

From: [Scanlon, Amy](#)
To: [Scanlon, Amy](#)
Subject: FW: Landmarks Ordinance revisions
Date: Monday, March 09, 2015 11:14:46 AM

From: Bidar-Sielaff, Shiva
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2015 10:53 AM
To: Schmidt, Christopher; Zellers, Ledell; Rummel, Marsha; King, J Steven; Clear, Mark
Subject: Fwd: Landmarks Ordinance revisions

FYi

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Stu Levitan <[REDACTED]>
Date: March 8, 2015 at 7:53:12 PM CDT
To: "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>, "regentneighborhoodassn@googlegroups.com" <regentneighborhoodassn@googlegroups.com>, "regentneighbors@yahoogroups.com" <regentneighbors@yahoogroups.com>, Dave Mollenhoff <[REDACTED]>, James Matson <[REDACTED]>, Jason Tish <[REDACTED]>, Fred Mohs <[REDACTED]>, Kitty Rankin <[REDACTED]>, Franny Ingebritson <[REDACTED]>, Ledell Zellers <[REDACTED]>, Amy Scanlon <ascanlon@cityofmadison.com>, "John Strange" <jstrange@cityofmadison.com>, Leigh Mollenhoff <[REDACTED]>, John Martens <[REDACTED]>, "Erica Fox Gehrig" <[REDACTED]>, Anne Monks <amonks@cityofmadison.com>, Christina Slattery <[REDACTED]>, "Michael J. Rosenblum" <[REDACTED]>, Jason Fowler <[REDACTED]>, "David W. J. McLean" <[REDACTED]>, Marsha Rummel <district6@cityofmadison.com>, Shiva Bidar-Sielaff <district5@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Landmarks Ordinance revisions
Reply-To: Stu Levitan <[REDACTED]>

John

Ald. Bidar-Sielaff has forwarded your correspondence with the Regent neighborhood listserv, in which you assert that the draft ordinance which the

Landmarks Commission proposed was "considerably weaker" than the current ordinance, and that the Landmarks Ordinance Review Committee has been further weakening that draft. I take issue with your characterization of both the Commission's efforts and what LORC has done.

There are several areas in which the draft Ch.41 is a significant improvement over the current ordinance, starting with the separation of these provisions in a stand-alone chapter. The draft also clarifies and corrects several confusing terms and processes.

Contrary to your statement, the draft Purpose and Intent is more detailed and comprehensive than the current ordinance.

Contrary to your statement, the draft defines several critical terms and concepts which the current ordinance does not, such as "Demolition by Neglect."

Contrary to your statement, the draft materially improves the enforcement section through Subchapter E, relating to maintenance of landmarks, sites and districts.

Contrary to your statement, it is proper that the draft change "variance" to "waiver."

Contrary to your statement, it is entirely appropriate that the Common Council retain the authority to reverse or modify a Commission action. The Council is the parent body which represents the entire city. I believe the retention of the 2/3 vote necessary to reverse or modify a commission action ensures the Council will not take such action lightly.

Contrary to your statement, this draft is not something the development community "has been lobbying for." My impression of the work of the LORC is that the "development community" has been largely unsuccessful in materially weakening the draft.

After more than three years of effort working to improve this vital ordinance, I am sorry that you feel we have failed in that mission, and in fact have made things worse. But I stand by the work of the Commission, and support what the LORC has done as well.

Please feel free to convey any further questions or comments. And I would appreciate being copied on any further correspondence concerning the draft.

Yours,
Stu Levitan
Chair, Landmarks Commission