

Greg Minikel

From: Greg Minikel
Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2024 12:22 PM
To: Common Council
Cc: Dan Koski; Mike Zimmer; Sonja Birr
Subject: Council Document #24-2057 Possible Elimination of Island with the Reconstruction of Fleetwood Dr. - Waldo Blvd. to Stokes Lane

To Mayor and Common Council:

I would just like to highlight some of the facts and comments from the residents regarding last week's PI Committee Meeting with the abutting property owners along Fleetwood Drive from Waldo to Stokes.

The property owners that attended the meeting in person or on Zoom were as follows:

1. 1220 Fleetwood Dr. – Kumar Kangayappan. He does not have full access to his driveway or the island impedes his access, but he did not care. He wants the islands to remain. He would also like to see underground electric power and ornamental street lighting like we have in the newer subdivisions to the north of Stokes Lane.
2. 1234 Fleetwood Dr. – Nancy Duckart. She does not have full access to her driveway or the island impedes her access, but she did not care. She wants the islands to remain.
3. 1240 Fleetwood Dr. – Barbara Sitkiewitz. There is full access to her driveway as there is already an island opening at this location due to the Fleetway Ct. cul-de-sac. So, the island does not impact her access. However, she wants the islands to remain.
4. 1244 Fleetwood Dr. – Andrew Langer. (Attended via Zoom) His access is impeded by the island. Therefore, he would like the islands removed. Andy also stated that his neighbor at 1248 would be very happy if the islands were removed. They share the same driveway.
5. 3104 Wildwood Dr. – Christine & Mark Nickels. Their existing driveway access is off of Wildwood Drive and therefore are not really impacted by the islands. However, they would like to see the City keep the islands.
6. 3016 Fleetrun Court – Vicki & Steve Grant. Their existing driveway access is off of Fleetrun Court and therefore are not really impacted by the islands. They are already at an island opening for their cul-de-sac. However, they would like to see the City keep the islands.

I also received a text from Charlene Haug at 1320 Fleetwood Dr. with questions prior to the PI meeting. I also talked to her after the PI meeting and she felt like removing the islands were a reasonable thing to do. Her driveway is blocked by the island, but she is very close to the Stokes Ln. intersection

So, based on the above information, we have 5 property owners who would like the islands to remain in place and 3 property owners that would like to see the islands removed.

We wished that we would have received input from the remaining 14 property owners who did not attend the meeting or call/email the Engineering Dept.

There seemed to be some confusion about the new terrace width if the islands were removed (WOMT made it sound confusing anyway). If the islands are eliminated, then the terrace width would increase by 6-7 feet on each side of the

street or they will have a total width of about 12-13 feet (from face of sidewalk to back of the curb). This would be a little wider than the terrace areas to the north where there is no island. The overall look of the street would be similar to what it is to the north of Stokes Lane.

However, nobody at the meeting seemed to care about the additional lawn cutting or snow removal. It was all about the aesthetics and speeding traffic as the reasons for keeping the islands.

It is easier and quicker to both design and build without the islands.

There would be maintenance benefits for the City Staff without the islands.

We can get flatter driveway and handicap ramp slopes without the islands which would assist with better ADA accessibility.

The full list of benefits and negatives of the island removal were included in the letter that was sent to the property owners as part of the invitation to the PI Committee Meeting.

The total cost savings by eliminating the islands is estimated to be around \$200,000. (fewer storm sewer inlets needed, much less curb and gutter, less pavement). WOMT reported only the \$120,000 savings, which is only for the reduced footage of curb and gutter. I guess we will have to bid the project according to whatever is decided and see where the numbers come out.