



CITY OF NORMAN, OK
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING
Municipal Building, Council Chambers, 201 West Gray, Norman, OK 73069
Monday, May 04, 2026 at 5:30 PM

MINUTES

The Historic District Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, will meet in Regular Session in the Council Chambers at the Municipal Building, on Monday, May 04, 2026 at 5:30 PM and notice of the agenda of the meeting was posted at the Norman Municipal Building at 201 West Gray, and on the City website at least 24 hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT

Commissioner Mitch Baroff
Commissioner Michael Zorba
Commissioner Jo Ann Dysart
Commissioner Karen Thurston
Commissioner Kendel Posey
Commissioner Susan Skapik
Commissioner Tyler Burns
Commissioner Trent Baggett

STAFF PRESENT

Anais Starr, Planner II/Historic Preservation Officer
Jeanne Snider, Assistant City Attorney III
Bailey LaChance, Admin Tech IV

GUESTS PRESENT

Matt Seaton, 300 W Main Street, Norman, OK
Ken Wineburg, 735 S Lahoma, Norman, OK
Bonita & Amy Sohn, 413 S Lahoma, Norman, OK
Steve Ladner, 501 S Lahoma, Norman, OK

MINUTES

1. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF THE MINUTES AS FOLLOWS:

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 6, 2026.

Motion made by Commissioner Dysart, **Seconded** by Commissioner Posey.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Baroff, Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Thurston, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Skapik, Commissioner Burns

Voting Abstaining: Commissioner Baggett

April 6, 2026 Historic District Meeting Minutes were approved.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUESTS

2. (HD 26-05) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUEST FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 735 S. LAHOMA AVENUE FOR THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS: A) REPLACEMENT OF ATRIUM WINDOW WITH A SET OF ORIGINAL WOOD WINDOWS; B) RESTORATION OF FRONT PORCH FLOORING, RAILINGS, AND TRIM; C) REPLACEMENT OF TWO HALF COLUMNS WITH FULL COLUMNS ON THE FRONT PORCH.

A) REPLACEMENT OF ATRIUM WINDOW WITH A SET OF ORIGINAL WOOD WINDOWS;

Motion made by Commissioner Thurston to approve HD 26-05 item A) replacement of atrium window with a set of original wood windows as submitted; **Seconded** by Commissioner Burns.

Staff Report

Anais Starr, Planner II/Historic Preservation Officer, presented the Staff Report.

Commissioner Zorba sought clarification regarding whether the windows were found on-site and if they were believed to be original to the home. Ms. Starr stated there should have been a photograph included in the packet and noted the applicant had additional information regarding where the windows were found. She stated the windows were most likely the original windows removed in order to install the atrium window currently in place.

Applicant Presentation

Ken Wineburg, the applicant, presented the proposed modifications.

Commissioner Skapik asked for clarification regarding the portion projecting below the atrium window. Mr. Wineburg explained the addition extends approximately three feet from the house and is in poor condition, so they are proposing to remove it and replace the area with siding to match the existing house.

Commissioner Zorba confirmed the applicant would be removing the portion beneath the window, and Mr. Wineburg stated that was correct.

Commissioner Baggett asked whether the applicant owned the home when the atrium window was installed. Mr. Wineburg stated he had recently purchased the property but had been told the atrium addition was installed around the 1970s. Commissioner Baggett then asked whether it appeared standard windows had previously existed in that location. Mr. Wineburg stated it appeared the area had originally been framed for conventional windows.

Commissioner Thurston asked whether siding remained beneath the atrium support structure or if replacement siding would be required. Mr. Wineburg stated he was unsure what remained beneath the structure but anticipated any existing siding would likely not be salvageable and would need to be replaced.

Commissioner Burns asked whether the windows found matched the size of the existing opening and suggested that, during demolition, the applicant attempt to fit the windows within the existing opening to allow the siding to align cleanly and avoid difficulties matching the existing siding. Mr. Wineburg stated that if siding replacement became necessary, he intended to closely match the existing material, including potentially removing siding from a less visible portion of the home, such as the rear elevation, to maintain consistency on visible facades. Ms. Starr added that she had discussed the process for replacing deteriorated siding with the applicant.

