



# TOWN OF JEROME

POST OFFICE BOX 335, JEROME, ARIZONA (928) 634-7943

## Regular Meeting of the Town of Jerome DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Tuesday, January 24, 2023, 6:00 pm

Via ZOOM  
MINUTES

### 6:17 (0:02) Item 1: Call to Order/Roll Call

Vice Chair Tyler Christensen called the meeting to order at 6:17 p.m.

Deputy Town Clerk Kristen Muenz called the roll. Present were Vice Chair Christensen and Board members John McDonald, Mimi Romberger, and Carol Wittner. Chari Brice Wood experienced technical difficulties but was able to join the meeting at 6:24 p.m.

Staff present included Zoning Administrator Will Blodgett and Deputy Clerk Muenz.

Members of the public present included Scott Hudson of Copperstar Remodeling and Mac, a Contractor of Crested Construction.

### 6:18 (0:53) Item 2: Petitions from the public – There were no petitions from the public.

#### Possible Direction to Staff

### 6:18 (1:01) Item 3: Approval of Minutes: Minutes from the regular meeting of Tuesday, November 25, 2022.

#### Discussion/Possible Action

#### Motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of November 25, 2022

BOARD MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
CHRISTENSEN			X			
MCDONALD	X		X			
ROMBERGER		X	X			
WITTNER			X			
WOOD					X	

#### Continued Items/Old Business:

#### No Items

(1:41) Before discussing Item #4, Mr. Christensen said he would like to make a motion to move Item #8 up on the agenda, taking place after item numbers 4, 5, and 6.

#### Motion to move up Item #8 on the agenda to take place after Item #6

BOARD MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
CHRISTENSEN	X		X			
MCDONALD		X	X			
ROMBERGER			X			
WITTNER			X			
WOOD				X		

#### New Business:

### 6:20 (2:25) Item 4: Seeking Approval for New Signage

Applicant/Owner: Lizabeth Lord / Flagg Properties

Zone: C-1

Address: 405 Hull Avenue

APN: 401-06-020

Applicant is seeking approval to install a new projecting-hanging sign for the opening of their new business.

#### Discussion/Possible Action

Vice Chair Christensen introduced the item: new signage by applicant Lizabeth Lord in the C-1 zone.

Zoning Administrator Will Blodgett explained it is a new business going into the location at 405 Hull Avenue that was previously the Rickeldoris candy shop. The applicants are seeking approval to install a projecting sign and a window sign, which our ZO calls a wall sign. He said the wall sign will be applied to the main window of the façade; it will be professionally designed and printed, and the graphic is shown in packet. It will be a vinyl decal with the dimensions of 5.3 ft by 2.3 ft, a total of 12 sf, which is well within the maximum of 16 sf. The 2nd sign, a projected hanging sign, will be laser cut MDF wood with the dimensions of 3 ft by 3ft, 9 sf of surface, which is also well under the 16 sf max. Pictures of the building show a photoshopped image of the window sign in relation to the windows. They also photoshopped an image of the projecting sign in place, utilizing the existing sign mount. Mr. Blodgett asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Christensen asked, looking at the image of the single-word window sign imposed over the mullioned window, if the "ghost" will be on one side of the window and "flower" on the other.

Mr. Blodgett said that the applicant had not given him that specific information. Mr. Blodgett asked if anyone was present on behalf of the item but he applicant was not present at the meeting.

Mr. Christensen said his other question was regarding to second sign. If it was wood, would it be a vinyl decal on top of the wood?

Mr. Blodgett replied that he believed it would be a vinyl decal applied to the wood and sealed.

Mr. Christensen asked if it would be possible to get some clarification on how exactly the window decal would be divided amongst the panes. He said that if they must cut it in half, it looked like it would be okay.

(6:24) At this point in the meeting, Chair Brice Wood was able to join.

Chair Wood said he had a question. He said that it looks like the window facing the street has a mullion and the graphic goes right over it. He asked, how does that work?

Mr. Christensen explained that he had the same question, and the applicant was not present. We assume the word would be divided in two, but do not have a final answer on that.

Mr. Wood said he had concerns about the stability of the projecting sign because it can be windy in that location and wanted to know if the applicants had taken that into account.

Mr. Blodgett responded that the existing mount was previously in use; if the previous sign did not have any issues, there shouldn't be problems with this one. He added that nature can take its course and we can adjust it needed.

