Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes

Monday, February 24, 2025
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
6:30 PM

Call to Order – 6:30 PM
Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present:	Lynda Haley, Chair Christine Burg, Vice Chair Josh Anderson Marty Beauchamp Keith Keller Sloan Whidden Talbot Wilt
Staff Members Present:	Rob Zuccaro, Director of Community Development Emily Cline-Gibson, Planner II Ben Jackson, Planning Clerk

Approval of Agenda
The agenda was approved by voice vote.

Approval of Posting Locations
Motion to approve the posting locations was moved by **Beauchamp**, seconded by **Whidden**, and adopted by voice vote.

Election of Officers
Motion to elect Lynda Haley as Chair and Christine Burg as Vice Chair was moved by **Beauchamp**, seconded by **Anderson**, and adopted by voice vote.

Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda
Eric Hartronft, resident, wanted to provide the Commission with an update on the grain elevator. He spoke about the newly planned development, and the plans to preserve the historic aspects of the site. He said that he looked forward to bringing this before the Commission at a later date.

Ross Bowie, resident, was representing the new ownership of the grain elevator. He said that they wanted to find ways to give the City access to the site, and to find a way to repurpose the building.

Public Hearing Items

a) 509 LaFarge Avenue: Landmark, Alteration Certificate, and Grants

Staff Findings:
Cline-Gibson introduced the presentation for the landmark, alteration certificate and grants. She noted that there had been relatively little change aside from a rear addition and porch. The house was approximately 115 years old, and had been moved from Superior to Louisville in 1943. It had a strong connection to Louisville's mining and French immigration history. She said that the proposed changes for the alteration certificate would have a minimal impact on the historical aspects of the property. The preservation and restoration grant request was for an amount of $40,000, and staff found that the proposed work qualified for the grant aside from the replacement roof shingles. Staff also found that the new construction grant request for $15,000 met all criteria.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommended approval of Resolution 1, Series 2025, Resolution 2, Series 2025, and Resolution 3, Series 2025, covering all grants to a total of $55,000.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:
Burg asked when the rear addition was added to the house.
Cline-Gibson said that she was not sure, but believed it was after the house was moved in 1943.

Applicant Presentation:
Erik Weissenberger, resident, said that he had moved to the house in 2005, and spoke about what they were looking to get out of the changes to the house. He said that the addition might have been present by 1948 from the photos.

Peter Stewart, resident, was the architect. He said that the addition was built between 1943 and 1948. He spoke about the design process for the proposed changes, and how they came to their proposed design.

Questions of Applicant:
Anderson asked about past window replacements.
Stewart said that they were completed by previous owner, and that they were a kind of Anderson clad window. They intended to replace them with a more historically accurate double hung window design.
Anderson asked about the materials they planned to use for the windows.
Stewart said they were planning on using wood for both the interior and exterior.
Beauchamp asked whether they were planning to replace the existing siding on the sides of the property to match the siding on the front.

Stewart said yes, and that this would help to restore the original design of the house.
Haley wanted to note that the extension was slightly offset from the original building.
Wilt asked about the position of the bump out, and why it was in the middle of the house. Had some concern about the amount of change to the rear two thirds of the house.
Stewart said that the location was due to the desire to preserve a large tree that would otherwise have to be removed.

Public Comment:
None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:
Haley suggested the Commission break the discussion into three sections, one for each resolution.

On the landmarking application:
Burg said that the property met all criteria for landmarking.
Beauchamp agreed, and felt that it would be cool to keep it.

Motion to approve Resolution 1, Series 2025, was moved by **Burg** and seconded by **Whidden**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

On the alteration certificate:
Beauchamp noted the language from the energy code on alteration certificates, particularly on the roofline and plane.
Stewart said that they planned on using spray foam in the corners, but otherwise would not have an issue installing insulation in the roof.
Beauchamp said that he liked transition in siding orientation.
Burg said the addition would not overpower the original house.
Anderson appreciated that the original window designs on the front third were to be retained.
Beauchamp asked whether there would be a smaller profile siding on the sides and a larger profile on the front.
Stewart said that this was a change made in the 1960s around the same time the front porch was added.
Haley noted that the changes to the roofline would not be visible from the street.
Anderson said that he had no issues with the changes given it was not on a corner lot.
Wilt noted that addition would not impact the historic structure.
Haley said that it was clear a lot of thought had gone into preservation in the design.

