

From: Tim Kubala <tim.r.kubala@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, February 8, 2024 8:25 PM

To: Engineer <engineer@cityofmadison.com>; Tim Kubala <tim.r.kubala@gmail.com>; Madison Parks <parks@cityofmadison.com>; Streets <streets@cityofmadison.com>; Kaniewski, Adam B <AKaniewski@cityofmadison.com>

Subject: garver north parcel

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

It seems that representatives of the city have a pervasive need to develop 'vacant' land that more often than not embellish private investments to the further expense to city taxpayers. For instance addition of city parking spaces that augment private, originally designed inadequate numbers of surface parking spaces. Where does it say the city is required to enhance the privately owned living units and businesses with hardscape parking spaces. How about the novel idea that the profit nature of the concerned business should mandate original and adequate parking capacity rather than an overflow relief measure. The confused nature of drivers becoming walkers to get to the cramped garver building becomes a pedestrian safety issue extending back out to fair oak intersection. A further illustration of the city subsidizing apartment units and private investments as affectations like the incessant attempts at imposing a dog facility on a coherent community that strongly stated its case in favor of maintaining the character of the existing and affected parkland, only a creeks width away. The need to continually develop empty spaces is not implicit and any notion in that direction should be engaged with the utmost caution and introspection. Spending

significant segments of the park budget on native plantings are steps in the correct direction. Utilize some of the free thinking madisonians take so much pride and apply it to this project with new and innovative ideas, breaking loose from the typical paradigm, separating this project from conventional decision making. Preserve the north parcel as a example of urban wildness and earn the merits of the madison community as innovators and farsighted parkland managers.

The north parcel park development layouts lack sophistication. It essentially a license to mow the entire acreage including right up to the waters edge . The truth be told this effort to reintroduce the dog park is reliant on the mostly transient population of tenants of the new high rise apartment complexes (most of whom have shared this far oak community for a few months). Residences that are hardly conducive to knowing your neighbor down the hall much less to the activity of building community relationships with owner occupants, many residents of better than ¼ century. City procedure presents city proposals by way of public meetings whose plan is all but decided before any public input meeting ever happens and the options differ very little. 2 – 4 foot berms are dysfunctional as for noise and sound abatement. As for an creative, unique alternative would briefly read something like this; rather establish a serpentine ridge system at an 8 – 10 foot height, that would capture the entire width of the parcel at a latitude tangent to the arcing paved path, containing two egress breaks in the berm that connect to board walks on the

north side as is necessary to complete a walking loop. Just an idea only slightly more sophisticated than the standing design. many times more enjoyable /functional to exposing the pedestrian explorer to ephemeral wetland and long marsh grass habitats.

so take care in considering the consequences of your decisions, the destruction of the character of a wonderful ecosystem juxtapositioned with the current mania of apartment complex construction based on ten year projection, without a low rental, affordable housing presence. Take a deep breath then take a paddle up Starkweather to see what I;m talking about.