

From: [Ledell Zellers](#)
To: [Scanlon, Amy](#)
Cc: [Rummel, Marsha](#); "[Stuart Levitan](#)"
Subject: Landmarks Commission meeting today
Date: Monday, September 19, 2011 5:54:14 AM

Hi Amy,

While I hope to get to the Landmarks Commission today, I may not be able to make it. In case I cannot get there, could you please share this email with Commission members? (Legistar seems to be down. It has been unresponsive since last evening so I cannot reference the following to specific agenda items.)

Erdman building nomination ... I wanted to take a look at the staff report again as I know this is has been a thorny nomination. I've been thinking about this nomination a lot (and its potential precedent and impact on other landmark nominations) and looking at the ordinance. The ordinance says the commission "may" recommend designation. Specifically it says "after application of the criteria in Subsection (4), above, the commission may recommend the designation of the property" as a landmark site. However, if the property meets one or more of the criteria, my question is, on what basis would the commission decide not to recommend designation? Economic issues (not part of the duty of Landmarks to consider this)? Whim? Political pressure? Or what? It seems to me consistency demands that the Commission recommend designation if the property meets the standards. One other related item I would note, there is nothing in the ordinances that precludes nomination and designation after a developer files a development proposal with the exception of properties listed on pages 50 and 51 of the Downtown Historic Preservation Plan (33.19(6)(b)).

Demolition... Again, I wanted to look at the Legistar information related to this agenda item. My understanding is that there is a request to demolish a "contributing" building in the Third Lake Ridge historic district. And while I know that technically there are only "contributing" buildings in national historic districts it is an apt term when the building does indeed contribute to the "historic character of the District as a whole and therefore should be preserved" (33.19(5)(c)3.). Approving demolition of a contributing building in a local historic district "would be contrary to the purpose and intent of this chapter" as set forth in Sec. 33.19(1). My understanding also is that this building is structurally sound (unlike the home approved for demolition on Willy Street across from Ground Zero), albeit in need of maintenance. My understanding also is that this is not a "grand" building but rather a worker type home which certainly contributes to the historic character of the district. Approval to demolish this building would substantially weaken not only the Third Lake Ridge historic district but all Madison historic districts.

Thank you.
Ledell

Ledell Zellers
510 N. Carroll St.
Madison, WI 53703

608 231 1526