Board member Carol Wittner asked if we should wait until we receive more information.

Mr. Wood replied that we can table items, and wait for input from the applicant.

Ms. Wittner asked if that was what Mr. Wood would like, and he said that we should table this.

**Motion to table the item for clarification on the placement of the window sign**

BOARD MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
CHRISTENSEN			X			
MCDONALD			X			
ROMBERGER			X			
WITTNER		X	X			
WOOD	X		X			

**6:28 (10:42) Item 5: Seeking Approval for new Garden Signage**

Applicant/Owner: Town of Jerome

Zone: C-1

Address: 301 Hull Avenue

APN: 401-06-015

Applicant is seeking approval to post a permanent garden sign in the Town of Jerome community garden.

**Discussion/Possible Action**

Mr. Christensen introduce the item, a new sign in the C-1 zone, and said with the applicant being the Town of Jerome, he assumed this was a courtesy review.

Mr. Blodgett confirmed the sign was for the community garden, and as he was not certain the garden had its own organization, he filed the application for review under the Town of Jerome. He said that if you look at the image in the packet, you will see a beautiful sign created by Mimi Romberger. Mr. Blodgett said there were two proposed locations for mounting the sign. One option is to mount on a shed that has yet to be approved, but there is intention to place a shed there. The other option would be to mount it on the fence. The dimensions are well within the max square footage requirements of the ZO. He also explained that it is not fully a rectangle, because of the corner containing the image of a bird.

As the creator of the sign, Board member Mimi Romberger explained that she had used wood that she had on hand, that is why she put the bird in there for fun. She said it has been sealed with 3 coats of water sealant on both sides and it was of 3/4-inch plywood painted with acrylic.

Mr. Christensen commented that it looked good, and he liked it.

Ms. Wittner said she loved the sign and thought it looked great.

Mr. Blodgett asked if there were any questions or comments.

In reference to location, Mr. Christensen said he would prefer it mounted on the fence, he felt that would be more visible.

Ms. Wittner responded that she agreed.

Mr. Christensen asked if the other board members agreed and Mr. Wood replied, yes.

Ms. Romberger said that she personally preferred the fence as well.

Mr. Christensen asked if there was a motion.

Board member John McDonald made motion to approve the sign as presented at to mount it on the fence.

Ms. Romberger asked to abstain from the vote because she had created the sign.

**Motion to approve the new Garden Sign as presented with recommendation to mount on the fence**

BOARD MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
CHRISTENSEN			X			
MCDONALD	X		X			
ROMBERGER						X
WITTNER		X	X			
WOOD			X			

**6:32 (15:19) Item 6: Seeking Approval for new Garden Tool Shed.**

Applicant/Owner: Town of Jerome

Zone: C-1

Address:301 Hull Avenue

APN: 401-06-015

Applicant is seeking approval to build a tool shed for the Town of Jerome community garden.

**Discussion/Possible Action**

Mr. Christensen introduced Item #6 and said that the applicant is the Town of Jerome, and this will be a courtesy review. The applicant is seeking approval to build a new shed for the community garden.

Mr. Blodgett explained that the previous Zoning Administrator had been working with a resident to come up with designs for a shed, but this was not that shed. This is prefabricated shed, akin to a vinyl shed for an average yard. He said that he does have the first shed paperwork and designs, but he did not include them in the packet because this is what was presented to him by Councilmember Sage Harvey. So, there is an alternative option if this not approved. This shed is 8 ft by 4 ft and is called a lean-to style. It comes with a foundation, but it must be assembled. Mr. Blodgett explained the purpose of the shed would be to secure tools and equipment intended to be used in the community garden.

Mr. Christensen said he was curious about to know what the foundation was made of.

Mr. Blodgett said that it looks like an aluminum frame that you drop particle board into, but he can't confirm that from the specs.

Mr. Christensen said that he had also looked at the specs and the main thing that caught his eye is that the product weight was 126 pounds. He asked if we knew the cost of the shed.

Mr. Blodgett responded that he did not know.

Mimi Romberger said that she believed the cost was under \$1,000.

Mr. Christensen continued, the material is vinyl, the weight is 100-plus pounds, everything is made of plastic, including the roof. Looking at pictures of the door, and having assembled similar sheds in the past, he would say it is not a secure shed and is probably vulnerable to vandalism. He commented that if he was motivated, he could see pulling the door hard enough to open, even with a locking mechanism. He said he felt it would also be possible to pry the walls apart.

