

# MINUTES

City of Ypsilanti  
**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
Hybrid Meeting held in person and via Zoom

Tuesday, February 14, 2023 (approved 3/14/23)  
7:00 P.M.

## CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chairperson Pettit                      Video/telephone usage instructions given for potential attendees  
Meeting called to order at 7:02pm

Commissioners Present:              Alex Pettit – Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti  
James Chesnut – Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti  
James Ratzlaff – Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti  
Stefan Szumko – Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti

Commissioners Absent:              Delrhea Byrge – Washtenaw County, City of Ypsilanti

Staff Present:                              Ellen Thackery, Preservation Planner  
Christopher Jacobs, Planning Director, present for the public hearing

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ratzlaff: Noted that he would need to recuse himself from the 306 S Washington agenda item because he owns an adjacent property. Pettit noted that in that case, the commission will lose quorum on that item, so an agenda amendment will be necessary. 306 S Washington will need to be removed from this agenda and added to the next meeting's agenda.

Motion:                                      Szumko (second: Ratzlaff) moved to approve the agenda as amended.

Voice Vote - Ayes:      Commissioners Pettit, Szumko, Chesnut, Ratzlaff  
Nays:      None  
Motion carried.

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS, other than their agenda item and the public hearing item—**  
none

## PUBLIC HEARING

### 206-210 N Washington

*\*Proposed demolition of three-story apartment building and attached one-story addition; two historic outbuildings are to remain on site.*

First, chair asked **staff** to review the records received.

- Staff mentioned that the buildings were not considered contributing when the National Register nomination was written but staff at both the City and the County would consider them contributing now.
- The architect's and engineer's reports have been included in the packet. The architect found that there are significant issues with the building and likely many more that are unknown. The engineer concluded in 2022 that, in his opinion, the three-story tower is not a good candidate for structural rehabilitation.
- Staff reiterated that the two historic outbuildings are to remain standing, and staff shared the concern that these outbuildings need to be regularly maintained and used. The continued preservation of those outbuildings concerns staff.
- A site was included in the packet, and a more detailed site plan is available for viewing in the packet for the planning commission meeting 2/15. Staff offered to pull that up for viewing if anyone is interested.
- Staff suggested that public commenters might want to consider framing their comments for this commission (commission's purview includes the building's significance, whether a condition for a notice to proceed has been met, effect of the proposal on the historic district), and if their comments would be better shared with the planning commission, that meeting is 2/15/23 at 7 pm and comments can also be emailed to [handrews@cityofypsilanti.com](mailto:handrews@cityofypsilanti.com).
- Staff explained that the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Buildings* generally guide the work of the commission. Demolitions, however, are almost always outside those Standards and so, for demolitions, Commissions issue Notices to Proceed. At least one of the four criteria need to be met in order to issue a Notice to Proceed.
- Applicant would not be demolishing immediately; financing and environmental clearances will need to be obtained before demolition could occur.

Chair opened the public hearing about 7:10 pm and explained the procedures of the hearing.

Chair invited **applicant to present**.

Applicant: Avalon Housing, Inc. Present: Wendy Carty-Saxon, David Esau, Donald Wesley, and Aubrey Patino.

Carty-Saxon: Expressed appreciation for the commission's review of the proposed demolition and the opportunity to review the application with the commission last month. Mentioned that last month, commission expressed interest in receiving more detailed information about preservation vs new construction and Avalon provided that and that summary is in the packet.

- Reminded commission of the situation—vacant building, city took possession and issued an RFP for affordable housing and selected Avalon as the partner. At that time, the building was already blighted, hazardous, and not weathertight, and water damage from the fire further damaged the structure. For these reasons, the building is a hazard to public safety.
- Further, as Avalon investigated the site for affordable housing, it became clear that keeping the building would be inconsistent with providing quality affordable housing on site. After commissioning a structural engineering report and after the architect spending extensive time on the site, it became clear that demolition and a new building was the only way to accomplish the city's affordable housing goals. That understanding after due diligence is what supports the argument that preserving the building will be a deterrent to a major improvement program.
- The financial realities of redevelopment in this case made rehabilitation of the existing building for affordable housing impossible. The costs involved don't result in the necessary value. Avalon's

comparison of costs and results are included in the packet, and the comparison demonstrates undue financial hardship.

