

TPC 02.12.14  
ITEM F-5.  
HAND-OUT

TPC on univ corridor Plan 2.txt

KEN GOLDEN  
2904 Gregory St.  
Madison, Wisconsin 53711  
608.238-4370/ 608.332-8208(cell)  
kengofpluto@yahoo.com  
February 3, 2014

To: Gary Poulson, Chair  
Members of the Transit Parking Commission  
  
Ken Opin, Chair  
Members of the Plan Commission

FROM: Ken Golden

RE: UNIVERSITY AVE CORRIDOR PLAN

I am deeply disappointed in this plan and many of its recommendations. I am even more disappointed that this plan is even being considered in light of the fact that it has apparently been developed by people who do not live on/in the corridor covered by the plan. University Ave. is primarily occupied by students and other renters, two groups who have historically not been an active part of the Regent Neighborhood Association. I am quite familiar with that organization since between 1989 and 2001, I represented this area on the City Council. This one defect is so significant that I am voting against accepting this plan and recommend both commissions either do the same or refer it into a more democratic, representative process. Frankly, I would simply place it on file and not use it to guide development along this corridor.

This is not the only defect in this document. Let me briefly some of the important significant deficiencies in the plan that would need to be changed for the recommendations in this plan to be useful.

1. The plan does not discuss University growth and housing needs and how this nearby area might help address these.
2. The plan hints some times at the regional role of University Ave. but treats it like a neighborhood only street. This fails to mention the fact that the BRT system, a regional facility, would use this street.
3. The plan does not show proposed BRT stops at Farley, Walnut and Breese Ter.
4. The plan is contradictory in describing the business district. On the one hand, it is described as neighborhood serving. On the other hand, many uses (hotel, restaurants, etc) are more regional. It also actually says that "a vast majority" of customers are from outside the area.
5. There is no discussion of the adequacy of parking in the business district. Are meters or a public lot needed?
6. The plan pays homage to public transportation with supportive language but fails to mention TOD and limits density of the city's number 1 transit corridor.
7. The 3 story limit is not realistic and should be rejected.
8. The plan says that the "young, racially diverse, low income" corridor residents are not compatible with the single family homes. We may want to rephrase that to hide the discriminatory implications of this language.
9. The plan fails to identify redevelopment sites.
10. P. 23 talks of the objective of the plan being to benefit the neighborhood. Benefiting the city or the residents of the corridor is not mentioned.
11. P. 31 implies support for the walnut ramp to campus drive but fails to mention that reducing traffic would hurt the business district it claims to support.
12. P.39 I actually like the idea of skyline variation but prefer it be done at greater heights.
13. There are discussions of neighborhood commuter parking but no recent studies are cited. Construction at the Hospital, parking on Speedway for West High, an increase in enforcement staff coupled with a reduction in car ownership by millennials and students all may have reduced this problem to zero. This is old thinking that needs a factual update.

TPC on univ corridor Plan 2.txt

I'm sorry to be so critical but I fear that we will adopted this plan because we don't like to stir up controversy and go against neighborhoods, at least until a proposal comes along that is not supported by the plan. I say, lets be candid and ask this neighborhood to do it again but as citizens of the city, not parochial residents of a neighborhood fearing their neighbors and change.

c. Mayor Paul Soglin