
Recommendations for Naperville's Historic Preservation Ordinance and Commission

Unified Proposal Presented by the East Central Homeowners' Organization, North Central College, Naperville Heritage Society and the City of Naperville Planning Staff

A culmination of community discussion from November 2008 through April 2009.

Presented to the Naperville City Council on May 19, 2009.

Recommendations for Naperville’s Historic Preservation Ordinance and Commission

Table of Contents

- Introductory Memorandum..... 3
- Residents’ Concerns 4
- Soliciting Community Input..... 5
- Final Unified Recommendations.....6-8
 - Statement of Purpose 6
 - Designating Districts and Landmarks..... 6
 - Commission Composition and Responsibilities 7
 - Commission Meeting Location and Format..... 7
 - Procedural Recommendations 8
- Suggested Next Action Steps 9
- Community Feedback and Working Group Responses..... 10-12
- Appendix** 14-15
- Education and Training 14
- Ideas for Future Consideration 15



Naperville



**NORTH
CENTRAL
COLLEGE**
NAPERVILLE, ILLINOIS
Founded 1861



ECHO

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor George Pradel and City Council Members

FROM: Naperville Preservation “Working Group”:
Carol Schmidt and Susan Fitch, ECHO
Paul Loscheider and Alice Stonebraker, North Central College
Peggy Frank and Debbie Grinnell, Naperville Heritage Society
Suzanne Thorsen and Ying Liu, City of Naperville, T.E.D.

DATE: May 11, 2009

SUBJECT: Unified Recommendations for Revisions to the Naperville’s Historic Preservation Ordinance and Historic Sites Commission

Pursuant to the November 18, 2008 request from the Naperville City Council, representatives from the Naperville Heritage Society (NHS), East Central Homeowner’s Organization (ECHO), North Central College (NCC) and city staff (CON) met regularly to consider potential changes and prepare a unified recommendation as to the composition and mission of the Historic Sites Commission. We appreciated the extension beyond the original 90 day deadline in order to solicit as broad and comprehensive community feedback as possible.

The working group’s objective was to establish a consensus recommendation that supported maintaining the historic district, strengthened the city’s historic preservation ordinance, and sought the community’s buy-in. The attached recommendation

- Identifies residents’ issues regarding regulation of the historic district,
- Describes how and what community input was received,
- Details specific recommendations to improve the COA process for increased property owner satisfaction,
- Lists suggestions for continued education and training,
- Poses ideas and topics for future consideration, and
- Outlines next action steps.

The attached report is prepared and fully endorsed by all members of the working group on behalf of their representative organizations.

We look forward to responding to Council’s questions, and move forward in appropriately and effectively preserving Naperville’s historic architecture. It is our hope that a more streamlined, user-friendly process will encourage future landmark designations and proud and happy property owners within the historic district.

Concerns About Naperville's Current Preservation Ordinance

As reflected in feedback received through surveys, public testimony and discussion with community members, Naperville residents are interested in seeing the current historic district maintained and are potentially interested in new districts or additional landmarked properties. However, under the current practices of Naperville's existing Preservation Ordinance and Historic Sites Commission responsibilities, there are several concerns.

1. Property owners feel the current restrictions are onerous, prohibiting ease and economic reasonableness for normal and routine maintenance. There is the desire for expediency on minor issues while still retaining appropriate review processes.
2. There has been concern, by both property owners and city staff, of inconsistent interpretation and application of the existing ordinance and design guidelines. Strict interpretation of the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation is considered unrealistic for private property owners.
3. There is the need for more user-friendly check lists and processes, including a less intimidating and more professional format working with the Historic Sites Commission.
4. Property owners want more informative, educational, and useful guidance for property maintenance and/or renovation of their properties.
5. Proper education and ongoing training for staff and commissioners is lacking, and yet is essential to effectively administer the preservation ordinance.
6. Property owners and residents throughout the town want to see the current historic district's architectural and aesthetic character retained through reasonable and equitable standards.
7. The desire to "clean up" the existing ordinance and codify what has been in actual practice was deemed extremely important.

Soliciting Community Input to Develop the Recommendations

The working group was very conscientious in reaching out to both residents of the current historic district and the community at large. Numerous techniques were used to disseminate information and solicit input. All feedback was given thorough and serious consideration. Recognizing that consensus would not result in an outcome that is ideal for all participants, the overriding philosophy used to reach compromise and decisions with a unified consensus was that “everyone could live with it.”

