

Bass, Kelly

Subject: FW: Demolition Ordinance

-----Original Message-----

From: John Martens [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, November 08, 2016 8:08 AM
To: Scanlon, Amy; Stu Levitan; Erica Gehrig; Rummel, Marsha
Subject: Demolition Ordinance

(Please feel free to forward this to other landmarks commissioners; I simply do not have their e-mail addresses)

I'm sorry, but in my rant about what I feel is a loophole in the demolition ordinance I neglected to mention the overarching reason for my concern. Recently a major landlord with numerous holdings in the Third Lake Ridge district was forced to put his deteriorated properties on the market. By definition those properties will be purchased by others, and it seems to me there would be a very high potential to justify their demolition because of the transfer of ownership.

I don't even want to think about what those could be replaced with (pseudo-historical condos like the "Vinyl Victorian" in the 1000 block or the bloated brick and steel monument to profitability that just reared itself on the corner of Willy and Patterson?), and how such "improvements" would utterly destroy the rhythm, scale, authenticity, and genuine charm of a neighborhood that's supposed to preserve its existing "gross volume, heights, rhythm of building masses and spaces," etc.

Best,
John Martens