

Developer Support Workgroup

The work group to explore developer support for public art met March 20 at 7pm at John Kotarski's house. Present were: John Kotarski, Jonah Copi, Mary Thiefels, and David Esau.

The group explored:

- Ways developers could access Michigan's creative community through a no-cost registry of artists and art consultants who have a public art practice.
- Ways developers could explore the potential of their development project for public art.
- A public art idea book that developers and residents could use for inspiration.
- Having a representative of the art commission on the Design Review Board.
- Including art commission support documents in a preparatory packet for developers.

Registry for Artists with a Public Art Practice

This would list Michigan artists, who have a public art practice, detailing their credentials, experience, and artwork. Developers could use this to find an appropriate artist for their project.

pros: would promote local artists to developers. **cons:** developing the registry and maintaining it

Registry for Art Consultants with a Public Art Practice

This would list Michigan arts consultants (who might also be an artist or an art organization), who have a public art practice and could assist developers in shaping overall strategies and/or selecting art/artists for their project. This registry would detail their credentials, experience, and past work.

pros: promote local arts organizations/consultants. **cons:** developing the registry and maintaining it

Project Review

We considered matching interested developers with willing AAPAC members to discuss potentials for art on their project, but felt like it might stretch our members' capacity beyond what we could deliver. Some sort of Project Review Checklist seemed like a reasonable alternative. See draft attachment.

This checklist would help developers identify their project's potential for public art.

pros: developers could get a free guide to identify what and where they should consider public art in their projects. **cons:** maintaining and distributing it.

Idea Book for Public Art

A collection of unique ideas for public spaces that could be adapted to Ann Arbor's unique culture and energize our public spaces.

pros: stimulate designers, developers, and residents to consider public art as a part of our public spaces. **cons:** how to maintain, update, and promote it. Here is a [link](#) to a draft online site.

Appointment to Design Review Board

The experience the art commission has in reviewing and recommending potential for public art in municipal construction can be applied to private development.

The mission of Design Review Boards and Public Art Commissions are aligned and interconnected in many municipalities. This synergy in Ann Arbor would help encourage private investment in public art.

pros: an experienced voice regarding the esthetic quality of public spaces would add to the advice the city gives to developers promoting quality design in public spaces. **cons:** advice would be voluntary.

Recommendations to Staff

- A. Regarding artist and art consultant registry, staff should:
 1. Explore with City IT an online portal that individuals could register themselves as either an artist or art consultant and final publishing could be done by supervising staff.
 2. Explore with local arts organizations how they might collaborate and promote the registries.
 3. When a prototype is designed, it should be released in limited edition and review by stakeholders before official public launch.
- B. Regarding a project review checklist, staff should:
 1. Explore ways a checklist could be distributed to developers and ways to promote it.
- C. Regarding the idea book for public art, staff should:
 1. Explore ways to publish and update it.
- D. Regarding Design Review Board, staff should:
 1. Explore ways to expand the Design Review Board to allow the appointment of a representative of the art commission as a non-voting ex-officio member.