Motion to approve Resolution 2, Series 2025 was moved by **Burg** and seconded by **Whidden**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

On the grant request:
Beauchamp said that he had no issue with the grant amount, and said that it all seemed appropriate.
Burg agreed, and said that she was in support.

Motion to approve Resolution 3, Series 2025, was moved by **Beauchamp** and seconded by **Whidden**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

Discussion Items

a) HSA Grant Amount Increase

Staff Presentation:
Zuccaro introduced the presentation for the discussion on changes to the HSA grant process. He said that the proposed changes were for HSA grants specifically. He went over history of the grant program, then covered proposed increases to HSA grants, and for the introduction of an extraordinary circumstances criteria that would allow for higher grants. He covered other changes such as to who would be able to conduct HSA and what needed to be included.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:
Anderson asked whether the requirements for structural engineers was geared more towards commercial structures.
Zuccaro said that it would most likely be for commercial projects, but could be for either.
Haley said that she appreciated the requirement for 2 bids for extraordinary circumstances.
Beauchamp thought that these changes were long overdue, and suggested they should revisit it every few years. He thought that the grant amounts were reasonable.
Wilt said that the amounts were reasonable and that they had been overdue for change.
Anderson said that he liked the changes to the grant amounts, and said that he would be hesitant to ever use the extraordinary circumstances, but appreciated that it was an option.
Beauchamp spoke about the difficulty there would be in finding two competing HSA bids.
Zuccaro said that the reason for this was to try and reduce the overall cost on an extraordinary circumstances request.
Haley suggested a potential scenario where this could be necessary.
Zuccaro said that they could use alternative language where the Commission could potentially ask for a second bid if necessary rather than requiring it.
Haley on whether it had ever been requested before.
Zuccaro said no, but there had been one case where the grant did not cover the total cost of the HSA.
Haley wondered whether more people would have extraordinary circumstances if they opened this up as an option.

Public Comment:
Andy Johnson, resident, thought changes proposed were great. He spoke about the past costs of HSAs that his company has conducted in the City, and the billing rates. He suggested that the building type also be considered in extraordinary circumstances, like building materials, etc. He agreed that finding a second bid would be very difficult. He spoke to what he thought would count as extraordinary circumstances.

Commissioner Discussion:
Haley thought that the staff review prior to the awarding of the grant was really important, and agreed that they should consider updating the requirements.
Zuccaro noted that the staff review was only surface level, and that they were not positioned to identify whether specific aspects were missing details, for example.
Haley suggested that they could produce some sample HSAs to use as a template.
Zuccaro said that staff wanted to send out all of the completed HSAs to Commissioners, and noted that they had not been seeing a big range in quality in the completed HSAs.

The consensus amongst Commissioners was that proposed amounts were appropriate, and that the other requirements were good. On the extraordinary circumstances, Commissioners generally felt that there were very few buildings in Louisville to which it could be applied, so they did not feel it would be overused. They also agreed that there should not be a requirement for two bids, as this would be too difficult and onerous for applicants to obtain.

Motion to recommend the proposed changes to Council with the language on the two bids removed was moved by **Burg**, and seconded by **Beauchamp**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

b) May Landmark Ceremony Date

Staff Presentation:
Cline-Gibson introduced the presentation on the landmarking ceremony. She said that the discussion tonight was to determine the date for the 2025 ceremony. She covered some previous dates it had been held, and suggested some dates for the 2025 ceremony.

Commissioner Discussion:
Burg suggested that a date in mid or early may would work best due to the end of the school year at the end of May.
Haley suggested that it should be held mid-week.

The consensus amongst Commissioners was for it to be held on Wednesday May 14, with the date to be confirmed pending a check for any other conflicts.

Items from Staff
Cline-Gibson went over the proposed meeting dates for 2025.

Updates from Commission Members
None were heard.

Adjournment
Motion to adjourn was moved by **Anderson**, seconded by **Burg**, and adopted by voice vote.The Commission adjourned at 8:03pm.

