

From: Michele LaVigne

Sent: Monday, November 6, 2017 10:49 AM

To: Stouder, Heather <HStouder@cityofmadison.com>; Rummel, Marsha <district6@cityofmadison.com>; Ahrens, David <district15@cityofmadison.com>

Subject: proposed development at 131 S. Fair Oaks

I would like to offer some comments about the proposed development at `131 S. Fair Oaks. To put it simply, this proposed development is too big - way too big.

As currently designed, it is grotesquely out of proportion to anything that should be built on that site. I urge you to come and take a look. Fair Oaks and the side streets are mixed use residential with small bungalows. That is part of its history and yes, it's charm. This type of grand- scale development has the potential to destroy the character of the neighborhood.

Then there is the matter of traffic on Fair Oaks. As it is, Fair Oaks is too busy. It is a bus route and a prime access road to E. Wash, Milwaukee St. Route 30 and the interstate, MATC, and the airport. It is also a bike route, with a major crossing for the bike path. The intersection of Fair Oaks and Atwood is already a mess, especially on school days when school buses, parents, and kids are attempting to get to Lowell. Increased traffic from 160 housing units (220 if we count the proposed development across the street) will take the situation from bad to much worse. As you consider this project, please bear in mind that the common council has already given its approval for a development of 60 units right across the street. Placing that kind of traffic burden onto Fair Oaks, which is already stressed, is bad policy. We already know that Atwood reconstruction between Fair Oaks and Cottage Grove is in the works for 2022. I think we can guess what that will do to Fair Oaks since that will be the detour (either official or unofficial). Once again, please come and see for yourself.

And then there is Kipp. Steve Klafka is probably the most conversant in Kipp history and science than anybody in this city and I urge you to take a serious look at his extensive study of Kipp's "legacy." Meanwhile I have to say how disappointed I am in the common council for not taking a more informed stance on the effect of Kipp on this project and the affordable housing project across the street. For years, the city and the DNR have given assurances that the pollution caused by Kipp wasn't "that bad." Or that Kipp was remediating the conditions. But then months later it turns out that yes it was that bad, or the remediation wasn't working, and new steps have to be taken. This has happened again and again. Kipp basically dug up half a block in an attempt to remove the toxins and they are still showing up around the Goodman Center. The air filtration system has supposedly been acceptable for a number of years, but now Kipp must install new systems because it turns out the emission levels are actually too high.

If these housing units are built and it turns out that the city and state's findings are once again wrong, then what? At the risk of sounding hyperbolic, let me remind you that the city of Niagara Falls and the state of NY once said that Love Canal wasn't that bad either. I realize the developers are attempting to address this issue with expert analysis. I just hope that they are prepared to assume the costs if it turns out that their expert, like so many of the experts from the city and state, turns out to be wrong.

I recognize that increased density is the only way we can provide housing for the many who want to live in our neighborhoods. But we should not be attempting to completely solve the problem in a single block Fair Oaks.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Michele LaVigne
█ Ludington Ave.
53704