Mr. Blodgett asked, if the Board would like to table the item, if we would like to have him add the information for the design of the other shed.

Ms. Wittner replied that she thought we should do that.

Mr. Christensen said that he does like the lean-to style, except for the materials, the weight, and the fact that it doesn't seem secure. He thought that plastic would not fit in that area and if it were wood or metal, or a combination of those two, it would be much better. Also, though it is described as wind resistant up to 100 mph, he could not help but feel it could be torn apart. If it was okay with the Board, he would like to make a motion to table the item and request other options.

Ms. Wittner said she would second that.

Jerome resident Mark Krmpotich said we should look into having a concrete pad. Because of the weather here, he said a shed should be bolted onto a concrete pad.

Ms. Wittner replied to Mr. Krmpotich that she agreed.

Ms. Muenz asked to add a comment from personal experience. She said without a level foundation, the doors will not stay shut on a vinyl shed.

Mr. Krmpotich responded that would be the reason for a concrete pad, with metal anchors, for whatever design we have.

Mr. Christensen agreed that it did not seem strong enough.

**Motion to table the item with direction to staff to gather information on a second option**

BOARD MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
CHRISTENSEN	X		X			
MCDONALD			X			
ROMBERGER			X			
WITTNER		X	X			
WOOD			X			

**6:43 (26:13) Item 7: Seeking Approval for Demolition permit for the historic "Tamale Lady's House".**

Applicant/Owner: Crested Construction / McWhirter Robert James & Huerta Maria Regina Trust.

Zone: R1-5

Address: 21 North Drive

APN: 401-11-008

Applicant is seeking approval to demolish the house at

**Discussion/Possible Action**

Mr. Christensen introduced Item #7, an application to demolish a house. He asked Mr. Blodgett for an update.

First, Mr. Blodgett wanted the board to know that Building Inspector Barry Wolstencroft wished to take part in the meeting but had been unable to. He went on to explain that the Tamale Ladies house, while historic, is falling apart and is proving to be a health, safety, and fire hazard. Fire Chief Blair and Barry Wolstencroft both agreed that it poses those risks; in fact, many months ago, he and Mr. Wolstencroft talked about recommending condemnation for the building. He said the property owners reached out through the contractor, Mac, and asked that the property be demolished and then rebuilt. Mr. Blodgett said that he did not believe it would be rebuilt to the Federal requirements of a reconstruction; however, those designs have yet to be made and they are proceeding one step at a time. As it is, there is very little that is salvageable, perhaps some exterior treatments that could be used for the façade and maybe décor. Mr. Blodgett acknowledged that the house itself is famous. He said he looked, but did not find a property inventory survey from the Arizona Historic Properties for that building, so he and Scott from the Historic Society have discussed this and, if one is not found, he will make one. He said that he has already gathered some basic information and photographs of the exterior of the building and will continue to do so as the demolition progresses, which from what he understands will be more of a methodical dismantling. He asked Mac if that was correct.

Mac, the contractor representing the project, replied that it will be as safe as they can do it.

Mr. Blodgett added that Mac has kindly agreed to allow him to gather more information and historic date so that he can get all the historic gather he can gather for archaeological record standards. He said we will know open the item for discussion.

Ms. Wittner said it breaks my heart to see that building go down, especially with the history and the Tamale Ladies. She said she understands

what is going on, but it is a heartbreaker.

Mr. Wood said that he agreed with Ms. Wittner. He said we are a national historic monument, we are supposed to preserve things, not tear them down. This building was occupied recently, that it isn't on the historic survey is irrelevant, we know the people who lived there. Mr. Wood said that what he would like to do is table this progress so that we can have some other considerations. One of which, is that he would like to see what is going to be put in its place, if that is what happens. Also, he would like time for the community to hear about this. He said this will be a big issue in town, we are historic, so this is not trivial; we need further information about what will happen. He said we need drawings. This is one of a dozen buildings in Jerome, and Mr. Wood said that he has seen worse restored, fixed up, and made livable. He expressed amazement that Chief Blair said it was a hazard. He would like to put this off until we know more of what the plan is. It is easy to destroy something, if that is what we are going to do, but it is not that easy to put something in that will look appropriate for our historic town.