COLORADO • SINCE 1878

Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes

Monday, March 17, 2025
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
6:30 PM

Call to Order – 6:30 PM
Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present:	Lynda Haley, Chair Josh Anderson Keith Keller Sloan Whidden Talbot Wilt
Commission Members Absent:	Christine Burg, Vice Chair Marty Beauchamp
Staff Members Present:	Rob Zuccaro, Director of Community Development Emily Cline-Gibson, Planner II Ben Jackson, Planning Clerk

Approval of Agenda
The agenda was approved by voice vote.

Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda
None were heard.

Public Hearing Items

a) **600 Pine Street** – Landmark, Alteration Certificate, and Grant Application

Staff Findings:
Cline-Gibson introduced the presentation for the landmark, alteration certificate, and grant application. She noted the location and historical condition of the house. The house was approximately 120 years old, and was in the Queen Anne style. It met the requirements for physical integrity, and architectural and social significance. The alteration certificate was proposed to allow the removal and replacement of the chimney with a like-for-like replacement, as the existing chimney was in a state of disrepair. The grant request of $4,250 was intended to help facilitate this chimney replacement.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommended approval of Resolution 4, Series 2025, Resolution 5, Series 2025, and Resolution 6, Series 2025, with a total grant amount of $4,250.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:
Wilt asked whether the chimney was a part of the original house.
Cline-Gibson said that plans found as part of the HSA suggested that it was original.

Applicant Presentation:
Victoria Malcolm, resident, said that the chimney damage was caused by a poorly designed guttering system.

Public Comment:
None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:
Wilt wondered whether the replacement chimney could be subject to the same conditions that caused the current chimney to fail. He asked whether the applicant planned to do more beyond the chimney replacement.
Malcolm said that she planned to do more once she could afford it, such as replacing the windows.
Haley suggested that replacement of the flashing would be a part of the chimney replacement.
Beauchamp noted that they could come back to request further grant funding at a later date.
Anderson wondered whether they could make it a condition that a cricket be a part of the restoration to help avoid future water damage.
Haley felt that the fact that the original family still lived there counteracted the changes made in the 1980s, and, given the social significance, it merited landmarking.

Motion to approve Resolution 4, Series 2025 was moved by **Whidden** and seconded by **Anderson**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 5 to 0.

Motion to approve Resolution 5, Series 2025 was moved by **Whidden** and seconded by **Wilt**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 5 to 0.

Motion to approve Resolution 6, Series 2025, up to an amount of $5,750, with a condition that water diversion be included, was moved by **Anderson** and seconded by **Whidden**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 5 to 0.

b) 945 Caledonia Street – Demolition Review
Staff Findings:
Cline-Gibson introduced the presentation for the demolition review. She noted that there had been many changes made to the exterior of the property. It was approximately 116-

131 years old, in the national style, and had notable social significance related to Louisville's history of Italian immigration and mining. Staff found that the exterior changes limited its architectural significance, and as a result did not warrant landmarking.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommended release of the demolition review request.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:
None were heard.

Applicant Presentation:
Nina Williams, non-resident, said that the existing home was not habitable or safe, and needed to be demolished and replaced. She noted the extent of the past changes to the structure.

Commissioner Questions of the Applicant:
None were heard.

Public Comment:
None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:
Wilt agreed with the applicant's assessment, and felt a stay was not worthwhile.
Whidden agreed, and said that it was interesting to see just how much it had changed over time.
Haley said that it had lost its architectural significance to the point that it was no longer worth landmarking.
Keller agreed, and noted that they had declined to landmark similar properties in the past.

Motion to approve to release the demolition review was moved by **Wilt** and seconded by **Whidden**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 5 to 0.

Discussion Items

a) Comprehensive Plan

Staff Presentation:
Zuccaro introduced the presentation to update the Commission on the Comprehensive Plan process. He explained what the plan covered, and how the work of the Historic Preservation Commission related to it. He also noted that the preservation tax would be up for renewal soon, and that this would need to be a priority.

Commissioner Discussion:
The discussion centered on promoting the preservation of commercial businesses downtown, general opposition to changing height limits in the Old Town Overlay District, that reviewing the design handbook would be a worthwhile endeavor, and that the

Commission needed to improve outreach so that more residents were aware of what the preservation program had to offer. There was also a discussion of the possibility of future property acquisitions, and about how to reduce commercial vacancies.