Techniques Used to Communicate with the Public

- ▣ Email blasts (City-160 addresses, NHS-746 addresses, ECHO-70 addresses)
- ▣ Websites: City of Naperville, Naper Settlement, Triblocal, NCTV17, Positively Naperville, NAHC
- ▣ Direct mailing to historic district and landmark property owners
- ▣ WONC radio interview
- ▣ NAHC packet and announcement at the 4/18/09 meeting
- ▣ Naperville SUN press releases
- ▣ Public Notice Posters at Naperville train stations, public libraries and municipal center
- ▣ NCTV17 “Spotlight on Naperville” and PSA announcements
- ▣ Electronic City Notes

November-December 2008:

- ▣ Workshop with current HSC commissioners
- ▣ Public meeting with ECHO/Historic District residents
- ▣ Individual discussions with Councilmen
- ▣ Met with city staff
- ▣ Newspaper and electronic invitation to the full community to voice their concerns and ideas

January-April 2009:

- ▣ Working group met biweekly
- ▣ Suzanne Thorsen, Ying Liu and Debbie Grinnell met in between group meetings to prepare draft ideas for consideration
- ▣ Outside expertise was sought from the IL Historic Preservation Council, National Trust, Landmarks IL and other communities with successful ordinances and procedures for guidance and advice to understand current trends and best practices

February 2009:

- ▣ Revised Statement of Purpose was publicly distributed
- ▣ The revised statement served as a guide for the working group’s continued deliberations

March-April 2009:

- ▣ Preliminary recommendations shared publicly
- ▣ Two public open houses held
- ▣ Written and verbal feedback received from the public
- ▣ Final recommendations considered all feedback received

Final Unified Recommendations

Proposed Statement of Purpose for the City of Naperville's Historic Preservation Ordinance

This statement establishes the global direction, tone and purpose recommended to guide the City of Naperville's efforts towards historic preservation.

In acknowledgment that Naperville's historic architecture, districts and neighborhoods contribute to the community's economic well-being and development, the purpose of this chapter [of the municipal code] is to protect these valuable resources by:

1. Fostering civic pride through public education and enhanced awareness of Naperville's rich history as embodied in its architecture, neighborhoods and districts.
2. Preserving Naperville's heritage by proactively providing tools and oversight to identify and protect landmarks and historic districts.
3. Protecting neighborhood character by requiring that rehabilitations, renovations and new improvements are compatible in terms of scale, style, exterior features, building placement and site access.
4. Supporting property owners and property values for designated historic areas or landmarks by encouraging repair, rehabilitations and renovations that are compatible with their historic, architectural and aesthetic character.

Proposed Process for Designating New Historic Districts and Landmarks

CURRENT DISTRICT DESIGNATION:

- One historic district
- 10% of owners must consent to nomination of district

CURRENT LANDMARK DESIGNATION:

- 2 landmarks currently designated
- No owner consent required for designation

PROPOSED DISTRICT DESIGNATION:

- Maintain current historic district
- 10% of owners necessary to petition for a new district designation process to begin
- If 51% of owners opposed, no new district
- Commission responsible for managing district designation process

PROPOSED LANDMARK DESIGNATION:

- Maintain current landmarks
- Owner consent is preferable in consideration of landmark
- Maintain city ability to landmark without owner consent

Proposed Commission Composition & Responsibilities

Based on community feedback, it became apparent that renaming the commission to the Naperville Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) would more clearly communicate the intent for the commission to do more than just review COAs, but encourage a broader awareness of historic properties beyond the currently designated historic district.

While the hard work and volunteerism of past and current Historic Sites Commissioners is recognized and appreciated, it is recommended that a new commission be appointed to work under the revised ordinance with a different set of expectations of responsibilities.

