

**From:** [Nicholas Davies](#)  
**To:** [Transportation Commission](#)  
**Cc:** [Martinez-Rutherford, Dina Nina](#); [Southeast Area Plan](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Southeast Area Plan transportation recommendations (88389)  
**Date:** Sunday, November 30, 2025 12:58:24 PM

---

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

Dear Transportation Commission,

Regarding the proposed transportation actions in the draft Southeast Area plan, a lot of it makes sense to me. Much of it boils down to encouraging WisDOT to do the right thing in their plans for Stoughton Rd, in terms of land use and safe crossings. I think the city has already made this preference clear, but adding it to the Comprehensive Plan is good too.

#### Street network additions (and lack of subtractions)

- The map shows an extension of Dawes through Eastmorland Park to Silver. This would make a bike boulevard more attractive to through traffic. I would support a bike/ped bridge here instead, probably at lower cost.
- A connection from Cottage Ct to Dempsey, through a property currently owned by American Family, would require an additional crossing of the Cap City Trail, and the railroad (good luck with that). A dead-end off of Dempsey could serve the same purpose without those impacts.
- The connection between Lumbermans Trail and Leo Dr would be useful for bikes/peds traveling the Cap City Trail, but it would also allow cut-through traffic from Atlas Ave to Acewood Blvd via what is today a quiet residential street.

On the whole, these proposed street connections feel like "make-work" that is included just to check a box. This area (at least the northern half) is developed already. It's okay to stop adding street connections.

In fact, it suggests a pro-car bias at work, when the plan only includes street additions, and zero street subtractions. Whereas to achieve low-stress, low-traffic neighborhoods, that is what we ought to be doing instead: deciding which streets do not need be accessible from both ends by car, now that the area is built out and we can measure how these streets are being used.

I would encourage the Planning Division to reassess their process for how this part of an area plan gets put together, because this kind of net-pro-traffic stuff seems to be a chronic problem from one area plan to the next.

#### Parking at Olbrich

The draft actions also mention a shortage of parking at Olbrich Park. However, there are already several large parking lots at Olbrich:

- one at the Biergarten
- one at the boat launch
- another at the *other* boat launch
- another on the other side of the baseball diamonds

- another at the gardens
- a smallish lot by the sledding hill
- on all sides of Garver Feed Mill
- a planned lot at Olbrich North
- plenty of street parking nearby as well

The Olbrich area also has direct access to the bike path network, and high frequency transit on the C line. Parking is the last thing we need more of, and last time I heard from Eric Knepp on this, Parks were interested in downsizing the lots as they get repaved or redeveloped. That was in fact part of the argument in favor of adding *yet another lot* at Olbrich North.

This is important because excess parking becomes a destination of its own, one that's especially attractive for criminal activity. For instance, the parking lots at Olbrich have become a gathering place for the street races that endanger our neighborhoods and contribute a stressful amount of noise pollution to many of our city's arterials.

Thank you,

Nick Davies  
3717 Richard St