Public Comment:
None were heard.

b) 2025 Work Plan
Staff Presentation:
Cline-Gibson introduced an update to the 2025 work plan. The aim was to identify a few key projects to focus on for the rest of the year. She listed a few suggested projects from previous years that had yet to be completed, such as updating the preservation fund grant program.

Commissioner Discussion:

The discussion centered on ways to improve outreach and overcoming misunderstandings about the landmarking process, increasing the funding available for preservation grants, and improving the HSA grant process and the way that HSAs are completed. As part of this, Commissioners suggested that it could be worthwhile including sample HSAs on the website for applicants to use as a template.

The consensus amongst Commissioners was that improving outreach and expanding the preservation grant program were the most important things to address in 2025.

Public Comment:
None were heard.

Items from Staff
Cline-Gibson provided an update on expected items for the April, 2025 meeting.

Updates from Commission Members
None were heard.

Adjournment
Motion to adjourn was moved by **Anderson**, seconded by **Wilt**, and adopted by voice vote. The Commission adjourned at 8:32pm.

City of Louisville
COLORADO • SINCE 1878

Historic Preservation Commission
Meeting Minutes

Monday, April 21, 2025
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
6:30 PM

Call to Order – 6:30 PM
Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present:	Lynda Haley, Chair Christine Burg, Vice Chair Josh Anderson Marty Beauchamp Keith Keller Sloan Whidden Talbot Wilt
Staff Members Present:	Emily Cline-Gibson, Planner II Ben Jackson, Planning Clerk

Approval of Agenda
The agenda was approved by voice vote.

Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda
None were heard.

Public Hearing Items

a) **1016 Main Street** – Demolition Review

Staff Findings:
Cline-Gibson introduced the presentation for the demolition review. She noted that there had been minimal changes to the front façade of the house, and that extensions were added in 1948 and in 1989. The property received a probable cause finding in November 2024, was approximately 114-129 years old, and was in the Queen Anne architectural style. Staff found that it did meet the criteria for landmarking. The HSA also found that the building was suitable for continued use.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommended placing a full stay of 180 days on the demolition.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:
None were heard.

Applicant Presentation:
Andy Johnson, resident, DAJ Design, introduced his presentation. He noted that the application had attracted a great deal of public interest. He understood the opposition from neighbors, but noted that it was the right of the property owners to decide what they wanted to do with the house. He said that they had a letter of intent from another landowner to move the historic house from its current site to another one in old town, meaning that the house would still be preserved.

Commissioner Questions of the Applicant:
Wilt asked whether cost was the primary reason the applicant decided not to retain the existing structure.
Johnson said that the owners really wanted to build a home of their own.
Beauchamp asked whether they had done any design studies to preserve the house.
Johnson said that the applicants initially wanted to work around the existing building, but eventually it became clear that this was less than ideal for their desired outcome.
Anderson asked how long they had been working on plans for the house.
Johnson said they started the HSA process in the summer of 2024, and had been working consistently since then.
Anderson asked whether a new location for the building had been decided.
Johnson said yes, but that he couldn’t disclose where at this time.

Public Comment:
Jean Damiana, resident, lived next door. She said that she did not want to see the house demolished, and that it would hurt the fabric of the city.

Gary Damiana, resident, lived next door. He said that he did not want to see another house torn down, particularly given the amount of change the neighborhood had already experienced. He wanted to see it preserved.

Jean Morgan, resident, was opposed to the demolition. She was encouraged that the applicant wanted to move the house rather than demolishing it entirely, but she would rather it remain where it was.

Tom Rafferty, resident, acknowledged the rights of the property owners to decide what they wanted to do with their property, but asked that they reconsider preserving the house in its current location so as to protect the heritage of Main Street.

Peter Stewart, resident, noted the significance of demolishing a house on the National Register. He asked that the Commission and homeowners consider preserving the house in its current location. He asked for a 180 day stay.

Gary Dunlap, resident, asked that the building be preserved, particularly given its current condition and history.

