



Historic Preservation Commission Agenda

The regular meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission Committee has been scheduled for February 10, 2026 at 3:30 PM in Community Room, City/County Complex. This meeting will be facilitated by Chair-Elect.

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84355662209?pwd=blwNxwLoObxa2mItm46gccYJCbuMJ2.1>

Meeting ID: 843 5566 2209

Passcode: 181186

Phone: 1-669-900-9128

Call to Order

1. Roll Call

2. Approval of Minutes

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 11, 2025

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JUNE 10, 2025

3. New Business

A. ELECTION OF BOARD CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR FOR 2026

B. 2026 HPC WORK PLAN DISCUSSION - NO ACTION REQUIRED -Planning Director Jennifer Severson will facilitate discussion with the board about ideas for a 2026 HPC Work Plan, including collaborating with MSU Design Center in fall 2026 to draft Historic Preservation Design Guidelines specific to Livingston’s Downtown Commercial Historic District.

4. Old Business

5. Public Comments

6. Board Comments

7. Adjournment

File Attachments for Item:

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 11, 2025

Historic Preservation Commission

Regular Meeting Minutes

February 11, 2025

Community Room, City County Complex, 414 E. Callender Street

3:30 PM

Chair Tom Blurock called the meeting to order at 3:30 PM.

1. Roll Call

Present: Tom Blurock, Lindie Gibson, Jack Luther, Eli Isaly, Kristin Vanderland. Staff: Jennifer Severson, Planning Director.

A quorum was present.

2. Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve the December 12, 2024 minutes by Gibson. Second by Vanderland. Motion passed 5 to 0.

3. Election of Officers

Chair: Motion to nominate Tom Blurock by Luther. Second by Gibson. Motion passed 5 to 0.

Vice Chair: Motion to nominate Jack Luther by Blurock. Second by Vanderland. Motion passed 5 to 0.

General Public Comment

City Manager Grant Gager thanked Commissioners for their service. No additional public comment.

4. Design Review: Main Street Print Shop and Park County Community Journal, 108 N. Main Street

Staff presented a request for two non illuminated, flat wall signs for Main Street Print Shop and the Park County Community Journal. The signs were proposed within the existing brick insets above the awning. Dimensions were stated as approximately 30 inches tall by 118 inches wide. Commissioners confirmed the awning would remain in place and asked whether the proposed signs met City sign standards. Staff confirmed compliance.

No public comment was offered on this item. Commissioners discussed the signs briefly and noted that locating the signs within the existing brick insets helped limit visual impacts in the historic district.

Motion to approve by Gibson. Second by Vanderland. Motion passed 5 to 0.

5. Design Review: Fainting Goat Pub, 122 N. Main Street

Staff presented a request for a hanging blade sign to be installed at the Main Street entrance for the Fainting Goat Pub. The applicant proposed an internally illuminated version of the existing sign design located on Park Street, with the Main Street sign intended to be lit from within. Staff noted that the sign was reviewed against current sign code requirements and stated it was compliant. Staff also referenced the City's dark sky standards, noting that internally illuminated signs are addressed in the broader code, while the Commission's review focuses on the historic district design standards.

Public comment was received. Bob Ebinger (128 S Yellowstone) stated concern with internally illuminated, modern style signage in the historic district. He described the proposal as similar to conventional commercial signage and asked the Commission to favor external lighting or another approach that would be more consistent with the historic character of the district. He stated he would vote against internally illuminated signage if he were on the Commission.

Jeff Galli (302 N Yellowstone) stated sign would be more attractive if externally lit.

Commission discussion followed. Commissioners asked clarifying questions about materials, lighting, and how the proposed sign compared to the existing Park Street sign. Staff and commissioners discussed prior code expectations and how the current sign code differs from past practice. Commissioners noted that the proposal met sign code requirements but expressed mixed views about whether internal illumination was appropriate for the historic district. Some commissioners indicated a preference for external illumination as a more traditional treatment.

Motion to approve by Gibson. Second by Vanderland. Roll call vote: Blurock: no; Luther: yes; Isaly: yes; Vanderland: yes; Gibson: yes. Motion passed 4 to 1.

6. Design Review: Industrial Towel Building Demolition Permit, 218 S. 2nd Street

Staff introduced the request for a demolition permit for a commercial building within the downtown historic district and reviewed the Commission's role in making a recommendation before the City may act on the permit. Staff outlined the intended meeting structure for this item: applicant presentation, public comment, commissioner questions, commission discussion, and then a motion and vote.

Applicant presentation: Developer Eric Horn presented the proposed project and described it as a mixed use development intended to activate the Second Street corridor and serve as a gateway to Sacajawea Park. He stated the request before the Commission was limited to the

demolition permit and explained that securing the permit was needed to proceed with schematic design and entitlements. Horn stated that the Second Street brick facade was intended to be preserved and integrated as a key element of the future development, and that an as built survey would be used to document existing conditions and inform structural bracing and phasing. Horn referenced efforts to pursue assistance through the Urban Renewal Authority to support facade integration and inclusion of affordable housing units. He described a concept that included a blend of market rate and affordable housing, associated parking, and a small neighborhood restaurant.

Project concepts and technical discussion: The project team discussed a massing concept described as a U shaped building with a central courtyard. They described a podium level intended to accommodate parking and the restaurant, with residential units above. Commissioners asked whether the podium would cover the entire site and discussed how the restaurant would relate to the preserved facade. The team described exploring setbacks near the adjacent historic building to the north, including a rough 13 to 15 foot setback concept in relation to a nearby cobble foundation, and discussed how future design review would occur when more detailed drawings are developed. The team described anticipated methods for temporarily bracing and supporting the facade during demolition and construction, including documenting the wall and surrounding conditions through an as built survey. Commissioners also heard discussion of geotechnical conditions and the need to understand subsurface conditions as part of structural planning.