Given these findings and the fact that the city had chosen Avalon to provide affordable housing on site, Avalon chose these three grounds to justify the proposed demolition.

Commissioner questions/comments:

Szumko: Noticed the poor condition and varied nature of the additions. Commented that one of the sheds could perhaps be used for bike storage.

Ratzlaff: Question about environmental testing—is there asbestos in the building? Radon? Were there any environmental issues with the repair shop next door? Architect mentioned that there is likely asbestos and it would be managed appropriately before demolition. The building is so open to the elements that any radon is not being trapped and so radon tests are not accurate with the building as it is; a radon mitigation system, either active or passive depending on test results, would be installed in the new construction. Regarding the repair shop next door, applicants' recollection is that no environmental hazards were found related to that shop. A Phase I environmental assessment is underway now, a Phase II will be done as needed, and a previous assessment indicated no hazards from next door.

Chesnut: Clarified the new financial summary provided. Applicant explained that the summary looks at the cost per square foot as the same, but because rehabilitation would provide fewer units, the per unit cost is higher with rehab than with new construction. Additionally, with higher unit costs, the competitiveness of the application for affordable housing incentives is decreased. Commissioner expressed appreciation for the new information.

Chair opened the hearing to members of the public who are **in favor** of the application.

Amy Doyle, 210 S Washington: Ypsilanti residents since 1990/historic district residents since 1998. Reviewed the materials from last month, appreciated the history of the site, does not feel that the site in its current condition contributes to the neighborhood, is glad that Avalon will be doing the project, and supports the project.

Bob Doyle, 210 S Washington: landscape architect and a licensed residential builder. Found the structural report valuable. Sympathized with the building's dimensional issues and the building's challenges to create housing for all people. Loves old buildings, but the work proposed will be a real asset to the community.

Josh Warn, 715 Cornell: board president of Religious Action for Affordable Housing, which works to make housing more affordable and has worked with Avalon. The quality of work Avalon does and their supportive management at their properties, along with the proposal being a good fit for the community, are reasons he supports proposal. He thinks it would be worthwhile to honor the history of the building and architect, but doesn't think the building has to be left standing to achieve that.

Stefani Crouse, 271 Stevens Dr in Ypsilanti Twp: works at Circling Back Peer Support Network in the city and is working to support people experiencing homelessness and housing insecurity. Appreciates efforts being made by Avalon to preserve the heritage of area—perhaps design elements—that could

marry old with new. Affordable housing is the future—28% of city's residents are living at or below poverty level. We need to support these people so they can create history we'll want to preserve in the future.

Matthew Hoostal online supported these comments.

Barry LaRue, Oak Street: [online comment received by staff] He encouraged the stabilization and preservation of the outbuildings on site as the best-case scenario. He mentioned that if that is not possible, there is some precedent for allowing moving of buildings in order to save them. Perhaps Avalon would prorate the cost of moving the buildings if they cannot afford to maintain them on site. He has a large yard and would welcome the opportunity to work with Avalon on the preservation of at least one of the structures being moved to his yard.

Chair opened floor to people who **oppose** proposal.

Cheryl Farmer, 214 N Huron, since 1988: Serves on the Towner House Board, and the House was the flashpoint for the historic preservation movement in Ypsilanti. The fight to preserve this modest house indicates how Ypsilanti favors preservation of both modest and grand structures, and she supports the preservation of these outbuildings. Outbuildings help tell the story of the community and Ypsilanti has, unfortunately, lost many of them. She also expressed concern about the low number of parking spaces proposed. She indicated that she had thought the outbuildings were proposed to be demolished as part of the development and that 31 units would be built on site, but the proposed number is actually 22 units and the outbuildings are proposed to be preserved.

Chair opened floor to **questions** to which he would seek answers.

Staff Christopher Jacobs asked chair if the commissioners were aware that the outbuildings are proposed to be preserved and that the number of units is actually 22. Commission indicated they understood both of these facts.

Chesnut: asked for clarification on number of accessible units included in the 22 total units. Applicant and page 35 of packet explained that there will be 22 total units, and 6 of these will be accessible.

Chair checked with staff to see if there were any more people online who wanted to offer comments or questions; there were none and none in the room either.