CURRENT COMPOSITION:

9 voting members

- 1 Plan Commission Liaison
- 4+ district residents
- 1 downtown business owner
- 1 realtor
- 1 person experienced in architecture or design
- 1 historian or person with historical interests

PROPOSED COMPOSITION:

9 voting members

- 1 Plan Commission Liaison
- 4 district or landmark property owners or residents
- 4 residents at-large with demonstrated interest in related fields
- 1 non-voting member (Heritage Society)

PROPOSAL OF COMMISSIONERS RESPONSIBILITIES (BEYOND COA REVIEW)

Commissioners will work with City Planning Staff to oversee creation and implementation of:

- Historic Building Design Guidelines
- COA Application Form (user-friendly)
- COA Procedural Guidelines (user-friendly check list)
- Ongoing training and educational plan for staff, commissioners, realtors, residents
- Potential development of local financial incentives

Commissioners will be expected to assist in proactively reaching out to the community to:

- Create awareness of the value of historic preservation
- Educate about available financial incentives for preservation
- Oversee architectural surveys, identifying their purpose and frequency
- Ensure ongoing evaluation of process and outcomes for efficiency and effectiveness

Proposed Commission Meeting Location

In an effort to create a more comfortable environment for residents to present COA applications and questions to the Commission, the following recommendation is being made:

- Municipal Center Meeting Rooms
- U- Shaped Table set up with microphones
- Name cards for commissioners
- Test Period of 3-6 months

Public may participate by:

- Signing up in advance
- And/or when called on by the commission chair
- Side conversations will not be tolerated as they are disruptive to the meeting flow and make recording difficult

Procedural Recommendations

The **Certificate of Appropriateness** (COA) procedural guidelines for Historic District & Landmarked properties identify what type of home improvement would trigger one of three actions:

- No review or Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) required
- Administrative COA required – review and approval by city planning staff
- Naperville Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) COA required – review and approval by the commission
- COAs are limited to primary facades visible from the street (i.e. primary façade = front and side facades facing the street for corner properties)
- It is encouraged that minor appurtenances (i.e. satellite dishes, solar cells, wind turbines) be placed in obscure rear locations to retain the architectural integrity of the building as viewed from the street

The overall intent of the **Historic Building Design Guidelines** will be to serve as an educational document that encourages sympathetic maintenance and renovations consistent with the historic architectural style and character of the structure and scale of the existing neighborhood.

- These guidelines will not include procedural references, but rather be a heavily illustrated resource of the predominant Naperville architectural styles through the 20th century to serve as an educational tool providing design guidance for rehabilitation of historic structures.
- As the currently designated historic district is primarily residential, the first guidelines prepared will have a residential focus with later additions addressing additional building types.

COA SUMMARY OVERVIEW

NO COA or REVIEW REQUIRED	ADMINISTRATIVE COA	HPC COA	DEMOLITION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> New structure/addition not visible from street <input type="checkbox"/> Storm doors <input type="checkbox"/> Deck (rear or side) <input type="checkbox"/> Detached garages <input type="checkbox"/> Rear porch <input type="checkbox"/> Gutters <input type="checkbox"/> Landscaping <input type="checkbox"/> Painting (including color) <input type="checkbox"/> Window A/C Units and similar appurtenances <input type="checkbox"/> Routine Maintenance & Repair (including porches and doors if no change in materials) <input type="checkbox"/> Signs & Graphics (already covered in other city code) <input type="checkbox"/> Fencing, if wood or iron open picket facing the street <input type="checkbox"/> Driveways (retaining existing alley or street access) <input type="checkbox"/> Rear Yard Improvements <input type="checkbox"/> Siding – ordinary maintenance and repair of less than 50% of the primary facade 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Doors – in-kind replacement or use of wood or original materials <input type="checkbox"/> Windows – if using wood or aluminum-clad wood <input type="checkbox"/> Driveways – relocating existing street access no more than 5’ <input type="checkbox"/> Roofs – in-kind replacement; use of asphalt or reversion to original material <input type="checkbox"/> Siding – if replacing more than 50% of the primary façade; reverting to the original materials; or changing from wood to fiber cement board (i.e. hardi plank) <input type="checkbox"/> Porches – in-kind replacement or COLUMNS – Replacement with wood, plaster or cement FLOORING - Wood or trex-like materials OTHER PORCH COMPONENTS – Original or wood materials <input type="checkbox"/> Shutters & Awnings – in-kind replacement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Doors & Windows - change in style, opening, or any type of materials not listed in Administrative COA <input type="checkbox"/> Garage – if attached <input type="checkbox"/> Driveways – new or relocated street access <input type="checkbox"/> Roofs - Change in height, pitch, or replacing with material that is not original to the building or is not asphalt <input type="checkbox"/> Siding - Change in reveal/profile or use of materials not listed in Administrative COA <input type="checkbox"/> Porches - change in size, style, new enclosure or use of materials other than those listed in Administrative COA <input type="checkbox"/> Shutters & Awnings - change in size, style or new addition <input type="checkbox"/> Addition visible from street <input type="checkbox"/> Fencing - along street if anything other than wood or iron open picket <input type="checkbox"/> New principal structure 	<p>Primary Façade (front & street side for corner lot)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to COA Outline <p>Secondary Façade (not facing the street)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> No COA of any type if like or similar materials are being used <i>and</i> new work doesn’t protrude from the existing wall plane <input type="checkbox"/> HPC COA required if <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● removing an original feature visible from the street ● if new work will protrude from the existing wall plane or change the building height visible from the street <p>Tertiary Façade (rear portion)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> No COA of any type <input type="checkbox"/> If substantial demo, adequate bracing of the primary façade(s) insured by structural engineer <p>Full Demolition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> HPC COA required

