

Andrew Kirsh
Mad-P gardener
10/23/19

Re: Comments on the Velmeir plant viability memo and attachments (shadow study),
Project 3020338

1. Mr. Dugan's conclusion that the proposed building will have negligible effect on gardening at the Mad-P hinges on his assertion that "The shadows cast by the existing tree canopy is very similar to the shadow cast by the proposed structure." (Velimer [sic] Plant Viability memo, "Conclusions".) This assertion is unsupported by any evidence. The trees are deciduous poplars with gaps between them and a nearly entirely vertical growth habit. Because they lose their leaves in the winter and have gaps between them, their shadows cannot be comparable to that of a solid building. In leaf, the gaps between them and their growth habit (relative openness) makes their canopies quite porous to sunlight (see photo 1, taken from the Mad-P).



Photo 1. Poplars (in leaf) on the proposed building site, with the sun in the background. Photo taken from the Mad-P P-Patch.

2. Cloudiness data and light-intensity readings: The question to be answered is whether the proposed building will change the growing conditions at the Mad-P. In order to answer the question, current conditions must be accurately documented in order to enable a fact-based comparison. Cloudiness is irrelevant, as it will be the same in the presence or absence of the proposed building. Light intensity readings taken outside the Mad-P, including those taken in the street in the shade of the trees in the planting strip (shade that does not reach the garden, as evidenced by the photo mapping the reading sites), are also irrelevant.

3. Shadow studies: The drawings treat the poplars as solid objects, ignoring their characteristics described under paragraph 1 above. The trees are deciduous and not equivalent to a building in regard their shadows. The shadow drawings are invalid. The legends to the drawings consistently cite the “existing building and trees” as shadowing the P-Patch, but at no time does the existing building shadow the P-Patch. This is a blatant misrepresentation of the current conditions. The shadow studies do demonstrate that the new building would cast a considerable area of shadow on the P-Patch. Because the existing building casts no shadows on the P-Patch, and because any shadow cast by the trees cannot be accurately assessed from drawings in which the trees are misrepresented as solid objects all year even though they are deciduous, it appears that shadowing by the new building would be considerably worse than under the current conditions.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Andrew Kirsh