Motion: Ratzlaff (second: Chesnut) moved to close the public hearing for this agenda item.

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Chesnut, Ratzlaff, Szumko

Nays: None

Absent: Commissioner Byrge

Motion carried.

Commissioner comments/deliberation:

- Szumko: reiterated that it is unfortunate that a structure was destroyed by fire and it is unfortunate that the costs now to rebuild it make a restoration infeasible.
- Chesnut: agreed that it would be difficult to let a historic resource go, but it is also a question of if this project doesn't go forward, how long might it be before another possibility develops? Feels that community is at a point where we can't let this building devolve/ self demolish any more. Appreciates the extra financial info applicant provided at his request.
- Ratzlaff: agrees. The Thompson Block, former Civil War barracks, were likely of a simpler, more solid and more cohesive design and construction. This building was not cohesive in its construction, and if left as is, nature will take over and demolish it and affect nearby buildings. In this case, there is a hazard to the safety of the community. Wants to get into the record that if a building is going to be demolished, it must be absolutely be in the best interests of the city. The city and country gained something of incredible value when the Thompson Block was rehabilitated after its fire. Wants to put it on record that a demolition decision is not made lightly.
- Chesnut: Wanted to get into the record that, with the preservation of the outbuildings, the applicant technically met the city's requirements and their burden of proof, in his opinion. Thanked everyone for their comments.
- Pettit: Thanked everyone for their feedback; the participation in the public hearing shows that the community cares and that this decision about what to do with this building is not a decision made in isolation—everything in the district is connected. There are two issues: the demolition and the new construction that will come after. The loss of this building is meaningful—it is a loss in the district. But perhaps this building was already lost, and it's important to remember that the district is a living, evolving thing. History is made all the time. Believes that this path is a constructive way forward. Thanked everyone again for all of the information.
- Motion: Szumko (second: Chesnut) moved to issue a Certificate of Approval for Demolition for Application PHDC 23-0002 and issue a notice to proceed for the demolition of both the three-story apartment building and one-story office wing at 206 to 210 N Washington. This application for a permit to demolish a resource within the Historic District has met all requirements of the Ypsilanti Historical Preservation Ordinance and the *Ypsilanti Historic District Commission Guidelines for the Consideration of Application for the Demolition or Moving of Structures within the Ypsilanti Historic District*. This approval to demolish is issued without reservation and shall become effective immediately. The Ypsilanti Building Department shall be authorized to issue a permit once Building Department requirements are met.

Roll Call Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Chesnut, Ratzlaff, Szumko  
Nays: None  
Absent: Commissioner Byrge  
Motion carried.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **201 E Cross, Unit 2**

*\*Vinyl windows that had been installed without proper permits now to be replaced with wood windows with aluminum cladding.*

Applicant: Judy Weinburger, homeowner, and attorney Alexander Berry-Santoro - present

Discussion: *Notes per Staff Review: The house has some nonhistoric windows on the first floor in the front. Applicant had installed four vinyl windows without permits. Applicant now is proposing to replace these vinyl windows with four wood windows with aluminum cladding. Please note that the application in the packet says the applicant wants to replace 3 windows—a later revised application is for four windows. The application before the commission tonight is actually for FOUR windows. This application had received an extension for commission action.*

Applicant: does not have anything to add; thinks there have been sufficient conversations and that the proposed windows now meet the guidelines.

Pettit: Clarified which “existing” windows were measured. Applicant clarified that the measurements were of the existing wood windows on the west side.

Chesnut: The math on the measurements seems to be not quite accurate, but the vertical measurements/proportions are most important in these windows to correct the filled-in nature and thickness at the sill that the vinyl windows currently have. Importantly, this material will be more in line with the Standards and guidelines.

Ratzlaff: Tries to prioritize material for the well-being of the building.

Pettit: Is the trim proposal here understandable to the commission?

Ratzlaff asked some clarifying questions. Pettit communicated that part of the trim question is due to the fact that the window trim will be installed on aluminum siding. It will not look like wood trim on a wood-sided house.

Two commissioners agreed that addressing the vertical proportion issues that the vinyl windows currently have will go a long way toward resolving the issue these vinyl windows currently exhibit.

