

From: [Helen Kitchel](#)
To: [All Alders](#)
Subject: Starbucks on Park St.
Date: Tuesday, January 23, 2024 2:13:36 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

The leadership of SMPC and neighbors from Bay Creek and south of Wingra Creek spoke out clearly at Plan Commission last year to request that the site plan for the future Starbucks ensure that drive-through traffic be routed to and from S. Park and not residential Beld St.

Plan included a condition of approval to require an easement across 1605 S. Park, the property next door. This driveway would be at the north end of 1605 S Park, lot #1 on the Certified Survey Map included in the site plans for 1609 S. Park. Specifically:

-- Starbucks would obtain an easement across 1605 South Park Street for access to South Park Street, and

-- "The applicant shall add signage directing traffic to the driveway entrance along South Park Street."

However, the revised CSM for 1605 S Park, up for review by Council tonight, does not include the proposed easement.

Please do not accept the raised Plan as written, but ensure that the easement through the adjacent property is included as recommended by Planning staff.

From: [Linda](#)
To: [All Alders](#)
Subject: Agenda #36 comment for 1.23.24 CC meeting
Date: Tuesday, January 23, 2024 12:02:23 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Legistar 81084 is a Certified Survey map for 1609-1613 S Park St. Please do not adopt this CSM under the suspension of MGO 2.055. The approval process should proceed in the normal matter to ensure that Starbucks ingress/egress easement across 1605 S Park is properly addressed.

When Plan Commission approved Starbucks' conditional use request for a drive-thru at 1609 S Park (lot #2 on the CSM), it added a condition of approval: "The applicant shall add signage directing traffic to the driveway entrance along South Park Street." This driveway is at the north end of 1605 S Park (lot #1 on the CSM).

Plan Commission approval was predicated on the fact that Starbucks would obtain an easement across 1605 South Park Street for access to South Park Street, thus the added condition about signage. Without this easement the only access to Starbucks would be from Beld Street. (The southerly portion of lot #2 on the CSM appears to give access from W Wingra, but this segment of the lot is blocked off by a curb creating the drive-thru lane.)

Wis. Stat. § 236.34(1m)(e), provides that a "certified survey map may be used ... for granting easements to the public or any person, society, or corporation marked or noted on the map..." The Wisconsin Department of Administration's *Wisconsin Certified Survey Map Checklist* provides that a certified survey map may be used for granting easements.

The MG&E easement is required to be recorded and shown on the CSM (condition #9 of the Conditional Approval Letter). Yet the easement on lot #1 for Starbucks is only covered by condition #8 which requires staff review and recording immediately subsequent to the CSM recording. The CSM should also reflect Starbucks easement on lot #1 for ingress/egress to lot #2. Without that easement being reflected on the CSM, the Council will not be assured that development proceeds in accordance with Plan Commission's approval of the conditional use for 1609 S Park.

Respectfully Submitted,
Linda Lehnertz

From: [Carrie Rothburd](#)
To: [All Alders](#)
Subject: Item #36, Legistar 81084
Date: Tuesday, January 23, 2024 2:56:20 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

To: Common Council
From: Carrie Rothburd, Transportation Committee Chair, BCNA
Re: Item #36 re entrance and egress from 1609 S Park
Date: 1/23/24

Will there be the required easement to direct traffic to and from Park St instead of to and from Beld for the future Starbucks at 1609 S Park?

As chair of BCNA's Transportation Committee, I have shared notice of this item with BCNA. I hope to be able to come back to the general membership at our meeting in two weeks to say that the Council has done its due diligence in protecting not only the people of Bay Creek from an undue traffic burden but also the people of the neighborhoods to our south and has passed this CSM back to Plan Commission for its review and approval.

As the co-chair of SMPC explained at Plan when Galway's proposal for Starbucks's site plan was up for approval last year, routing traffic for a Starbucks onto Beld compromises the safety of the many South Madison residents who rely on Beld Street to travel it to gain access to Park St., especially during rush hour. Presumably this is the time when Starbucks will do some of its heaviest business.

Several South Side residents and Alder Knox spoke out clearly at Plan Commission last year to request that the site plan for the future Starbucks ensure that drive-through traffic be routed to and from S. Park, avoiding residential Beld St.

Plan included a condition of approval to require an easement across 1605 S. Park, the property next door. I believe Alder Evers also supported this easement as part of the CSM for 1609-1613 S. Park. This driveway would be at the north end of 1605 S Park, lot #1 on the proposed CSM included by Galway in the site plans for 1609 S. Park (lot #2).

Plan's conditions of approval for 1609 specifically included the following provisions:

- Starbucks would obtain an easement across 1605 South Park Street for access to South Park Street, and
- "The applicant shall add signage directing traffic to the driveway entrance along South Park Street."

I am puzzled then that the proposed revised CSM, up for review by Council tonight, does not include the proposed easement. Presumably the absence of the easement does not preclude the possibility of such an easement being built in the future. but how are South Side residents to feel secure that it will be built?

Without this easement being reflected on the revised CSM for 1605 and 1609, can we and can Council be assured that Galway's development will proceed in accordance with Plan Commission's approval of the conditional use for 1609 S Park? Will drive-thru traffic wind up entering and leaving the future Starbucks via Beld St, as it now appears on the CSM?

Please do not approve this CSM under the suspension of MGO 2.055. Please instead insist that the approval process proceed in the normal manner and send the CSM back to Plan to ensure that Starbucks ingress/egress easement across 1605 S Park is properly addressed.

From: [Charlene Sweeney](#)
To: [All Alders](#)
Subject: Starbucks on Park St.
Date: Tuesday, January 23, 2024 2:51:20 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Alders: I thought the addition of a Starbucks drive-thru on Park St. was voted down. I guess I was wrong. I is a poor plan for Park St. first of all, there is a Starbucks on Fish Hatchery, and one on Rimrock Rd. This is halfway in between, and a big over kill! Not needed.

There are other small businesses on Park St. that rely on customer coffee business. I support those (like Cargo Coffee), and strongly feel the city should support them too. There is no justification for another Starbucks in this area—and especially not a drive thru that complicates driving, etc.

please oppose the whole plan. It does nothing for our city.

Charlene Sweeney
114 E. Lakeside St.
Madison, 53715

Sent from my iPhone