

From: [Evers, Tag](#)
To: [licensing](#)
Cc: [Blackamore, Shannon](#)
Subject: Legistar 92370: New License 421 S. Park St
Date: Wednesday, April 15, 2026 2:34:41 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-cid_image0.png](#)

Dear ALRC members

On March 23 I emailed the applicant informing him of my reservations:

Hi Sukh,

Thanks for reaching out and informing me of your application to open a liquor store at 421 S. Park St.

I have serious concerns about this location and its proximity to Brittingham Park. Brittingham Park has been a trouble spot in the summer time for several years now, with open-container alcohol consumption one of the primary causes of disturbance.

I believe I speak for residents in District 13 there is not a groundswell of support for your application.

As you can see from the number of emails you have received on this item, I was not wrong in my assessment.

From what I understand, neighborhood opposition is unanimous. The reasons are simple. Brittingham is an alcohol-free park, a restriction imposed in response to serious and persistent issues in years past associated with alcohol use.

Alcohol is the combustible element that threatens to upset the delicate balance the city has achieved in maintaining Brittingham Park as a safe, family-friendly environment.

Last evening, I was copied on email by Parks Superintendent Eric Knepp to Midtown District Captain Shannon Blackamore:

Captain Blackamore –

I heard from Alder Evers that there is an application for a liquor license at 421 S. Park St. next to Brittingham Park.

I wanted to share with you that the Parks Division does have concerns related to changes around Brittingham Park that could impact the delicate balance that we have established over the years in partnership with MPD, neighbors, park users, and service providers. The history of the Park includes some dark days where it was effectively unused by most community members due to safety concerns. A contributory factor to most of the behavior and quality of life concerns was alcohol. The issues were so significant that it led to the Parks Commission and City Council banning alcohol at Brittingham Park without a permit and also was a significant driver of events that led to the Parks Behavior Policy (that can lead to non-citation park bans for behavior violations).

The Park today is a much different story. From the City's first fully accessible playground, to an amazing community garden, a healthy boat rental business, and countless gatherings throughout the year, the Park is full of positive community use. The park users today are truly reflective of our entire community, and it has over the past decade become a very well used and loved park. I often use the park as an example of the philosophy the absolute best limiter of negative behavior in a park is to increase positive behavior in the park. I have learned over the years that it is critical for us to not lose sight of how delicate the balance is when things are going well. Though I wish no ill will to someone who seeks to create a successful business selling alcohol, based on the concerns from

past experience and the price of losing the balance at Brittingham, I felt it important to share with MPD my concerns about proliferation of availability of alcohol in and around Brittingham. I cannot say what will happen, but I can confidently say that for about a decade families, children, and community members did not use Brittingham for positive activities very often due to negative activities that were rooted in alcohol. Anything that could move us back in that direction is a concern and worthy of extra scrutiny.

The proposed location, at 421 S. Park St, is within 500 feet and a short walk from Brittingham Park, increasing the likelihood of impulse buys that have a proven correlation with negative impacts on quality of life issues for other park users and the surrounding neighborhood.

I share Superintendent Knepp's profound concerns, concerns that are consistent with the unanimous neighborhood opposition.

When my colleague, Council President Vidaver, put forth a proposal for geographic limits on new Class A Licenses Premises as a strategy for reducing excessive alcohol use and alcohol-related harms, those who opposed argues the ALRC permitting process was sufficient to address these concerns.

Here we are, a proposed liquor store within 500 feet of a city park with a history, past and current, of alcohol-related problems.

(Please see link to a memo from Dr. Felice Borisy-Rudin of the Wisconsin Alcohol Policy Project establishing the correlation between increased alcohol density and alcohol-related harms consistent with the ongoing challenges at Brittingham Park: <https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14300857&GUID=65A8C8C0-37DD-4DDD-8EAF-DD1B2051E749>.)

Lastly, my interactions with the applicant have all been positive. His promises to run an exemplary liquor store are noted and of which I have no reasons to doubt. However, that is not the point. The very best operator of a Class A liquor license at 421 S. Park St would still be selling alcohol and that is a serious problem that must be avoided at this location.

Accordingly, I ask that you do not approve, but rather place this application on file with prejudice.

Thank you,

Tag Evers



Tag Evers

District 13 Alder

Tel 608 424 2580

Email District13@cityofmadison.com

Sign up for District 13 email updates/blog:

<http://www.cityofmadison.com/council/district13/blog/>