Public Comments

There were no public comments

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Zorba stated he believed the proposal to restore the original windows was a great idea.

Commissioner Baroff stated he did not anticipate the applicant having difficulty matching the existing siding and felt the proposal would be a significant improvement.

Commissioner Dysart stated she found the proposal to be compatible with the historic character of the property.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Baroff, Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Thurston, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Skapik, Commissioner Burns, Commissioner Baggett

HD 26-05 item A was approved.

B) RESTORATION OF FRONT PORCH FLOORING, RAILINGS, AND TRIM;

Motion made by Commissioner Thurston to approve HD 26-05 item B) restoration of front porch flooring, railings, and trim as submitted; **Seconded** by Commissioner Dysart.

Staff Report

Anais Starr, Planner II/Historic Preservation Officer, presented the Staff Report.

Commissioner Skapik sought clarification regarding the original orientation of the porch boards. Ms. Starr stated the decking boards currently run in the same direction as the historic decking; however, the fascia boards are presently installed in the opposite direction from the original configuration.

Applicant Presentation

Ken Wineburg, the applicant, presented the proposed modifications.

Ms. Starr asked whether the applicant intended to keep the pressure-treated wood decking already installed. Mr. Wineburg confirmed that was correct.

Commissioner Burns asked whether the vertical fascia boards would be changed back to a horizontal orientation. Mr. Wineburg confirmed they would, explaining the current installation resulted from miscommunication with the contractor and would be corrected if approved.

Commissioner Thurston questioned the size of the replacement boards, noting the new decking appeared larger than the original material. Mr. Wineburg confirmed that was correct. Commissioner Thurston stated she was unsure whether the original board size was still readily available. Commissioner Baroff recommended several sources where similar historic decking materials may still be found. Commissioner Thurston stated she preferred the original board dimensions but understood sourcing them could be difficult.

Commissioner Thurston also asked whether the new boards were tongue-and-groove like the historic flooring. Ms. Starr stated the proposed decking consisted of standard pressure-treated boards. Commissioner Baroff noted the installed material appeared to be evenly spaced pressure-treated one-by-six boards. Commissioner Thurston asked whether the spacing caused the boards to exceed six inches in width overall, and Commissioner Baroff stated modern-day boards were approximately five-and-a-half inches wide.

Commissioner Baggett requested clarification regarding the orientation of the replacement boards. Mr. Wineburg stated he intended for the decking to match the original orientation, running from the door toward the street, with horizontal fascia boards along the front edge of the porch.

Commissioner Thurston stated her primary concern was that flat one-by-six decking did not convey the appearance of a historic porch. Mr. Wineburg responded that, in his opinion, the historic character of the porch is more strongly defined by the columns, railings, and windows, and that the board dimensions are not readily visible from the street-facing view of the house.

Commissioner Dysart confirmed the original porch flooring consisted of approximately three-inch-wide boards, which Mr. Wineburg confirmed.

Public Comments

There were no public comments

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Baroff asked whether the photograph of the completed project included in the packet had been shown in the presentation slideshow for improved visibility. Ms. Starr stated it had not been included in the PowerPoint presentation.

Commissioner Zorba stated it would likely be difficult to locate decking material in the exact historic dimensions.

Commissioner Thurston emphasized that the Commission should evaluate the request as though the replacement decking had not yet been installed. Ms. Starr confirmed the Commission must consider the proposal as if no work had occurred.

Commissioner Skapik asked Ms. Starr whether another recent porch decking replacement approved administratively had used historically accurate board dimensions. Ms. Starr stated she believed that project involved a like-for-like replacement.

Commissioner Dysart asked whether pressure-treated boards were available in three-and-a-half- or four-inch widths. Ms. Starr stated she did not believe so and noted smaller boards would likely need to be stained or painted instead. Commissioner Baroff added that he had not seen pressure-treated tongue-and-groove commonly available in those smaller dimensions.