Commissioner Discussion:
Beauchamp said that he was disappointed with the direction the homeowners decided to go, and wanted to see further design studies that could allow for the home to be preserved. He was in support of a 180 day stay.
Burg said that it would be a real loss to the neighborhood's sense of place, and wanted to see more options explored.
Whidden agreed, and said that more time was needed.
Anderson said that the location was one of the hardest things about losing this property, given its proximity to downtown. He thought it was really unfortunate to see it come up for a demolition review. He encouraged the applicant to look at other options.
Haley said that it clearly met the criteria for preservation. She was in support of a full 180 day stay on demolition.
Keller noted for those in attendance that a 180 day stay was the most the Commission was able to do.

Motion to place a 180 day stay on the demolition was moved by **Burg** and seconded by **Whidden**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

b) 1117 Lincoln Avenue – Demolition Review
Staff Findings:
Cline-Gibson introduced the presentation for the demolition review. She noted that there had been a major extension added to the side of the house in the 1980s, but that the historic portion had seen relatively minimal changes. The home was approximately 75 years old, and met the criteria for social significance and physical integrity. However, staff were unable to determine an architectural style of significance given the size of the 1980s extension. Therefore, staff did not believe that the property would qualify for landmarking.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommended releasing the demolition review without a stay.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:
None were heard.

Applicant Presentation:
Jeff Rakes, resident, said that the property was beyond being able to be saved, and that he agreed with staff's assessment.

Commissioner Questions of the Applicant:
None were heard.

Public Comment:
Andy Johnson, resident, said that from his knowledge of the property, it was not going to be possible to save or restore it. He was supportive of releasing the demolition review.

<u>*Commissioner Discussion:*</u>
Beauchamp said that he agreed with Andy Johnson, and supported releasing it.
Burg said that given the house's structural issues, preservation was unlikely to be a viable option.
Anderson said that it was an interesting house, but agreed that it wasn't worth preserving.
Whidden agreed.
Haley said that this house was not the best option for preservation from this era, and that a stay was not warranted.

Motion to release the demolition review was moved by **Beauchamp** and seconded by **Whidden**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

Discussion Items

a) **2025 Work Plan**

<u>*Staff Presentation:*</u>
Cline-Gibson introduced the presentation on the tasks for the 2025 Work Plan. She said that the tasks were going to be an update to the historic preservation fund grant program, and work on improving public outreach and awareness.

<u>*Commissioner Discussion:*</u>
The Commissioners decided on sub-committee membership for 2025.

Items from Staff
Cline-Gibson provided an update on the agenda items for the May 2025 meeting.

Updates from Commission Members
None were heard.

Adjournment
Motion to adjourn was moved by **Anderson**, seconded by **Burg**, and adopted by voice vote. The Commission adjourned at 8:11pm.

City of Louisville
COLORADO • SINCE 1878

Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes

Monday, July 21, 2025
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
6:30 PM

Call to Order – 6:30 PM
Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present:	Lynda Haley, Chair Josh Anderson Marty Beauchamp Keith Keller Sloan Whidden Talbot Wilt
Commission Members Absent:	Christine Burg, Vice Chair
Staff Members Present:	Rob Zuccaro, Director of Community Development Jess Daniels, Historic Preservation Planner Ben Jackson, Planning Clerk

Approval of Agenda
The agenda was approved by voice vote.

Approval of Minutes
The minutes for the May 2025 meeting were approved by voice vote.

Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda
None were heard.

Public Hearing Items

a) **601 Pine Street** – Probable Cause

Staff Findings:

Daniels introduced the presentation for the probable cause application. She noted that the house had only had minor exterior changes, including the installation of a porch and awning, but was otherwise intact from. The house was approximately 109-135 years old, was in the national folk style, and met the criteria for physical integrity and social significance.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommended a finding of probable cause.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:
None were heard.

Applicant Presentation:
Josh Johnston, resident, DAJ Design, spoke to the structural integrity and physical history of the house.

Michael Deborski, resident, was the owner of the house. He spoke about the social history of the house, and noted how long his family had been living there.

Commissioner Questions of the Applicant:
None were heard.

Public Comment:
None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:
Beauchamp said that this was a pretty straightforward application, and that he concurred with staff's assessment. He was in support.
Wilt agreed, and wanted to see it preserved.
Keller concurred.
Haley said that it met all of the criteria, and was in support.
Anderson said that he was in support.

