

From: [fae dremock](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: ITEM 72946// Against approval
Date: Monday, December 12, 2022 3:34:38 PM

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

Ample opportunity for the complete green street and traffic overlay project was given — as it was being drafted, but the feedback and comments process is not complete — feedback is still needed after creation of the full draft policy currently submitted. **That process is not yet complete.** This policy still needs a full final review and feedback from all stakeholders.

That full process is needed to legitimize what we do here. And that process requires more time.

These policies will affect historic districts and affordable housing projects alike, the central city neighborhoods as well as the poorer south side and north side neighborhoods. Many stipulations regarding tree canopy and flooding resilience have not been completely clarified, changes to current practice is not completely described, full remediation and support for increased canopy is not fully built in. The full climate mitigation is not yet built in. Etc.

There are still many gaps and we are being asked to trust that current practices will not change. It's worth remembering that protocols are easily changed when there is no recorded stipulation that disallows that change. As example, the city currently allows canopy tree replacement in 4 ft terraces but with an 8 foot terraces now considered the best width, it is easy to imagine that in practice and with time, the only width that gets canopy trees will be that 8 ft terrace. That would have a huge effect on much of the city. The stipulation that we continue to plant in 4 ft terraces needs to be in place in this document.

As one example, the impact on new development including affordable housing with its stipulation of 8 foot terraces for tree canopy is likely to make affordable housing either more expensive to develop— or create affordable housing development very short on tree canopy,. This is an equity issue, as much as a canopy and green space issue, as much as a flooding issue.

These policies will affect the city for years to come. We need more time for full review and a round of full final feedback with all T's crossed and I's dotted. Let's slow this down one more time and do it right— with full review of the final document by ALL stakeholders.

We need green streets and traffic design, but we need to make sure that any such redesign/design is fully and completely green. Let's do this right.

Fae Dremock
1211 Rutledge St Apt 4
Madison, WI 53703

From: annewalker@homelandgarden.com
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Complete Green Streets Policy
Date: Monday, December 12, 2022 2:24:26 PM
Attachments: :-

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

Dear Plan Commission Members,

Isthmus neighbors are canopy tree deficient. The City of Madison goal of 40% tree canopy is a good goal. My hope is that that is a goal for every neighborhood and not an average for the city as a whole. .

Isthmus neighborhoods have a great deal of competition for space. In the *City of Madison Downtown Plan*, in the portion related to Urban Forestry, Downtown neighborhoods are identified as tree challenged due to development and emphasizes how important street trees are. "Recent development has generally occupied more lot area and left less room for existing or new trees. This has put a premium on having healthy and sustainable trees along street and sidewalks. Trees with larger canopies in particular can greatly enhance a streetscape."

Urban heat islands are a reality in our neighborhoods. In addition to heat, we are a flood zone. 2018 and the flood was a wake-up call for us all. We need canopy trees and we need more vigorous stormwater management.

In the *City of Madison Comprehensive Plan*, vines are encouraged in the urban environment. Well behaved vines can thrive in 1/3 of the soil volume that a canopy tree would need. I would hope that this policy would include vines in the greening our urban environment.

A great deal of the isthmus has been already been reconstructed and prior to the Green Streets policy. How will this policy address retrofitting neighborhoods such as ours?

Best,

Anne Walker

From: [Marlisa Kopenski Condon](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Comments in Opposition to Complete Green Streets Policy: 3
Date: Monday, December 12, 2022 1:30:01 PM

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

Hello -

I am writing as a resident of the Marquette Neighborhood. I oppose the Complete Green Streets Policy that will be voted on by the Plan Commission on 12/12. I encourage committee no suspend a vote on this plan as it is confusing, contradictory and incomplete and, in my opinion, is not ready to move through the approval process.

Things of concern to me:

- Language about needing eight feet of terrace to have a tree is unclear and incomplete. As written, this policy could effectively denude District 6 and many of the streets on the isthmus, central city and South side for new development. This would be tragic to the character of my neighborhood and our city.
- This policy lacks details that a "complete" plan should have. This includes tree-related things like flood resilience through bioremediation, issues of traffic emissions, bump outs, shade concerns, urban heat islands and placemaking.

I ask that, at minimum, a survey of terrace widths is made throughout the city. This would be a good first step to ascertain the best plan for a healthy balance of canopy trees and "green things" that enliven and protect our city.

Sincerely,
Marlisa Kopenski Condon
529 Clemons Avenue
Madison, WI 53704

From: [Lance Lattimer](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Comments re: Green Streets Proposal
Date: Monday, December 12, 2022 12:07:42 PM

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

Dear Plan Commission:

When discussing the Green Streets proposal, please keep in mind the many older neighborhoods in our city that will never have space deemed 'adequate' (8' minimum) by this plan for the planting of substantial trees.

We rely on this natural shade for the passive cooling of our homes as well as shade while walking or biking. The ornamental trees that would fill our terraces simply don't provide those benefits like a canopy tree does.

The final plan should include a way for large swaths of older neighborhoods to continue to have canopy trees, as well.

Thank you,
Lance Lattimer

From: [Jack Kear](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Agenda item #74926 Green Streets
Date: Monday, December 12, 2022 10:29:01 AM

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

Dear Sir or Madam:

As you are probably aware, there is some alarm that the proposed Green Streets plan will impose 8' terrace widths on 'old neighborhoods' who cannot support such a distance. These neighborhoods also are the home to many advocates for the urban canopy.

I am delighted to support any effort to make Madison more of a sustainable city as we go through climate change. I am also a long-time proponent of smart development especially here in the Marquette district.

Will you please clarify how the terrace width for trees, including future plantings, in older neighborhoods will be under the new plan? I think you have the right idea but without clarity there will be more consternation.

Thank You,
Jack Kear
1045 E Wilson St, Madison, WI 53703