Commissioner Zorba expressed concern that the spacing between the currently installed boards was too visually prominent and asked whether the applicant would be willing to use three-and-a-half- to four-and-a-half-inch tongue-and-groove flooring instead. Mr. Wineburg stated he would be willing to make that change and asked whether the Commission could approve the request subject to locating appropriately sized replacement boards.

Ms. Starr confirmed that such a condition could be incorporated into the motion if supported by the Commission.

Motion made by Commissioner Thurston to amend item B) to add 3.5-4.5-inch tongue and groove porch flooring must be used; **Seconded** by Commissioner Burns.

Commissioner Thurston sought clarification on whether the motion also included the proposed railings, which the applicant stated would be replaced in a like-for-like manner. Ms. Starr clarified that the original motion already included the railings and trim as proposed, and that the amendment pertained only to the revised porch flooring material.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Baroff, Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Thurston, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Skapik, Commissioner Burns, Commissioner Baggett

The motion to amend HD 26-05 item B was approved.

Commissioner Thurston sought clarification on whether the cedar trim and railing would be painted to match the original appearance. Mr. Wineburg confirmed the trim and railing would be painted to match the existing historic conditions.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Baroff, Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Thurston, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Skapik, Commissioner Burns, Commissioner Baggett

HD 26-05 item B was approved as amended.

C) REPLACEMENT OF TWO HALF COLUMNS WITH FULL COLUMNS ON THE FRONT PORCH.

Motion made by Commissioner Skapik to approve HD 26-05 item C) replacement of two half columns with full columns on the front porch as submitted; **Seconded** by Commissioner Posey.

Staff Report

Anais Starr, Planner II/Historic Preservation Officer, presented the staff report.

Commissioner Thurston asked whether there was any evidence indicating the original porch columns extended fully from the porch floor to the roofline. Ms. Starr stated she was unable to locate documentation or historic evidence confirming full-height columns in available records.

Commissioner Baggett clarified that while there was no evidence proving the porch originally had full-height columns, there was also no evidence showing that it did not. Ms. Starr confirmed that was correct.

Applicant Presentation

Ken Wineburg, the applicant, presented the proposed modifications.

Commissioner Baggett asked whether the applicant had investigated the existing structure to determine if a beam previously existed across the top of the porch to support the roof. Mr. Wineburg stated he had not.

Commissioner Zorba noted visible sagging in the roofline and asked whether the applicant had consulted a structural engineer. Mr. Wineburg stated foundation work had recently been completed and the contractor performing that work recommended adding additional support for the roof. Commissioner Zorba then asked whether there were plans to install a new beam across the top of the porch roof. Mr. Wineburg stated the roof is planned for replacement, but no additional structural elements are currently proposed unless deemed necessary once construction begins.

Commissioner Burns asked whether the applicant intended to match the trim detail at the tops of the new columns to the existing historic columns. Mr. Wineburg confirmed that was the intent.

Commissioner Thurston referenced a photograph included in the packet and pointed out indentations visible on the top beam that appeared to suggest full-height columns may have existed historically. She asked whether the applicant had noticed those markings previously. Mr. Wineburg stated he had not.

Public Comments

There were no public comments

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Zorba stated he did not object to the addition of full-height columns, since they were structural necessary.

Commissioner Skapik noted that her own home is architecturally similar to the applicant's property and includes four full-height columns, and therefore she did not see an issue with the proposed modification.

Commissioner Burns stated that installing a new interior support beam would likely be a much more extensive process and felt the addition of full-height columns was an appropriate solution to address the sagging porch roof.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Baroff, Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Thurston, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Skapik, Commissioner Burns, Commissioner Baggett

HD 26-05 item C was approved.

3. (HD 26-07) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUEST FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED 413 S LAHOMA AVENUE FOR THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS: A) CONSTRUCTION OF A DETACHED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT.

Motion made by Commissioner Skapik to approve HD 26-07 item A) construction of a detached accessory dwelling unit, as submitted, **Seconded** by Commissioner Posey.