Mr. Blodgett briefly responded that, in terms of the final building that is going to be there, it shouldn't weigh-in with our decision at this point. Technically, if the property owner was worried about the fire and health hazard, they could demolish it simply to remove the liability the building is accruing without ever replacing it, and they would be well within their legal rights to do so.

Mr. Wood said that obviously we are having this discussion because you need a permit to demolish a building.

Mr. Blodgett answered, yes sir.

Mr. Wood continued by saying the fact that they, through neglect, have been demolishing this building is perhaps something we should look at; this is irresponsible. He said that he does not understand it being "non historic."

Mr. Blodgett replied that we are not saying it is not historic, we are just saying the record is not there, so we are going to rectify that. He said that he understands it has great local, cultural significance, that is not lost on him, but from planning perspective, and the health and safety perspective, these are things he must consider. Even though we are a federally protected archaeological district, historic buildings and archaeology do not have to be in a time capsule. If something needs to be destroyed all it means is that there are requirements for data collection and gathering so that the information survives. As long as we follow all the requirements from a historical perspective, as heartbreaking as it is, they are well within their legal rights to demolish the building and even leave a vacant lot simply to remove their liability. Mr. Blodgett said that the time for it to have been rehabbed was probably 10 or 15 years ago. As to the particulars of how bad the interior is, Mac could probably give you a better description. Mac said that the whole objective is to rebuild the structure. Externally it will be redone with metal very similar to what is there. He explained that it can't be exact because that metal is not made anymore, but it will be wrapped in metal and structurally almost a replicate. From talking to the homeowners, he understands it will be just a little bigger and still multilevel. He said structurally, the building is not sound. He said he has been in it a few times, and is not sure how to structurally support it in a manner to leave it all there and rebuild it like he has on a Center Street house. He can't figure out a way to do it without someone getting hurt, because everything is so rotted, and worn out, it is not safe at all.

Mr. Christensen thanked Mac, and said he had a couple of questions for Will Blodgett. He read from a portion of the Property Standards, subsection B, that the Design Review Board can postpone for up to a permit for up to 180 days. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Blodgett said that is correct.

Mr. Christensen said that he thinks we should take full advantage of that time. This board would like to see multiple things, and what he would like to see in writing from the Fire Chief and Building Inspector, the fire hazard, and structural problems, so that it is on the record. Also, depending on how appropriate it is, a letter of intent from the contractor or owners. We would like to see some drawing of what this building will look like.

Mr. Blodgett commented that we need to be careful, we are reaching too far with that requirement on this aspect. We cannot take into account what they are going to do in the future for this particular consideration because the projects are not connected at this time.

Mr. Wood asked to speak. He said that in 1979, he bought the Rosie Salas House above Main Street. That house was condemned, and he bought it for \$10,000. It had been saved through community action; it was due to be torn down and enough people from Jerome took action that they could not do that. He suggested that could be another possibility, and said that house had at least the structural issues you see here. It was a lot of work, but it is a perfectly good house that was the piano teacher's house in those days. This was the Tamale Ladies' house; these things have history. He said he has seen restoration for worse. Mr. Wood said we need to see what the plan is.

Ms. Wittner said she also agreed with that, we should see more.

Mr. Christensen said we definitely want more details. He knows we cannot go into full plans, drawings, and numbers but he would like to know what the materials will look like, how many stories will it be, and how much bigger in square footage by percentage.

Mr. Blodgett responded that the problem is, while that might be the intention of the homeowner in the end, the project that is in front of us, legally, is the demolition. We need to keep our minds focused on the fact that this is the legal issue in front of us and that the new construction, as a separate project, is not in front of us yet, so we can't consider it at this point. We need to talk about the demolition and whether we want to allow it to proceed or whether we want delay it and what we would like to see happen if it was delayed. Mr. Blodgett explained that we must stay narrowly focused on this.

Ms. Wittner said she does not think we should demolish the building yet.

Mr. Christensen agreed, and said he would like to see, in writing from the Fire Chief and Building Inspector, so we have it on record, and it is not just word of mouth. We would like to take all steps at our disposal to delay demolition and make sure we are doing our due diligence to preserve as much as we can.

To which, Ms. Wittner said yes. She asked, should we make a motion?