Suggested Next Action Steps

There are numerous actions that would need to take place subsequent to City Council’s direction to implement the unified recommendations. Upon receipt of this report, the council should initiate amendments to the Municipal Code to modify the mission and composition of the Historic Sites Commission and direct the commission to interpret the current Preservation Ordinance in keeping with the intent of the unified recommendations. In addition, outlined below are the subsequent action steps identified by the working group. These steps, and potentially others, will need to be evaluated for prioritization and work load impact.*

1. Certificate of Appropriateness (COA):
1. A. Prepare the COA procedural guidelines including expected timeline for Administrative and HPC COA approvals.
1.B. Develop a user-friendly checklist identifying COA requirements.
1.C. Create a simple Administrative COA process including appropriate staff training for proper implementation.
1.D. Generate a regular Administrative COA reporting process to the HPC for information purposes.
2. Historic Building Design Guidelines:
2.A. Develop a comprehensive, Naperville-specific design manual guidelines in accordance with the unified recommendations.
3. Community Education and Outreach:
3.A. Initiate community education, publicity, and marketing awareness of the revised, streamlined procedures.
3.B. Develop an educational program for homeowners (both within the district and owners of historic properties outside the district) and realtors highlighting advantages to historic preservation.
3.C. Provide resources to property owners on existing state and federal tax incentive programs for historic preservation.
3.D. Prepare informational sheets for web posting and distribution to clarify key elements of Naperville’s Historic Preservation Ordinance, COA procedural guidelines and use of the historic building design guidelines.
4. Staff and Commissioner Training:
4.A. Join the appropriate organizations and develop a preservation resource library as outlined in the unified recommendations.
4.B. Develop an orientation program for new commissioners.
4.C. Create an annual and ongoing education and training program for commissioners.
4.D. Ensure the city’s practices for building permit review and inspections for historic properties are in accordance and consistent with the relevant approved COA.

* Following the Council’s endorsement of the unified recommendation and associated action steps, a work program will be established for implementation.

Progress related to implementation of the adopted recommendations will be communicated to the public through the use of the city’s website (<http://www.naperville.il.us/historicsites.aspx>) and e-News.

Community Feedback And Working Group Responses

The recommendations of the working group were well-received by the community, and ECHO residents in particular. While residents who provided verbal or written comments generally felt that the vast majority of concerns were addressed in the recommendations, the working group received specific comments on several areas of the recommendations. Based on community response, the preliminary recommendations were re-examined resulting in a few changes being incorporated into the final unified recommendations. The areas of consideration and the working group’s responses are highlighted below.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Statement of Purpose:

- ☐ Change the word “regulate” to “protect” in the 2nd bullet of the purpose statement.

Working Group Response:

- ☐ Incorporated the change as suggested.

GARAGES

Community Feedback:

- ☐ Mixed reaction to exempting garages from COA review.
- ☐ Agreed on the need for flexibility to make garages functional for contemporary use.
- ☐ Agreed to retain detached garages and rear alley access to maintain the neighborhood’s historic appropriateness.
- ☐ Some advocated a COA review on the aesthetics of garage modifications and new garages.

Working Group Response:

- ☐ Photographed and reviewed all 16 garages deemed “significant” or “potentially significant” in the historic survey.
- ☐ Garages (size, placement) are already well controlled by city zoning codes.
- ☐ Previous community input indicated a preference to exempt things not visible from the street from COA review.
- ☐ Feedback expressed aesthetic preferences rather than preservation-related concerns.
- ☐ Agreed to address architectural compatibility of garages in the design guidelines.
- ☐ The HPC should continue monitoring garages to determine if COA review is needed.