Motion: Szumko (second: Chesnut) moved to approve Application PHDC 22-0025 as amended and issue a certificate of appropriateness for the installation of four Andersen E-series wood one-over-one windows with aluminum cladding at 201 E Cross because the proposed work meets Standard 9 and the accompanying and local guidelines in that:

- the windows that were in place near the southeast corner of the house were not historic or contributing windows;
- these proposed windows in these locations will not destroy historic material and they will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing;

- applicant has demonstrated that the four proposed windows will not reduce glass size, will have the same configuration, and will have the same trim as the previous windows in these openings;
- and the commission determined that one-over-one windows in the window openings near the southeast corner of the house in this case are more appropriate than the six-over-one wood windows the guidelines and Standards would usually require, since it is currently unknown if these window openings are original to the house.

Voice Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Chesnut, Ratzlaff, Szumko  
 Nays: None  
 Motion carried.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **306 S Washington**

*\*porch work; agenda item removed from this agenda for lack of quorum*

### **20-22 N Huron**

*\*installation of solar panels on roof*

*Staff report: Commercial building contributes to the district; building has a parapet on the front façade that will hide the solar panels on a flat or near-flat roof. Staff did not find that this proposal will have an impact on historic materials or historic character of the building.*

Discussion:

Applicant: Invites everyone to their art gallery—open every first Friday. They look forward to continuing to contribute to downtown.

Commissioners: No concerns; inverters not on primary façade. Typically a proposal like this is what the commission would approve.

Motion: Szumko (second: Chesnut) moved to approve application PHDC 23-0001 and issue a certificate of appropriateness for the rooftop installation of 30 solar panels at 20-22 N Huron St as proposed because the work meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, specifically Standards 2 and 9.

Voice Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Chesnut, Ratzlaff, Szumko  
 Nays: None  
 Motion carried.

### **520 N Huron**

*\*front door and proposed porch work*

*Staff report: There was some unpermitted work on the porch that resulted in a pressure-treated deck, railing, and posts. A stop work order was issued, an application was submitted that included the pressure-treated components, and staff requested a new application that would meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the local porch guidelines. That revised application was submitted and that is the one before*

*the commission now. Staff mentioned that she thinks there was a communications error. Staff had outlined to the applicant that because the porch deck is not over 30" from the ground, a porch guardrail is not strictly necessary. Staff believes the contractor took this to mean that the porch guardrails need to be 30" tall, but that is not the case. Staff spoke with the building inspector and, in this case, the porch guardrail could be installed where it originally was, where the top of the porch guardrail lines up with the bottom of the front windows. Written staff report discussed proposed front door briefly but staff did not mention the new proposed front door in the verbal report.*

Discussion:

Applicant: Applicant apologized; had recently bought the house and the house was not listed on MLS as being in a local historic district. Now wants to get everything right and in line with the City's ordinances.

Commissioners: Clarified that the applicant would be willing to install the porch at a height lower than 30" to restore the porch to its historic appearance. Applicant happy to do that—it had been a misunderstanding as to what the 30" referred to. Commission agreed that that restored lower porch height would be beneficial for the house and stated that they'd want to include that requirement in the motion. Applicant does not know exactly how tall the bottom of the window is, but the motion can mention the bottom of the front windows is the key to the height of the guardrail.

Chesnut: Clarified the lattice installation. If you removed the vertical paneling installed below the porch now, structurally, there would be a band joist and a small gap visible. Typically, the lattice would go below that band joist. One option could be that that band joist gets painted black so it disappears visually and the lattice and its framing gets installed over it. Or, the vertical skirting boards could stay in place but be cut open near the bottom for ventilation for the porch decking and the lattice could be installed over that ventilation. It is a small gap between the bottom of the joist and the ground. Summarizing for the applicant: ventilation here would be key, but as long as the installation ends up looking like the drawing, that would be approved. There are a couple ways to achieve those objectives. One method would be keeping the vertical boards in place, painting them black, cutting a ventilation slit/hole low below the structural members, and installing white lattice and framing over those boards. Another might be to remove the vertical skirting boards and ventilate the porch and then install the trim and lattice.

