

From: [Nicholas Davies](#)
To: [Madison Landmarks Commission](#)
Cc: [Martinez-Rutherford, Dina Nina](#)
Subject: Landmarks approval of route B charging station (88466)
Date: Sunday, June 1, 2025 11:29:17 AM

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

Dear Landmarks Commission,

I hope you approve the route B charging station, and I hope you do so with the thoughtless rubber-stamping it deserves. However, I have concerns with the item itself being on your agenda, and how it is presented in the staff report.

The charging station is to be a net-new small-scale utility building in the public right of way, if you can even call it a "building" per se, any more than a traffic signal is considered a "building". Madison has dozens, if not hundreds, of these incidental utility constructions, and as someone who regularly reads Landmarks Commission agendas, I don't believe that these have previously been on your agenda or required your time and attention.

The premise of bringing this to your attention seems vague: that there hypothetically could be a building, whose viewshed could be obscured by this charging station, that isn't deemed historic today, but could be in future. Yet the staff report does not list any buildings near the charging station that could be deemed historic or could be obscured by it.

You're essentially being tasked with making up a "problem" to "solve", and the parameters are sufficiently open-ended that you could, if you tried. If one of the neighboring houses is still standing a century from now, then it could qualify as historic. And if the charging station is still standing at that point, then your view of that historic house could be obscured by that historic charging station. And it seems like you could use this science-fictional pretext to obstruct constructing the charging station in the present day.

But this is clearly an absurd exercise. This item doesn't deserve a place on your agenda, and I would fully support the Common Council making any ordinance changes necessary to eliminate this added red tape from routine city construction projects that already have plenty of it.

Further, I'm troubled by the report's implication that existing "street design" is now also something we're obligated to preserve. Just in the past week, a pedestrian died at this intersection, Northport & Kennedy. And now, instead of making the intersection safer, we want to preserve the conditions that killed him?? Let's repudiate this as strongly as possible right now.

Thank you,

Nick Davies
3717 Richard St