COMMISSION SIZE AND COMPOSITION

Community Feedback:

- ☐ Mixed reaction to how many residents of the historic district should have seats on the new commission.
- ☐ Recognized past challenges in recruiting qualified commissioners and a lack of interest from outside of the historic district to serve on the commission.
- ☐ Some feel that the recommended number of residents on the commission is appropriate.
- ☐ Some are interested in having more than 4 district residents on the commission because they understand the challenges.
- ☐ Some suggested a smaller size commission.

Working Group Response:

- ☐ Stayed with recommending 4 district residents on the commission.
- ☐ Felt commissioners living outside of a district helps provide advocacy throughout the community and illustrates the value of historic preservation beyond that assumed by district property owners.
- ☐ Stayed with recommending nine voting members that are consistent with the majority of other city boards and commissions.
- ☐ Felt that a seven member commission could result in a tie vote in COA decisions (quorum = 4 people).

Community Feedback And Working Group Responses (cont.)

FENCES

Community Feedback:

- ▣ Some felt that fences should be subject to a COA review, including on interior lot lines.
- ▣ Expressed concern about chain link and privacy fences visible from front and corner sides.

Working Group Response:

- ▣ Modified recommendation to require COA review for fences facing the street or along a sidewalk if other than open wood or iron picket.
- ▣ Determined that interior fences are already addressed in the city code.
- ▣ Recommended addressing appropriate fence style in the design guidelines.

DISTRICT DESIGNATION AND DISSOLUTION

Community Feedback:

- ▣ Sought clarification if the recommended process for district designation was in reference to new districts.
- ▣ A resident would like to see provision for dissolution of a district.

Working Group Response:

- ▣ Clarified that the recommended process addressed NEW district designation.
- ▣ The current ordinance is silent on dissolution of a district. The working group felt it should remain that way.

WINDOW AIR CONDITIONERS

Community Feedback:

- ▣ A resident suggested requiring window air conditioners to have an administrative COA.

Working Group Response:

- ▣ Agreed to have the design guidelines suggest window air conditioners be placed on the secondary and tertiary facades.
- ▣ Did not feel this temporary equipment warranted requiring any type of COA since it was not a permanent change to the building.

DEMOLITION

Community Feedback:

- ▣ A suggestion to require a COA for any type of demolition, including removal of a portion of the house.

Working Group Response:

- ▣ General public feedback was strong that tighter restrictions than those recommended would inhibit adaptation to contemporary needs.

NAME OF COA (CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS) AND COMMISSION

Community Feedback:

- ▣ A couple residents thought it might be advantageous to start from scratch with a new name/acronym for COA.
- ▣ Preliminary recommendation was for the Naperville Preservation Commission (NPC), but concern was voiced that it may be confused with the Naperville Plan Commission.

Working Group Response:

- ▣ After consideration of several ideas, it was decided to defer this suggestion for a new name/acronym for COA to the new commission.
- ▣ Agreed to recommend the Historic Preservation Commission, with the acronym of HPC.

Community Feedback And Working Group Responses (cont.)

WINDOWS

Community Feedback:

- ▣ Question of impact replacement would have on qualifying for state or federal tax incentives.

Working Group Response:

- ▣ Modified recommendations to eliminate vinyl-clad windows per guidance from the National Trust, National Park Service and IHPA.
- ▣ Recommended stating in design guidelines that state and federal tax incentives may be jeopardized if windows are replaced unless the originals are “well beyond repair.”

DEMOLITION STRUCTURAL REVIEW

Community Feedback:

- ▣ A resident suggested the option of an architect to provide structural evaluation for demolition purposes.

Working Group Response:

- ▣ Based on past experiences, the working group felt a structural engineer was the most prudent and appropriate requirement.

PROPERTY RIGHTS

Community Feedback:

- ▣ A resident indicated personal preference for property rights over any type of historic preservation governance.

Working Group Response:

- ▣ Only one individual cited this concern throughout the public input process.

COA Signage

Community Feedback:

- ▣ A resident suggested requiring people who applied for a COA to post a drawing of their proposed change in their front yard.