Staff Report

Anais Starr, Planner II/Historic Preservation Officer, presented the staff report.

Commissioner Thurston sought clarification regarding the proposed height of the accessory dwelling unit (ADU). Ms. Starr stated the applicant would address those dimensions during the presentation.

Commissioner Baroff asked whether the structure shown in the photographs was a shed. Ms. Starr clarified that it was the original garage associated with the house and would remain on the property.

Commissioner Burns asked whether any new concrete would be added as part of the ADU construction. Ms. Starr stated that question would be better addressed by the applicant.

Applicant Presentation

Matt Seaton, representative of the applicant, presented the proposed ADU.

Commissioner Baroff asked about the height of the existing primary residence. Mr. Seaton stated he did not know the exact height. Commissioner Baroff noted he did not believe the comparison was critical given the proposed ADU's distance from the main structure.

Commissioner Zorba asked whether the proposed ADU exceeded fifteen feet in height. Mr. Seaton stated he did not believe the proposed ADU would be taller than the primary structure, noting the house contains an addition with a steep roof pitch.

Commissioner Thurston sought clarification regarding the wall height and gable height of the ADU. Ms. Starr confirmed the wall height was proposed at approximately 10 feet 1 inch, with a gable height of approximately 15 feet and 8.5 inches.

Commissioner Zorba asked about the neighboring structure visible in the site photographs. Ms. Starr stated it was an original historic structure associated with the property to the south.

Commissioner Skapik asked about the height of the neighboring structure. Mr. Seaton stated he did not know the exact height but suggested relocating the ADU farther to the left side of the yard to reduce its proximity to the neighboring historic structure.

Commissioner Thurston asked whether relocating the structure would make it more visible from the street. Mr. Seaton stated it would remain hidden by existing trees. Commissioner Burns also noted the presence of fencing surrounding the property that would further obscure view.

Commissioner Baggett sought clarification regarding the proposed relocation, confirming the ADU would simply shift from one side of the yard to the other. Mr. Seaton confirmed that was correct.

Commissioner Baroff asked whether the revised placement would cause the front door to face south instead of north. Mr. Seaton confirmed that was correct.

Commissioner Burns asked whether siding details had been provided. Mr. Seaton stated the details were included in the submitted packet, though not displayed in the presentation slides. Commissioner Thurston asked whether the siding would be installed with the smooth side facing outward, and Mr. Seaton confirmed that was correct. Commissioner Burns further asked whether the siding exposure would be seven inches, which Mr. Seaton also confirmed.

Commissioner Baggett asked why a wall height of approximately 10 feet 1 inch had been selected. Mr. Seaton stated there was no specific reason for that dimension.

Public Comments

Steve Ladner, 501 S Lahoma, Norman, OK

Stated that while he was not protest this particular request, he objected to the continual approval of ADU in the Chautauqua Historic District.

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Burns asked whether the applicant intended to retain a gravel driveway for the ADU rather than install concrete. Mr. Seaton confirmed that was correct.

Commissioner Baggett asked why a metal door had been proposed. Mr. Seaton stated metal doors were selected due to lower cost.

Commissioner Thurston asked why metal windows had been proposed. Mr. Seaton stated the windows were also selected for cost reasons and that they were unaware different materials would be required.

Commissioner Thurston referenced the Historic Preservation Guidelines, noting they require aluminum-clad windows for new construction and specify that accessory structures should remain under ten feet in height. Mr. Seaton stated the applicant would be willing to revise the height of the structure and the window material.

Commissioner Skapik asked about the height of a recently approved ADU on Chautauqua for comparison purposes and stated concerns regarding the scale of the current proposal. Mr. Seaton explained the interior was designed with vaulted ceilings to provide additional storage space.

Commissioner Skapik stated she would like to see more architectural references to the original structure and asked whether the wider siding was selected because narrower siding could not be sourced. Mr. Seaton stated narrower siding was available, but the intent was to avoid directly replicating the original house.

Commissioner Burns suggested incorporating exposed rafter tails to better relate the ADU to the architectural character of the primary structure. Mr. Seaton stated the applicant would be open to including those features.

