

Children on Livingston?

Tim Madison <tmadison@madisonrosan.com> To: "electedofficials@bexley.org" <electedofficials@bexley.org> Tue, Feb 13, 2024 at 9:30 AM

President Lampke, Members of Council, Mayor Kessler, and Auditor McPeek:

In 2020, when I first learned that Bexley intended to develop housing for children on the corner of Livingston and Francis, I had a very simple question: Why do our Elected Officials want kids to live on the corner of Francis and Livingston?

When I learned that the proposed development on the corner of Francis and Livingston was to be 58 bedrooms, intended for children, with literally one parking space for those kids to play I had the same simple question: Why do our Elected Officials want kids to live on the corner of Francis and Livingston?

When The Community Builder's Jeff Beam stated at the Bexley Library public meeting that they expected <u>"40-45" kids</u> to live on the corner of Francis and Livingston, I once again had a very simple question: Why do our Elected Officials want "40-45" kids to live on the corner of Frances and Livingston?

As I followed the City of Bexley losing two (2) Common Pleas cases and one Court of Appeals case, while spending an exorbitant amount of taxpayer money, I asked a very simple question: Why do our Elected Officials want kids to live on Livingston to the extent that they engage in extended and expensive litigation?

As I watch car accident after car accident on Livingston and I hear and watch cars and motorcycles racing on Livingston, I again ask why do our Elected Officials want more kids to live on Livingston?

Livingston is not a safe street. Exorbitant numbers of car accidents, car racing and

motorcycle racing. And Livingston is not pedestrian safe.

<u>Livingston is not a quiet street</u>. Car and motorcycle racing constantly. Police and Fire continuously use Livingston.

Livingston is not close to Montrose Elementary, Bexley City Middle and High Schools, Columbus School for Girls, nor St. Charles.

<u>Livingston and Francis is not close to the Bexley parks</u>. The closest park is Mayfield Ferndale, but it is unsafe for the kids to walk or bike on Livingston to get to that park.

Please consider the following:

a. What kind of quality of life will those kids have on Livingston?

b. Can't we do better as a City, and you as our elected officials, than placing 40-45 kids on an incredibly dangerous street?

c. Don't those kids deserve better than Livingston?

d. Do you have a study from an urban planner concluding that additional children should live on Livingston?

I live a block off of Livingston and I drive on Livingston every day. I hear and see the racing and I see the car accidents. I watch cars blow through the traffic light at the intersection of College and Livingston as if the light does not exist.

The traffic-calming measures that were recently installed on Livingston between

Chelsea Avenue and Euclaire Avenue have made the intersection of Livingston and Francis significantly more dangerous because cars race (i) Eastbound to get from two lanes to merge into one lane and (ii) Westbound coming out of the one lane into two lanes headed for the College Avenue traffic light.

I have driven on Livingston for 59 years and I know that adding 40-45 kids at the intersection of Livingston and Francis is a grave mistake that jeopardizes the physical safety and mental well-being of those children. "Because there is no other location for housing" is not a justifiable basis for placing children directly in harm's way!

So, I ask the same question today that I asked over the four years: Why do our Elected Officials want more kids to live on Livingston?

Respectfully Submitted,

Tim Madison

956 Pleasant Ridge Avenue



Timothy G. Madison

39 East Whittier Street P: (614) 228-5600 ext. 1

Columbus, Ohio 43206 F: (614) 228-5601

tmadison@madisonrosan.com

This e-mail message is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message. If you are the intended recipient but do not wish to receive communications through this medium, please so advise the sender immediately.

Under requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that, if any advice concerning one or more U.S. federal tax issues is contained in this communication (including any attachments), such advice was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (1) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (2) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or tax-related matter addressed herein.