Motion to approve the finding of probable cause was moved by **Whidden** and seconded by **Wilt**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 6 to 0.

Discussion Items

a) **Work Plan Update**

Staff Presentation:
Daniels introduced the presentation for the work plan update.

Commissioner Discussion:
Commissioners discussed the progress of their sub-committees.

b) **Draft Historic Marker Policy**

Staff Presentation:
Daniels introduced the presentation on the draft historic marker policy. She said that this was being led by the museum, and that they wanted input from the Commission on the proposed criteria.

Commissioner Discussion:
The Commissioners broadly agreed with the proposed criteria, and were excited to seeing it implemented. There was a discussion as to which historic properties may be able to obtain a new historic marker.

Items from Staff
Daniels noted that an alteration certificate and demolition review were approved by the subcommittee, and that there were two commercial grant requests scheduled for the August 2025 meeting.

Zuccaro said that the Commission needed to establish a minimum fund balance for the historic preservation fund, and that this would also come before the Commission in August.

Updates from Commission Members
None were heard.

Adjournment
Motion to adjourn was moved by **Beauchamp**, seconded by **Anderson**, and adopted by voice vote. The Commission adjourned at 7:16pm.

City of Louisville
COLORADO • SINCE 1878

Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes

Monday, August 18, 2025
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
6:30 PM

Call to Order – 6:30 PM
Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present: Lynda Haley, Chair
Christine Burg, Vice Chair Josh Anderson
Keith Keller
Sloan Whidden
Marty Beauchamp
Talbot Wilt

Staff Members Present: Rob Zuccaro, Director of Community Development
Jess Daniels, Senior Planner

Approval of Agenda
The agenda was approved by voice vote.

Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda
None were heard.

Probable Cause: 720 Grant Street
Staff Presentation:
Daniels presented that the property is located at Pine Street and Grant Avenue. The home has maintained the original building footprint from 1948. Building permit records show changes including a new roof (2019), patio (2009), unfinished basement (1999), and new fence (1997). Identified as a national folk house architectural type with a rich social history. Meets landmarking criteria: age (121 years old, constructed in 1904), physical integrity, interesting building character (folk Victorian style), and social significance.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommends finding probable cause and approval of $7,500 toward HSA.

Applicant Presentation

David Finnimore, resident of 720 Grant Avenue, expressed appreciation for the commission's work. He has lived in the house since 1983 and wanted to research its history.

Commissioner Discussion:
Commissioners expressed support for the application. Noted the well-maintained original appearance of the house. Agreed it exemplifies the type of homes the commission aims to preserve.

Motion made for approval of probable cause for 720 Grant Street, seconded and passed unanimously.

Staff will contact the applicant regarding next steps for the HSA and potential landmarking application.

Public Comment:
None were heard.

Grant Update - Proposed Approach and Next Steps
Daniels presented research, methodology and proposed updates to the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) grant program. Noted that the HPF was established in 2008 to incentivize landmarking and supplement preservation costs. The last comprehensive update to the program was in 2019. Went through staff report content, which summarizes work already completed in Q1 and Q2 2024, including HPC retreat (January 2024), previous staff report (May 2024), community engagement, and user experience survey. She noted present and anticipated demands on the HPF Fund and provided an analysis of the 1/8 sales tax revenue for the HPF Fund (2019-2025) and grant expenditures. She provided an analysis of 10 large residential projects (over $40k in grant requests) between 2019 and 2025, adjusting costs and grant awards for inflation (5%). Line-item costs for structural work and restoration/rehabilitation work were analyzed. She provided estimates for residential projects and commercial project costs in Louisville. She presented inflation analysis using Engineering News Record and US Bureau of Labor Statistics (construction cost index, building cost index, and consumer price index). Staff used the national building cost index (5% average) to calculate proposed grant increases. Proposed grant increases were calculated using 5% adjusted inflation plus an additional 10% incentive for each category (excluding HSAs). She presented a tiered approach structured as a framework for understanding staff proposals. She clarified that the intent of all recommendations is to support equity as expressed as a need previously by the Commission.

