


To: Members of the Madison Common Council
 From: Elderberry Neighborhood Association
 Re: ENDP - July 10, 2018

Dear Council Members:

We wish to go on record as opposing street design in the Elderberry Neighborhood Plan. Almost 200 residents have petitioned against it, mainly because it will allow "cut-through" traffic between Mineral Point Road and Old Sauk Road, as well as in and out of future employment areas along Mineral Point. (Note: This appears to violate the city's policy on traffic management, adopted by the Council in 2016, which called for cut-through traffic to be *restricted to arteries*).

A map of the area is inserted below. The Elderberry Neighborhood is on the left, in yellow. Mineral Pt. Rd. is shown in green. In red are the **nine internal streets earmarked to move traffic from south to north**. (Marked in blue, for comparison, are typical west-side neighborhoods.)



Please note the following:

- 1) Mineral Pt Road is a **regional highway** projected to carry 40,000 cars per day. Nowhere on the west side have we found another area where local streets join a regional highway. In addition, the employment area is expected to serve 2000 workers, who can enter local streets from either the south or north of our neighborhood. This means a high volume of traffic potentially flowing through our neighborhood.

- 2) The map shows Elderberry Neighborhood sliced by **nine parallel north-south routes**. By comparison, other far west-side residential areas are laid out in mega-blocks, with only their exterior roads connecting to other areas. (A typical westside neighborhood, until now, has been designed with cul-de-sacs, circles, dead end streets, and otherwise protected blocks.) We understand grids are back in favor, but we disagree with tying grids to “connectivity” via local streets.
- 3) Of these nine internal north-south streets, three are designated as collector streets. However, these are on parcels that will not be developed soon. **The remaining six are “local” streets**, as measured by width and durability as well as their relationship to residences. Until collector streets are built, these local streets will have to carry the north-south traffic load.
- 4) Two of the above mentioned local streets — **Fargo and Burnt Sienna** — run through **already-developed neighborhoods**. These residents did not anticipate living on a busy connector street. Builders did not anticipate it either, since the traffic plan of 2002 was built on a totally different system of east/west connectors that tried to avoid cut-through traffic off Mineral Pt. Rd.

We believe this new plan is designed to compensate for previous mistakes the city made in laying out our collector roads, as well as its determination to promote growth, development, and good regional traffic flow — at the expense of residents. City staff and officials insist this plan is good because it “spreads traffic.” But they’ve not explained **how** it would support the quiet and safety we request. If they’re wrong, we live with the consequences.

We’re disappointed that never once has any person representing the city asked us to help them better understand our concerns, nor acknowledged that our concerns have validity. Never once has any person offered to explore with us better solutions. No amount of planning jargon automatically makes this street pattern a great idea. And claiming it will turn out to be just what we *really* wanted — had we been smart enough to understand the city’s thinking — does not make it so.

Sharon M. Goss
420 Straw Harvest Ln.
President, Elderberry Neighborhood Association