The contractor, Mac, said what he does know is that the structure will be rebuilt, he is under contract to rebuild the structure. In order to do that safely and in a matter that does not cause harm to himself or anyone who works for him, or create any issue with any neighboring properties or City property because of its location, it needs to be taken down to be rebuilt. He said that is no way to safely do that right now. From what he has been told, there is a hole in the roof that has been there 10 to 15 years and all the water and exposure has caused everything to be dry rotted and unsafe. What he is trying to do is take it down before it falls down and we can't use anything that is there now. Mac said that structurally, the metal can be reused, and the homeowner plans to use it as a fence around the property. The intent is to use metal on the exterior that is very similar to

what is there now and not change it that much. It is not the plan to build an elegant large castle, they want to maintain a similar size and structure. He said that, right now, we are just trying to move forward to get things so up so that when we do have the rest of the plans finished, which are being worked on now, we can proceed with the other parts of the process.

Ms. Wittner asked, is there any way that we can see those plans?

Mac replied that they are not done and, like Mr. Blodgett said, it is irrelevant right now. Right now, the only legal aspect is the fact that the building, which he cannot believe has not fallen over after being inside, is not structurally safe.

Mr. Wood commented that neither was the Rosie Salas house. He thinks we can combine our concerns into a motion to table this matter until we have the information that Mr. Christensen is asking for. Mr. Wood said he would like to make a motion that we table the matter until we have satisfied Mr. Christensen's questions.

Mac made a point of order, he said he wanted to know exactly what the board is asking for before we move forward with the vote. He said that, by law, he can ask for.

Mr. Christensen replied that first would be Fire Chief Blair's concerns with fire safety and structural concerns in terms with people being around it during destruction, and the Building Inspector concerns with general structural integrity. Then, if possible, a letter of intent from the owner. He asked Mr. Blodgett to look into the appropriateness of that.

Mr. Blodgett responded that he is not sure that would be legally appropriate, but he will check with the town attorney.

Mac said you are trying to make a requirement of someone with private property rights, you are trying to dictate what can and can't happen with a private property. Just because you don't want to see a building be torn down that is going to fall over if we don't do something with it. And the intention of the owners is to rebuild the structure.

Mr. Wood replied that you understand, we have an ordinance here, we have rules. We are trying to follow the Secretary of the Interior's guidelines in this matter.

Mac said, but you also can't dictate private property rights.

Mr. Wood replied that he is not in a hurry to do this. Is that relevant to me, that you are in a hurry?

Mac repeated that private property rights come into play to which Mr. Wood replied that private property also has rules attached. You are working in a community, in a state, please.

Mac said he will make it clear right now, because he is under contract with the homeowners, that no one is allowed on the property, in any way, shape or form, without the express written permission from himself. He repeated that no one is allowed on the premises and, if there are trespassers, he will press charges to the fullest extent of the law.

Mr. Wood asked if he thought that would help him.

Mac answered that it does not matter, he is just making sure that no one goes on the property so that none gets here because there is liability associated with the structural integrity of the building. It is not safe. He said that the board was trying to condemn the building prior to his starting this process. So, he is trying to eliminate a problem, through the town, by being able to take down a building, use as much of the material in the new structure as he can, and rebuild a building that looks very similar that is usable. Mac said, you are saying that I can't do that for people who are willing to pay for it to be done.

Mr. Wood said that what he was saying is that he would like to table this issue for a later time. He explained that we do this, we take our time.

(46:26) Mr. Blodgett asked to interject and clarify exactly what they wanted.

Mr. Christensen said that, based on the letters from Rusty Blair and Barry Wolstencroft, we will be able to make a better decision when it comes to potentially granting a permit. He said the motion would be to table the item with a request to get letters from Blair and Wolstencroft regarding the safety of the structure prior to granting a permit.

Ms. Wittner said she would second that.

Mr. Christensen asked if there was any more discussion. He clarified that we want to make sure we are doing due diligence and that this building is indeed unsafe in its current condition and the best option moving forward is to potentially grant a permit for demolition with the idea to rebuild it best as possible. And the best way to do that, like you said, is to take it apart as fast as possible before it falls down and we lose even more historical data. Mr. Christensen asked again if there were any more comments and, hearing none, he called the vote.

Ms. Muenz asked for confirmation that Mr. Blodgett had Mac's contact information, which he confirmed.