Public comment: Multiple speakers supported adding downtown housing but emphasized that historic preservation must remain central to the decision. Several commenters stated that demolition would permanently remove historic resources and urged the Commission to ensure that the preserved facade is not treated as optional.

Julie Riley, 214 S. 2nd Street, Unit B, speaking also for Gregory and Violet Rasnick, stated support for development and downtown vitality but opposed demolition or damage to the existing building and facade. She urged the owner to consider project alternatives that work with the existing structure and warned that approval without clear preservation requirements could set a harmful precedent.

Kris King, 425 W. Chinook, Executive Director of Explore Livingston, stated support for mixed use development and downtown workforce housing and noted that additional activation on Second Street could increase foot traffic and support businesses. King recommended using additional renderings and view studies as the project advances to help the public understand building height and context.

Sarah Barnett, a neighboring property owner, asked what responsibility the project would have if adjacent buildings are damaged during demolition or construction and expressed concern about massing and neighborhood impacts, including views from nearby homes.

An additional speaker questioned whether a structural study had established that the existing building was unsafe and stated opposition to demolishing the building rather than working with it.

Commission questions and discussion: Commissioners asked the applicant and consultants to explain the as built survey process, including how the facade would be documented, temporarily braced, and ultimately integrated into the new construction. Commissioners noted that some language in the demolition permit materials described the facade as something that may be preserved, and commissioners stated concern that the Commission's action needed to create a clear expectation. Horn stated that the team intended to make a serious effort to preserve the facade and agreed that, if future study shows the facade cannot be preserved, the applicant would return to the Commission to explain why and to discuss next steps. Commissioners also discussed broader concerns raised in public comment, including building massing, setbacks near adjacent historic resources, and the importance of avoiding impacts to surrounding properties during demolition and construction.

Motions and vote: A motion to approve demolition as presented was made but did not receive a second and therefore did not proceed. A motion was then made to approve the demolition permit with the condition that the existing brick facade be saved and incorporated into the design of the new building, and that if preserving the facade is not feasible the applicant must return to the Commission with additional information before proceeding. Second by Gibson. Roll call vote: Blurock: yes; Luther: yes; Gibson: yes; Isaly: yes; Vanderland: yes. Motion passed 5 to 0.

7. Old Business

None.

8. Board Comments

None.

9. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned.

File Attachments for Item:

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JUNE 10, 2025

Historic Preservation Commission

Regular Meeting Minutes

June 10, 2025

Community Room, City County Complex, 414 E. Callender Street
3:30 PM
Chair Tom Blurock called the meeting to order at 3:30 PM.

1. Roll Call

Present: Chair Tom Blurock, Vice Chair Jack Luther, Lindie Gibson, Elijah Isaly
Absent: Vanderland
Staff present: Jennifer Severson, Planning Director
A quorum was present.

2. Approval of Minutes

March 11, 2025 Minutes: Commissioner Luther noted corrections related to survey status of properties along Park Street and the north side of Callender Street. Specifically, 217 W. Park Street had not yet been surveyed and needed to be completed, while other buildings along Callender between Main Street and B Street had been surveyed. **Motion to approve minutes with corrections by Gibson. Second by Luther. Motion passed unanimously.**

April 8, 2025 Minutes: No corrections were noted. **Motion to approve by Gibson. Second by Isaly. Motion passed unanimously.**

February 11, 2025 minutes will be considered for approval at the next regular meeting.

3. General Public Comment - No public comment was received.

4. Design Review- There were no design review items on the agenda.

5. HPC Role Following State Legislative Changes (SB 214)

City Manager Grant Gager presented an overview of recent state legislation that removed the Historic Preservation Commission’s authority to approve or deny design review applications, making design review an administrative function performed by City staff. Grant reviewed the original ordinance establishing the Commission in 1982 and outlined the six historic powers and duties contained in City Code Chapter 31, noting that those related to mandatory permit review and approval are no longer legally permissible.

Gager explained that while the Commission can no longer serve as a decision-making body for permits, several functions remain appropriate under state law, including establishing

preservation criteria, commenting on broader planning efforts, providing preservation information to the public, assisting with surveys and documentation, and offering advisory guidance when requested by property owners or City staff.

Commissioners discussed the shift from a regulatory role to an advisory role and expressed concern about losing influence over major changes within the historic district. Questions were raised about whether City staff could request Commission input even if applicants did not voluntarily seek guidance, and staff clarified that review by an external board cannot be required, but advisory input may still be sought when appropriate.

Discussion emphasized the value of historic preservation to Livingston's character and economy, with several commissioners noting that rehabilitated historic buildings often hold greater long term value than new construction. Commissioners expressed interest in remaining active by providing design guidance, assisting with historic surveys, and participating in larger planning efforts such as the zoning code update and future growth policy revisions.

Staff suggested potential expanded roles including helping complete commercial building surveys when funding is limited, developing preservation guidelines for City staff to use during administrative review, creating a more formal historic preservation plan to guide future efforts, and supporting community education such as historic walking tours or improved preservation resources on the City website.

Meeting frequency was discussed, with consensus leaning toward continuing regular meetings in a flexible advisory format, potentially quarterly with special meetings as needed when projects or planning updates arise.

6. Old Business

There was no old business.

7. Board Comments

Commissioner Gibson announced her intention to step down from the Commission due to personal commitments. Commissioners and staff expressed appreciation for her years of service and contributions to historic preservation in Livingston.

Additional discussion addressed the importance of keeping the Commission involved in major downtown projects, maintaining awareness of demolition or redevelopment activity, and ensuring historic resources continue to be documented and protected to the greatest extent allowed under state law.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned.