

**Wadsworth House
2841 W. Richardson Pl.**

Reasons to Oppose Demolition

- 1. Demolition will remove a property from the tax roll. Assessed value in 2006=\$84,000.00 (The house was on the tax roll when it was last occupied in 2006 prior to Neighborhood House acquiring the property)
- 2. Demolition is contrary to the Near West Side Comprehensive Plan (approved 5/13/04); to wit:

A. "OVERALL LAND USE STRATEGY

Redevelopment Strategies, (p. 46)

Consider historic buildings, sites and districts as valuable irreplaceable assets to be used as key pieces of larger redevelopment efforts. For rehab or additions, maintain historic character of the existing buildings whenever possible."

Protect historic buildings so their eventual redevelopment potential can be realized...."

B. "RESIDENTIAL

Redevelopment Strategies (p. 49)

Acquisition/demolition/rehab

Encourage conservation of existing structures along with infill housing. Renovation is preferred over demolition."

Discourage demolition of residential units for the purpose of building surface parking lots. (Emphasis added)."

C. "COMMERCIAL

Redevelopment Strategies (p. 52)

Demolition/rehab/infill

Discourage residential demolition for building commercial surface parking lots.”

3. The vast majority of owner-occupants in the Concordia Historic District oppose demolition.
4. Historic Concordia Neighbors, Inc., (the local neighborhood organization) is opposed to demolition.
5. This demolition would represent the first demolition of an historic property since the Historic District was created in 1989.
6. The current condition of the property is the result of the current owner’s neglect. The property was occupied more or less continuously until the current owner acquired the property in 2006.
7. The owner/appellant’s June 19, 2008 letter supporting their appeal provides an incomplete quotation of the legal standard of review—they omit the last phrase highlighted below. Ch. 308-81-9-f provides in pertinent part as follows:

After a public hearing, the council may, by vote of 2/3 of its members, reverse or modify the decision of the commission if, after balancing the interest of the public in preserving the subject property and the interest of the owner in using it for his or her own purposes, the council finds that, owing to special conditions pertaining to the specific piece of property, failure to grant the certificate of appropriateness will preclude any and all reasonable use of the property and/or will cause serious hardship for the owner, *provided that any self-created hardship shall not be a basis for reversal of (sic) modification of the commission’s decision.* (Emphasis added).

I urge you vote to affirm the decision of the Historic Preservation Commission.

Robert J. Bauman
Alderman, 4th District