



**ARTS, CULTURE AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION WORKSHOP
AGENDA**

June 15, 2026 at 8:30 AM

Council Chambers at City Hall - 1123 W. Lake St. Sandpoint, Idaho

Call to Order

Roll Call

Consent Items

1. [Approval of written decision regarding App PM26-0002 Mural at 105 S. 1st Ave](#) – **Action Item**

Commission Business - Historic Preservation

2. Workshop on Historic Preservation Code

Adjourn

WRITTEN DECISION of the Arts, Culture, and Historic Preservation Commission

Mural at 105 S. First Avenue, Sandpoint, Idaho

Application Number PM26-0002

The application of **Jennings Waterhouse**, requesting approval of a mural was recommended by the Arts, Culture and Historic Preservation Commission at the conclusion of their review of application number PM26-0002 conducted on June 9, 2026 to the City Council to **DENY** the request. The subject application involved a mural located on the south side of an existing building at 105 S First Avenue.

The Commission evaluated the application, making note of their role to recommend action on applications for murals, also noting that City Council makes final decisions on applications for murals. Murals are defined and regulated in the City's Zoning Ordinance in Chapter 6, Sign Code (SCC 9-6).

At the conclusion of their review at a publicly noticed regular meeting of the Arts, Culture, and Historic Preservation Commission, the Commissioners deliberated the proposal and Commissioner Deaner moved and Commissioner McAlister seconded the motion, to recommend that City Council deny the application PM26-0002 for a mural. All Commission members who were present voted for denial.

Review Comments:

#1. The Commission asked staff whether or not the proposal was a sign or a mural because the submitted materials depicted an image that appeared more sign-like than a mural. Staff indicated that mural and signs were both defined in Sandpoint City Code, specifically the Sign Ordinance, Title 9, Chapter 6, and that:

- A. The proposal did not advertise any service, or product, and did not include any business name or direct anyone to any business;
- B. The proposal better met the definition of a mural identified in the code; and
- C. The proposal did not depict any image of a product or service that was being conducted inside the building of the proposed mural site;
- D. The proposal did not meet the definition of a sign.

#2. The Commission discussed that the submitted materials were inappropriate for a mural because:

- A. The proposal did not involve anything historic;
- B. The proposal was not art as is customarily depicted in murals;
- C. The image was too contemporary given the City's focus on historic preservation and efforts to reinforce historic identity;
- D. The image could be in any city, anywhere and despite its words did not evoke anything specifically relevant to Sandpoint;
- E. While friendly and the first image that would be seen as you enter Sandpoint, it was too trendy.