Staff Recommendation:

Increase grant limits to amounts presented in staff report. Continue the loan program with no proposed changes. Add income considerations: Households at/below 120% Area Median Income (AMI) eligible for maintenance requests or cash match waiver (up to 50%). Automatically set contingency emergency reserve to amount to be determined in next item. Add a new structural category. Add a cap to extraordinary circumstances. Add a new exceptional circumstance category. No changes proposed to the timeframe for requesting grants (36 months after landmarking) and reimbursement (60 months).

Commissioner Discussion:

Anderson said amounts on track with inflation and costs have gone up. Intrigued by new definitions and agrees with amounts. Feels that Commission should be firm on new exceptional tier. Examples of what could be exceptional were discussed. He said that exceptional circumstances needs more bite and language restriction. New amounts are double, and approach seems more fair.

Hayley likes the tiers, feels that it makes extraordinary circumstances more fair and that increasing Tier 1/2 will prevent needing Tier 3. She feels that a cap protects the HPC from overspending and addresses the subjective nature of the current program. She feels like everything is extraordinary right now. Noted that the average numbers presented speaks to where HPC awards above the current $40k residential limit. She likes the new structural grant category so that the property owner could have more capacity to address other historic items on their own. She clarified that a property owner could spend $82k on foundation, then an additional $20k for extra structural under the new grant type – this might not get to windows and doors, but likes that the HPF takes care of the structure. Noted that structural work is always high priority in HSA and is common issue in Louisville houses.

Wilt was concerned about cost of foundation work for exceptional circumstances as common in Louisville. Likes the new definition for extraordinary circumstances but thinks that preserving historic materials will cost more than the proposed amounts. Concerned that grant amounts may not be sufficient to incentivize saving historic elements like windows. Thinks Tier 2 should be higher. Doesn't like the term unlimited for exceptional. Thinks the structural match needs to be more clear. Thinks that all assets need to be reviewed, not just income for the new income qualifier.

Zuccaro and Daniels clarified tier approach and how they build on one another. Clarified intent of fund not pay for every eligible expense. Property owners can use multiple buckets for structural work, if needed and eligible. Clarified that exceptional circumstances criteria are for singularly unique properties and most commercial properties will have an easier time meeting it than residential, but some would qualify such as 1016 Main Street. Exceptional circumstances is intended for those 1-3 unique examples left in the City.

Andersen, Burg, and Whidden agree updating the amounts every three years moving forward is reasonable.

Whidden highlighted that current program has no caps and that the proposed program is more generous and constrictive at the same time. Likes the grant increases and thinks they are a considerable jump from what currently exists.

Staff clarified project estimates are only for historic portions of projects.

Burg noted that the HPC will see smaller residential projects as well and that the numbers are very generous for people but would also like to consider all assets as income in income qualification. Requested more community outreach for loan program, as people aren't aware of it.

Hayley summarized the discussion and confirmed each staff recommendation with the members. The members were comfortable with the proposed new framework and numbers presented. The timeframe (36 months) to request funds for landmarking and fund availability if this date was extended was discussed. The 36 month requirements is to remain and be re-evaluated after 2028.

Zucarro clarified the loan program: the Impact Development Fund does the underwriting. The loan doesn't have a cap, and is paid for through HPF. Property owners can use that for 50% match for their grant requirement. He said no one has done this, but it is an option for people without cash at hand. Clarified that anyone can do a loan – it is not income qualified. Believes that the loan program is good if the HPC fund stays healthy, as the HPF gets money back with a bit of interest. He noted the program could consider going to an all loan program if the ballot is not renewed. Zucarro clarified that the HPC is not obligated to award the full grant amount in any case.

Direction from Discussion:
The following is detailed direction from the discussion for incorporating into new draft resolution: Make structural language clear. Limit payment to foundation of historic home only (not new foundation). Consider increased amounts to present for Tier 2, structural amount, and top end of inflation categories (through to 2028) for consideration at October HPC meeting. Add to third Tier criteria that applicant has to demonstrate there won't be financial feasibility ("but for that") money. Commissioners and staff to think about additional "teeth" and emphasize the rarity in new language/definition for Exceptional Circumstances. No changes were proposed to the loan program. For income qualified. did not want to look at just annual income, but consider all assets

(look at other communities and deed restricted programs to know what to include other than just household income.)

Staff to bring a draft resolution with this direction at the October 18, 2025 HPC meeting for consideration.