Ms. Starr reviewed the applicable Historic Preservation Guidelines related to ADUs.

Commissioner Thurston reiterated that the guidelines specifically require wood or aluminum-clad windows for new primary and secondary structures and stated adherence to the adopted guidelines was important to maintain consistency and clear standards.

Commissioner Zorba asked whether the windows approved for a previously discussed ADU were aluminum clad. Ms. Starr confirmed they were. Commissioner Zorba then asked for additional feedback from the Commission regarding the proposed metal door.

Commissioner Burns noted that if the structure were relocated as proposed, the door would likely not be visible from the public street. Commissioner Thurston added that even if the fence were removed, the door would still remain largely obscured from view.

Commissioner Zorba asked whether additional information regarding the scale of the ADU would assist the Commission. Commissioner Thurston stated she believed the proposal appeared oversized and too tall. Mr. Seaton asked whether the concern related primarily to the wall height. Commissioner Thurston clarified that both the overall roof peak and wall height contributed to the scale concerns.

Commissioner Dysart noted that the proposed ADU would still remain shorter than the primary residence.

Break from 7:11 p.m. to 7:15 p.m.

Commissioner Posey sought clarification regarding which Historic Preservation Guideline sections applied to the proposed ADU, noting multiple sections addressed structures of that size. Ms. Starr identified the applicable guideline sections and explained some provisions applied specifically to secondary structures less than 400 square feet.

Commissioner Zorba asked whether the applicant preferred to postpone the request and return with additional information or proceed with a vote based on the current proposal.

Ms. Starr advised that a postponement would likely be the better option because the number of changes to the proposal and the amount of corresponding amendments required to the motion would be difficult to structure clearly. Commissioner Baroff added that a revised site plan would also be beneficial.

Amy Sohn, property owner of 413 S. Lahoma Avenue, explained that the existing historic garage on the property is over eleven feet tall, though smaller than the proposed ADU. She stated the proposed structure was intentionally designed to function as a dwelling space rather than appear as an additional garage while remaining compatible with the surrounding area. She noted nearby properties include several non-historic structures and stated the applicant was willing to make revisions in response to Commission concerns.

Ms. Starr clarified that the properties to the north are not located within the Chautauqua Historic District because they face Symmes Street. She also noted the neighboring structure to the south dates from the 1960s. Ms. Starr described the property configuration as unusual, with a historic rear structure that may have originally functioned as a garage and a later street-facing house constructed at the front of the property in the 1960s.

Commissioner Zorba asked whether the applicant wished to proceed with amendments. Ms. Starr stated any amendment would likely need to address the roof height, structure location, siding, windows, and entry door.

Commissioner Thurston asked whether the proposed siding was four-inch lap siding. Mr. Seaton stated the proposal used seven-inch siding. Commissioner Burns noted the packet described cedar-textured siding with smooth soffit materials, which Mr. Seaton confirmed.

Commissioner Baggett stated he was not supportive of the proposed metal door.

Commissioner Zorba asked the Commission what height they would consider appropriate for the ADU. Commissioner Thurston referenced a prior ADU approval in which the Commission reduced the maximum height from sixteen feet to fourteen feet. Mr. Seaton asked whether there was a specific guideline he could reference for determining an acceptable height. Commissioner Zorba stated the Commission generally evaluates height in relation to the scale and context of surrounding structures on the property.

Ms. Starr again recommended postponement due to the number of revisions under consideration.

Ms. Sohn clarified that the addition visible in one of the photographs was a non-historic addition approved in 2016 with a taller roof peak than the original structure. She also noted neighboring properties contain several taller structures and multiple dwelling units. Commissioner Zorba stated photographs documenting surrounding building scale would be helpful for future review.

Commissioner Thurston asked Commissioner Baggett whether his concerns related to the material or the design of the proposed door. Commissioner Baggett clarified that his objection related specifically to the use of metal.

