

From: [Windsor, Liz](#)
To: [Knox Jr., Isadore](#)
Cc: [Urban Design Comments](#)
Subject: RE: UDC Starbucks-South Park
Date: Wednesday, August 16, 2023 2:38:32 PM

From: Knox Jr., Isadore <district14@cityofmadison.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 16, 2023 2:24 PM
To: Windsor, Liz <LWindsor@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: UDC Starbucks-South Park

I am opposed to the revised access plan for the proposed Starbucks on South Park Street for the following reasons. The proposed access on Beld Street negatively impacts 14th district neighborhood resident who frequently travel on Beld Street to access S. Park Street at Cedar Street; Wingra Street and Gilson street to access John Nolan Drive via Cedar street. In addition, there are frequently parked cars who are going to the Naddy's restaurant on Beld street, and other events at the micro brewery/ bar on Gilson Street, as well as bike path traffic crossing at Wingra and Beld. This could cause traffic congestion and traffic safety concerns at a major through way out of the neighborhood.

I believe some consideration should be given to access and entry from South Park Street, as many other businesses in the area, Dunkin Donuts, Midas, Magic Car wash and others. I believe that traffic and access should be an important design consideration of the UDC.

In addition many of my constituents have expressed the desire to have destination businesses that allow sit down service to neighborhood residents. They are opposed to drive through only, businesses. I will not comment on other concerns related to the Starbucks brand, and the implications of what that may mean to the neighborhood and its residents, as I believe that is not within the perview or scope of consideration of the UDC.

Alder Knox.

From: [Carrie Rothburd](#)
To: [Urban Design Comments](#); [Cleveland, Julie](#)
Cc: [Dave Davis](#); [Richter, Jeff](#); [Evers, Tag](#); [Knox Jr., Isadore](#)
Subject: Please add to August 16, 2023 UDC packet re Item 10
Date: Wednesday, August 16, 2023 1:20:59 PM
Attachments: [Rothburd, Richter Davis UDC, Item 10.docx](#)

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

Thank you for including this letter from me, Carrie Rothburd, Dave Davis, and Jeff Richter. We met last night with alders Evers and Knox to discuss perspectives on the new plan for 1609 S Park; thus the late completion of our note.

I also wish you to include this email in the alders' packet. I may not be attend tonight's meeting despite the fact that I registered to speak. Given the fact that 1609 S Park is item 10 on a long agenda, I would have to dedicate many hours of my evening to speak for 3 minutes.

I consider in-person-only meetings a hardship and **I would like the UDC to consider hosting hybrid virtual/in-person meetings, as other commissions and boards do, as a means of facilitating participation by Madison residents in civic discussions.**

Thanks,
Carrie Rothburd

To: Urban Design Commission
From: Carrie Rothburd, 830 W Lakeside St, District 13 resident
Re: #10, 1609 S. Park Street
Date: August 16, 2023

This building on South Park Street must adhere to UDD7 guidelines and requirements. The staff report focuses on the building's glazing percentage, which has not been met. There are other ways in which the site design does not conformed to UDD7. These concern the serious matter of ensuring a logical and safe vehicle and pedestrian circulation pattern.

UDD7 points out that South Park Street is ...“a critical street for the vitality of adjoining neighborhoods.” It sets as its purpose providing “clear direction for how property owners can make improvements to their properties to collectively improve the visual character and safety of Park Street.” With respect to pedestrian access of developments along Park Street, UDD7 includes the following guidance:

- Pedestrian areas...should be separated from... drive through areas. *The site plan forces pedestrians and cyclists who approach the building from Park Street to cross a line of waiting cars.*
- Walkways should be provided to connect the building entrance to the public sidewalk. *The plan does not include such a pedestrian-focused walkway.*

Several of you spoke to the importance of safe and logical site access in your comments last time around, saying:

I just don't think the site plan works, you have a lot of pedestrian crossings, vehicular merging/crossings...I can't see the site plan working, if you're increasing traffic on Beld Street, there's going to be a wayfinding problem with all of that circulation and long distances of where you come in and where you want to end up.

For a business that is primarily a drive-thru coffee shop, the site plan stinks. The site plan for cars and circulation is really pretty bad.

The insistence of such a large queuing that forces a lot of that turning and confusion in the back of the site versus being able to come in and maybe place your order in a different spot and queue around the back of the building.

Many residents oppose the use of residential Beld Street as the entrance and egress route for what is likely to become a highly trafficked drive-through. Beld is already a busy street that provides primary access to South Park Street for parts of Bay Creek, Bram's Addition, and Capitol View. They further object to the location of the drive aisle parallel to park on the grounds that UDD7's overall intent is on creating a more visually appealing and less auto-centric street.

Galway's application contains a significant inaccuracy with respect to our concerns. At the first meeting we arranged with Galway, which was attended by Alder Knox, we told the developer that we objected to Beld Street as an entrance/egress. We repeated this objection at subsequent meetings to which we invited Galway, both the Bay Creek neighborhood meeting and the South Metropolitan Planning Council meeting. Puzzlingly, the application before you states that: “Some neighbors requested we restrict traffic from entering the drive through at the west end of the property and we have accommodated that request.”

We sincerely hope that the UDC will again refer this application for revision on the grounds that it does not confirm to UDD7 expectations, both with respect to the building and the circulation of the site plan.