Motion: Ratzlaff (second: Chesnut), as long as the porch will be restored to its historic appearance in materials and railing height, moved to approve application PHDC 23-0004 and issue a certificate of appropriateness for proposed work at 520 N Huron, including a proposed wood front door replacement and new tapered porch posts, railings to historic height equal to the bottom of the front windows, and 1x4" tongue-and-groove decking, all in wood, because the proposed work meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 2 and 9, with the condition that the skirting of the porch will look like the drawing and will ventilate under the porch.

Voice Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Chesnut, Ratzlaff, Szumko  
Nays: None  
Motion carried.

## **76 N Huron**

*\*install three wood windows with aluminum cladding on the nonhistoric concrete block wall*



*Staff report: Staff summarized that the proposed windows will be in a nonhistoric wall and not visible from the ground. No historic materials or historic character will be impacted by the installation of these windows.*

Discussion:

Applicant: Windows were originally scheduled to be installed at Zingerman's in Ann Arbor at an addition in the local historic district but they were ordered incorrectly and so are available for the Art Center. They will add a lot of light to that space. These windows' head height will pretty much match the historic windows on the front of the building.

Commissioners: Didn't have much discussion or any questions.

Motion: Szumko (second: Chesnut) moved to approve application PHDC-23-0005 and issue a certificate of appropriateness for the proposed installation of three new wood, aluminum-clad windows in a non-original, cement block wall at the rear (east) of the Riverside Arts Center at 76 N Huron. The proposed work meets Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, Standard 9.

Voice Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Chesnut, Ratzlaff, Szumko  
Nays: None  
Motion carried.

## **220 S Huron**

*\*replacing rear window panels that look like French doors with aluminum-clad windows and French doors*

*Staff report: Commission has seen this proposed work a time or two before as study items. The proposed work is to mitigate a long-term water problem and to try to get the surfaces out of the water that drains against the house.*

Applicant: Charles Bultman, applicant. A couple open issues: needs about 200 bricks, his hope is to find some bricks and would want to show them to the commission once they're located.

Commissioners: The infill bricks should be complementary/compatible but it's appropriate that they would be differentiated. The commission has on occasion approved infilled windows. How does raising the interior floor impact the exterior? Applicant stated that it won't really, but there will be a new concrete curb under the new windows and doors and also a new gently sloped ramp/apron up to the new garage doors.

*[Discussed sections and how the vapor barrier and insulation will work on those new garage doors.]*

*[Discussed wood walkway behind house that creates a gutter and causes issues. Applicant does plan to remove it but doesn't know what will be below it.]*

Motion: Szumko (second: Ratzlaff) moved to approve application PHDC-0006 and issue a certificate of appropriateness for the proposed work at 220 S Huron Street, to include replacements of two overhead garage doors with custom-made wood carriage-style doors on the house's south side and replacements of two window panels with Marvin wood and aluminum-clad products on the house's west side. On the west side, one window panel will be replaced with windows and appropriate brick infill, and the other window panel will be replaced with French doors, and technical details are included on the plan. The proposed work meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, specifically Standards 2, 6, and 9.

Voice Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Chesnut, Ratzlaff, Szumko  
Nays: None

Motion carried.

## **STUDY ITEMS**

121 N Huron

Applicant: Doug Kisor

Discussion: Mr. Kisor described what he's proposing. The house had been expanded at some point and the original roof pitch of the porch can be seen, but at some point, stairs and a door were added to get access to what was a second-floor apartment. The storm door is aluminum and then the wood door behind it may not have been an exterior door. They'd like to change this non-original door out. Spoke with Ypsilanti Restoration and was told that he'd never get bricks to match to infill to return the door to a window. Instead, applicant is considering a long two-over-two casement window there, where they could step out in case of a fire onto the porch roof, since the only other stair is at the front of the house. New casement window would have a limestone sill like the other windows. He also proposed replacing three non-original one-over-one windows with two-over-twos to match the other windows on the house. Commission was receptive to all of these ideas. As long as brick moulds and insets all match existing, commission indicated that they thought the proposed was a good solution for some previous (likely 1950s) work that would not have met the Standards. Applicant will bring a proposal as an action item.