Public Comment:
None were heard.

2025 Annual Contingency/Emergency Reserve Funds (HPF)
Daniels presented that Section 3 of Resolution Number 17, Series 2019 requires the establishment of an annual contingency emergency reserve fund. Clarified that these reserve funds could only be accessed if the HPC and City Council determine that urgent action is needed to prevent significant damage to the historic fabric or character of Louisville.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommend establishing 20% of the annual operating budget for the reserve.

Commissioner Discussion

Andersen suggested increasing the contingency to 25% (around $250,000) to allow for more significant projects, requiring strong justification to access it.

Questions for Staff:
Clarified that the contingency fund would be within the HPF fund. Discussed that philosophically, the desired outcome should drive the percentage more than any specific methodology. The fund could not be encumbered below this point without meeting specific criteria. When asked about recommendations, staff clarified that some departments use as low as 10% for contingency, depending on capital maintenance needs. 20% was proposed for the HPF due to the focus on structures and consistency with the initial resolution. Clarified that the operating budget is dependent on the estimated grant payouts from the fund. Zacurro recommended changing the contingency calculation to a percentage of sales tax revenue rather than the operating budget.

A motion was made to set the reserve contingency fund at 25% of the previous year's total revenue. The motion was seconded and approved via roll call vote.

Public Comment:
None were heard.

1016 Main Street Acquisition
Zacurro gave an overview of 1016 Main Street and said that the Historic Preservation

Commission (HPC) is being consulted for their recommendation on the acquisition. The City Council is considering purchasing a property that was previously under a demolition stay. The property owner bought the property about three years ago for a little over 1.3 million and is willing to sell it to the city for 1.4 million. The intent is to landmark the property and then resell it, recouping the funds for the HPF. The City Council has already taken formal action to enter a contract to purchase the property, with a closing date of September 30th. A financial risk analysis was conducted, including an appraisal that valued the property at 1.25 million. The appraiser provided a letter stating that landmarking, grants, and zoning incentives could maintain or increase the property's value. The resale proceeds will go entirely back into the HPF, even if the sale price exceeds the purchase price.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:
Commissioners asked about risk, re-sale potential, the renter living at the property, and the purchase and re-sale process. Zacurro clarified that the strategy for reselling the property involves engaging a realtor and marketing it with available incentives. Once an offer is received, the city council would likely consider it in an executive session. The HPC could potentially provide input or advice on the transaction, pending legal review. The renter is moving out by September 1st, as per the contract. The renter has purchased property elsewhere in Louisville. The city hasn't determined the process for finding a real estate agent yet. It's in the city's best interest to use a Realtor, even with the commission. Zoning incentives add significant value, especially for building additions on historic homes. Preparing a sales package that makes everything transparent is going to be important in strategizing.

Commissioner Discussion

Concerns were raised about the current market conditions and the potential for the city to incur a loss on the resale. Considering that the community and location suggest this might be an exceptional house. This property seems least risky compared to other properties that could have come before. It's a good trial, but not the best real estate environment for the experiment. Discussed how there was a lot of community support for this house. The amount of community feedback was the most the speaker has seen on any project in almost 10 years at the city.

A motion to approve the acquisition of 1016 Main Street was made and seconded. Roll call vote was taken and the motion was approved.

Public Comment:
None were heard.

Workplan (Subcommittee) Update

Commission and Staff Discussion

The Grant program update is on track for Q3-Q4. The Online map for landmark properties is about halfway through. The Old town walking tour subcommittee is planning to piggyback on the Historical Museum's use of their viewfinder walking tours. The updated brochure flyer subcommittee is going to present some ideas to the rest of the commissioners and get their feedback. The Events subcommittee has an event coming up this Saturday at the farmers market. It is the last event of the year.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Items from Staff

Daniels requested a Special Meeting to be scheduled on September 8, 2025, to review two demolition permits. An alteration certificate was approved at 1045 Front Street for a fence and a new ADU. Gigi from the museum will give a presentation on a historic marker policy update in October. The next meeting will be on Monday, September 15th at 6:30.

Updates from Commission Members

None were heard.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn was moved by **Anderson**, seconded by **Beauchamp,** and adopted by voice vote. The Commission adjourned at 8:50 pm