Working Group Response:

- ▣ Concern that a rendering might be expensive; the working group instead suggests the city loan a generic yard sign to COA applicants to post stating the date of the upcoming commission meeting at which their project will be discussed.

Appendix

Suggestions for Education and Training

It is strongly recommended that the City allocate the time and financial resources to ensure that city staff and historic preservation commissioners are properly trained and receive ongoing education for the effective application of the preservation ordinance and COA process. The commitment to ongoing training and professional development will ensure ability to stay abreast of best practices, changing trends and network with others facing similar challenges. It will also provide the vehicle in which to better communicate and educate the residents as to appropriate care of historic properties. Listed below are preliminary ideas generated by the working group. These need to be evaluated, prioritized and considered as funding permits.

Commissioner & Community Workshops:

Workshops, such as these, may be conducted for the commission and residents.

- ▣ Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA) training program for new commissioners.
- ▣ Adjacent communities can be invited to share sample materials, programs, processes and success stories.
- ▣ Landmarks Illinois and National Trust for Historic Preservation's Chicago Office may offer training on the value and benefits of historic preservation.
- ▣ Unified Recommendation: An overview of processes and practices
- ▣ History of Preservation in Naperville
- ▣ Tax Benefits and Financial Incentives
- ▣ Architectural Surveys
- ▣ 20th century or recent past architecture
- ▣ Mechanics of rehabilitation – windows, siding, doors, roof, porches, etc
- ▣ Building Relationships with other Preservation Organizations
- ▣ Basis of property tax assessments (with township assessor)
- ▣ "Marketing" the District and Preservation in Naperville

Institutional Memberships:

The City of Naperville currently holds membership in the National Trust for Historic Preservation and Illinois Association of Preservation Commissions. The benefit of the City's membership in the following additional organizations should be evaluated for community and professional growth:

- ▣ Landmarks Illinois (\$20)
- ▣ National Alliance for Preservation Commissions (\$130)
- ▣ Preservation Action (\$55)
- ▣ Suburban Preservation Alliance (free)

Preservation Resource Library:

The preservation resource library can be utilized for commissioner training, community workshops and internal reference on an ongoing basis. Some basics are listed below.

- ▣ IHPA DVD Series (\$30)
 - Residential Architectural Styles in Illinois
 - Windows: Preservation Treatments
 - The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation: Interpretation & Application
- ▣ National Trust Publications (\$150 for one set)
 - Basic Preservation: What Every Board Member Needs to Know
 - Design Review In Historic Districts
 - Historic Building Facades: The Manual for Maintenance and Rehabilitation
 - Getting to Know Your 20th Century Neighborhood
 - A Self-Assessment Guide for Local Preservation Commissions

Conferences & Seminars:

Attendance at local seminars and conferences should be evaluated for community and professional benefit in light of financial impact. National Trust conferences may be worth considering in the future. The following local conferences are scheduled for 2009:

- ▣ IHPA Certified Local Government Conference Fall 2009 in Quincy, IL
- ▣ Upper Midwest Preservation Conference September 24-26, 2009, Chicago

Ideas for Future Consideration by the Naperville Historic Preservation Commission

Several good ideas were brought forth by community members that the working group felt deserved continued deliberation. However, they were not fully evaluated by the working group and not considered to be of a priority nature for the current evaluation. Rather than losing sight of these suggestions, they are listed here for future consideration.

Areas for future consideration:

- ▣ Ongoing communication techniques with historic district residents and the community at large.
- ▣ Role of “green” enhancements to historic properties.
- ▣ Evaluation of the potential use of “recycled” or “salvaged” materials in historic properties.
- ▣ Annual evaluation of the Commission’s performance and resident satisfaction with the COA process.
- ▣ Ongoing evaluation of the Preservation Ordinance, COA procedural guidelines and historic building design guidelines to insure they remain responsive to the community’s needs.
- ▣ Submit grant applications through CLG and other sources to support workshops, training, educational outreach, recognition programs and more.
- ▣ Utilization of federal or state pass-through funds for maintenance, weatherization, etc.
- ▣ Aligning preservation issues, where appropriate, with other strategic initiatives identified annually by the City Council.
- ▣ Development of a potential local financial incentive program for improvements, green initiatives, maintenance, weatherization, etc.
- ▣ As warranted, studying property value analysis in the historic district as compared to other neighborhoods.