119 N Huron

Applicant: Doug Kisor

Discussion: This proposal would be for a new sign to hang from an existing bracket. Could be MDO but he thinks would likely be powder-coated aluminum. Thinks the square footage is within the zoning ordinance. Commissioner mentioned that the commission considers how the sign will be installed and how it will impact the historic building. In this case, the sign is freestanding and so does not directly impact the historic building. So the question becomes, does the sign have a negative impact on the character of the historic building or the neighborhood? The commission agreed that in this case the sign would not negatively affect the building or district.

Commission looks forward to reviewing these proposals as they were outlined here.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS—**

310 Maple: staff approved an asphalt roof for an asphalt roof.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Property Monitoring:

Staff still wrapping up enforcement and audit from 2022

Staff encouraged commissioners to use See Click Fix (<https://cityofypsilanti.com/506/Report-an-Issue>) to send staff property concerns. If it's indicated that the issue is in the "Historic District," it will come right to me.

Updates from Staff:

31 N Washington (current location of Déjà Vu) had been in court and the case is now settled. The contractor stopped by the office 2/13/23 and mentioned that the court settlement (staff received and will review) requires that the second floor must be made safe as a living quarters, and that will require asbestos abatement. Part of that will be window removal and replacement because the historic windows tested positive for asbestos. These second-floor historic wood windows are unique and are character-defining features of the building. Because the asbestos work needs to go forward and is expensive, contractor asked if staff could get administrative approval for replacement windows. Staff explained that we need excellent documentation on window conditions and all measurements and the measurements need to be specific. Staff asked commission if it would be possible for the commission to give staff administrative approval for replacement windows as long as sufficient documentation is submitted. Sufficient documentation would include measurements of all components of existing windows including sashes, glass, and muntins, and sufficient evidence that the proposed windows duplicate all measurements and match shadow lines, configurations, window inset/recess from the face of the brick, and mullions, and that the proposed materials are acceptable.

Motion: Chesnut moved ( Ratzlaff seconded) to approve staff administrative review and approval of the window application for 31 N Washington (the Déjà Vu building at the corner of Washington and Pearl), given the applicant provides detailed as-built drawings that include all measurements related to the windows in question for staff to review and determine whether that information is adequate for approval or determine whether the application needs to go before the whole commission for review.

Approval: voice votes, unanimous, motion carried.

218 N Washington: Ladies Literary Society/Foundation; handicapped ramp and porch were damaged by a car. Staff seeks ability to approve administratively the in-kind replacement of these non-historic features nonhistoric porch and ramp). Commission thought staff already had this approval ability, but approved this administrative review ability in the case of 218 N Washington just in case that administrative approval does not already exist. Staff has since confirmed (2/15/23) that it did already exist: staff has administrative approval of in-kind replacements of nonhistoric features, like detached HVAC units, rear egress stairs, etc.

Commissioner Comments

Historic District Perimeter Walk, 2/26, 10 am, meet at the Library, see YpsiReal website for more information.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**—none

## **HOUSEKEEPING BUSINESS**

### **1. Approval of the minutes of January 10, 2023**

Motion: Chesnut (second: Szumko) moved to approve the minutes of February 9, 2021, as submitted.

Voice Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Chesnut, Ratzlaff, Szumko

Nays: None.

Motion carried.

## **2. Approval of proposed HDC Annual Report and annual CLG report**

Staff: approval can be in one motion or two, but the commission receives two reports because the CLG program has a template we need to use for that report. Unless the City adopts the CLG format for this report, you will receive two reports to approve—one for the City/City Council, and one for the CLG program. You'll see that goals across both are similar: continued survey work, design guidelines if we need them (our Fact Sheets comprise our design guidelines), educational opportunities, and promoting the tax credit program for residential homeowners in 2023. Staff also believes that we need to systematize our enforcement so staff can better track it.

Commission: Will send resumes this week to submit with the CLG annual report, and if there are any goals to be added, commissioners will send them.

Motion: Ratzlaff (second: Chesnut) moved to approve the reports for both the CLG and the City annual reports for 2022, with the condition that additional goals may be added to them and the Downtown investment figures will be added to the CLG annual report.

Voice Vote - Ayes: Commissioners Pettit, Chesnut, Ratzlaff, Szumko  
Nays: None  
Motion carried.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Chairperson Pettit adjourned the meeting, citing the end of the agenda with no further items to discuss.

**MEETING ADJOURNED at 10:30 p.m.**

Full Minutes Prepared By: Ellen Thackery