical documents (WDNR BRRTS #06-13-506291), the property may contain residual contaminated soil. If contaminated soil is encountered as part of this redevelopment, all Wisconsin Department Natural Resources (WDNR) and DSPS regulations shall be followed for proper handling and disposal."
 3. A better use of this area on the site would be for a play space and/or green space. With 60 families on site it seems likely there will be over 100 children living there, and probably many more. The comments at the community meeting from residents of Carbon reinforced a fact that we all know which is kids need a place to play and be outside. Providing that place for these residents who are already going through a lot seems like an excellent use of this space that is currently dedicated to community gardens.
 4. I also want to note that I participated in the neighborhood steering committee which worked with the city and Gorman on the GDP for the site. And community gardens were of course part of the recommendations for amenities at Union Corners. However, grandfamily housing was not specifically on our radar at that time. And now that I have a better understanding of the needs of grandfamilies and kinship families, I'm comfortable removing the community gardens for something that better serves the residents.

Thanks,
Ken Fitzsimmons
■ Farwell St