

**From:** Bidar-Sielaff, Shiva  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 07, 2011 10:49 AM  
**To:** Nan Fey  
**Cc:** Noonan, Katherine; Rummel, Marsha; Murphy, Brad; Scanlon, Amy; King, Steve; Schmidt, Chris  
**Subject:** Plan Commission: ordinance typo  
**Importance:** Low

Hi Nan,

Thank you for pointing to the typo. It is indeed a typo. It is also part of the paragraph that Alders Rummel and I would like to offer substitute language for based on the recommendation of the Landmarks Commission (which unfortunately still does not appear in Legistar). Here is the language Landmarks Commission recommended as the new paragraph for 33.19 (5)(i) 1 (changes from original version in red):

"1. Review proposed land divisions and subdivision plats of landmark sites and properties in Historic Districts to determine whether the proposed lot sizes negatively impact the historic character or significance of a landmark or **landmark site and whether the proposed lot sizes are compatible with adjacent lot sizes and maintain the general lot size pattern of the Historic District.** The Landmark Commission review shall be advisory to the Plan Commission."

I have asked ACA Noonan to possibly enter a substitute/vers. 2 into Legistar tomorrow AM and we can have copies for Plan Commissioners so the vote is taken on the substitute, which seems easiest to me but if that is not possible I will verbally ask PCers to hopefully include the new language recommended by Landmarks in a motion.

Sorry for all the confusion. Best, Shiva

Shiva Bidar-Sielaff  
District 5 Alder  
(608) 220-6986

---

From: Nan Fey [nef@nanfey.net]  
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2011 1:25 PM  
To: Rummel, Marsha; Bidar-Sielaff, Shiva  
Cc: Murphy, Brad; Noonan, Katherine  
Subject: Plan Commission: ordinance typo

Hi Marsha & Shiva,

While reviewing the proposed ordinance change concerning lot sizes in historic districts (Item #10 on our agenda for Monday, legistar 23204), I noticed that the text in Section 1 at the bottom of page 2 doesn't perfectly track the language reported in the "action text" from the Landmarks Commission and I thought I should call it to your, and staff's, attention prior to the meeting.

Landmarks said "significance of a landmark or landmark site" but the ordinance text says "landmark or landmarks site" (adding an "s" in the second phrase).

Thanks for your help sorting this out before the meeting on Monday.

Nan