Mr. Christensen said that he knows this is a very contentious item, no one in this town likes to see a building demolished. We all, from the bottom of our heart, if it is demolished would like to see it brought back to a state that reminds us of what it once was. Obviously, we do not want to see a completely different structure here, but he does not think that is the intent at all. We just want to make sure we do our due diligence because, as Mr. Wood said, our role is to preserve. So, we do not want to miss an opportunity to fulfill that duty. Mr. Christensen thanked Mac for joining the meeting.

Mac replied, you're welcome.

Mr. Blodgett offered to answer any questions, historical or otherwise, about the house that people may have going forward. He expressed hope to discover historical building techniques if or when the project moves forward and, while the potential destruction may symbolize the end of an era, it is an opportunity to learn more about the house.

Mr. Christensen added that hopefully, this will be a very beautiful property in Jerome.

**Motion to table to a future meeting with directions to get a letter from Fire Chief Rusty Blair and Building Inspector Barry Wolstencroft regarding the safety of the structure.**

BOARD MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
CHRISTENSEN			X			
MCDONALD			X			
ROMBERGER			X			
WITTNER		X	X			
WOOD	X		X			

**6:38 (21:32) Item 8: Seeking approval for new windows**

Applicant/Owner: Janet Bustrin (Copperstar Remodeling/ Scott Hudson)

Zone: R1-5

Address: 538 School Street

APN: 401-06-092

Applicant is seeking approval for remodels to the home at 538 School Street that involve a change in the windows.

**Discussion/Possible Action**

Mr. Christensen introduce the item, saying the applicant sought to install new windows at 538 School Street.

Mr. Blodgett explained it was a small remodel project that Scott Hudson has been working on. Last week it went before Planning & Zoning and was approved and he had to add the item as an addendum because the windows, being on the exterior, require DRB review. He said there will be some siding replaced in the project, but the exterior is going to be like for like replacement. He said there will be two windows being installed, and asked Mr. Hudson if that was correct.

Mr. Hudson replied that was correct.

Mr. Blodgett continued that they are Anderson double-hung windows, and there was an example from manufacture showing the intended color of forest green. He pointed out the intended location and dimensions of the proposed windows in the application and asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Christensen asked the applicant, Scott Hudson, if he would like to have a word for the record.

Mr. Hudson said the windows that are going in are same brand, type, and color as rest that have already been replaced on the house. He said there is a French door on the front that will be removed and replaced with one window; that will be the major change. The other window to be replaced is located on the side of the building, which is not visible from the street.

Mr. Christensen said we will open the item up for discussion.

Ms. Wittner stated that she thought we should approve.

Mr. Christensen commented that he liked the presentation and does not have any questions or concerns.

Ms. Wittner motioned to approve the item as presented.

**Motion to approve new windows at 538 School Street**

BOARD MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
CHRISTENSEN			X			
MCDONALD			X			
ROMBERGER			X			
WITTNER	X		X			
WOOD		X	X			

**Meeting Updates:**

**7:09 (52:02) Item 9: Updates of recent and upcoming meetings**

- **January 10 regular Council meeting-** Tabled a meeting regarding the community garden until March, to await DRB's final decision for the tool shed and sign review. Resolutions focused on one-way streets failed due to a lack of motion. Approved an agreement with Lexington Law Firm PLC for prosecution services. Discussed possible regulations for mobile food vendors, and held an E-session to consider taking bids for town owned property.
- **January 17th regular meeting of Planning & Zoning Commission** – To be held.

Mr. Blodgett read the updates of recent meetings to the members of the board.

**7:10 (53:01) Item 10: Future DRB Agenda Items for Tuesday, February 28, 2023: TBD**

Mr. Blodgett said the Tamale Ladies house would likely appear on the next regularly scheduled meeting agenda unless we decide to schedule a special meeting.

Mr. Christensen said he was not sure yet, it may be on the agenda for the next month's meeting unless that agenda is already very full. We will make that decision as the time approaches. He thanked everyone for joining the Zoom call meeting and apologized for the technical difficulties at the beginning. He said we have some work going forward and we want to do our due diligence. He thanked Mac for his contribution and Mr. Wood for his experience.

Item 11: Adjourn

**Motion to adjourn at 7:11 p.m.**

BOARD MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
CHRISTENSEN			X			
MCDONALD			X			
ROMBERGER		X	X			
WITTNER	X		X			
WOOD			X			

Approved: Brice Wood Date: 2-9-23  
Brice Wood, Design Review Board Chair

Attest: Kristen Muenz Date: 2/9/2023  
Kristen Muenz, Deputy Town Clerk