Commissioner Thurston stated ADUs should remain subordinate in scale to the primary structure and expressed concern that the proposal appeared top-heavy. Commissioner Zorba stated additional information regarding structure height, site placement, siding dimensions, and aluminum-clad windows would assist the Commission in evaluating the request.

Mr. Seaton asked for clarification regarding the preferred height. Commissioner Thurston stated the Commission needed to review the structure in relation to the overall scale and massing of the property rather than focus solely on a single numerical height limit. She also stated the wall height should be ten feet.

Ms. Sohn asked whether structural modifications could reduce the building height without substantially altering the overall design. She explained their architect had indicated the gable design and framing configuration created additional space above the roofline. Commissioner Burns discussed possible solutions, including reducing the roof pitch or lowering the top plate height, while noting those revisions could impact the proposed loft and storage area.

Ms. Starr summarized concerns regarding the exterior materials and design details, particularly the siding, windows, and door materials. The Commission generally agreed that metal windows and doors would not be appropriate. Commissioner Skapik stated the overall design should include stronger visual references to the architectural character of the primary structure. Commissioners also requested larger and more detailed drawings for future review

Motion made by Commissioner Thurston to postpone HD 26-07; **Seconded** by Commissioner Posey.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Baroff, Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Thurston, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Skapik, Commissioner Burns, Commissioner Baggett

HD 26-07 was postponed.

REPORTS/UPDATES

4. STAFF REPORT ON ACTIVE CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS AND ADMINISTRATIVE BYPASS ISSUED SINCE APRIL 6, 2026.

Anais Starr reported on active COAs as follows:

- 549 S. Lahoma Avenue - Applicant has submitted a COA request for the north windows, but it was subsequently withdrawn prior to the February meeting. No change from last month.
- 904 Classen Avenue - Applicant is in the process of installing windows and siding on the north side of the house. No change from last month.
- 607-609 S. Lahoma Avenue - New wood front windows installed. They have until 6/5/2028 to install remaining windows. No change from last month.
- 1320 Oklahoma Avenue - Vacant lot. No building permit have been submitted. No change since last month.
- 505 Chautauqua Avenue - Work continues.
- 643 Okmulgee Street - Work on the house is complete. Rear fence complete. Expansion of the driveway with an additional parking space has not started. No change from last month.
- 467 College Ave – Work on covered patio complete. ADU work continues.
- 325 Keith Street – Building permit submitted and approved. Work has not started.
- 315 Castro Street - Building permit issued. Work has started.
- 502 Macy Street - Work has not started.
- 720 S. Lahoma Avenue - Work has not started.
- 533 S. Lahoma – Building permit issued.
- 452 S. Lahoma – Work has not started. No change from last month.
- 508 Chautauqua Ave - Work has not started.

Anais Starr reported on Administrative Bypass issued since January 5, 2026:

- 720 Miller Ave – Metal storm/screen door on front porch.

5. DISCUSSION OF PROGRESS REPORT REGARDING FYE 2025-2026 CLG GRANT PROJECTS.

Anais Starr discussed the progress report regarding FYE 2025-2026 CLG Grant Projects.

25-26 CLG Grant Projects

PROJECT 1: Educational Training - \$3,000

PROJECT 2: Memberships Dues for NAPC - \$150

PROJECT 3: Historic Tour Mobile App Maintenance - \$1,725

PROJECT 4: Lunch and Learn Windows Programs \$1,200

PROJECT 5: Biannual Education Postcard - \$1,800

TOTAL BUDGET OF CLG FUNDS - \$7,875

Ms. Starr explained that the final expense to be paid from the 2025–2026 CLG Grant funds would be a training opportunity for her, though the details were still being finalized. She also stated the City’s NAPC membership renewal had been completed and an

updated mailing list had been provided to NAPC, so Commissioners should begin receiving emails and correspondence from the organization.


MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

Ms. Starr informed the Commission that the Zoning Code is currently being updated and noted that the revisions may include updates to the Preservation Ordinance and Guidelines. The Commission then discussed potential changes and clarifications that could help make the guidelines more understandable and easier to interpret.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

Passed and approved this 1st day of June 2026.



Historic District Chair

