

# CARSON CITY HISTORIC ARCHITECTURE REVIEW COMMISSION

## Minutes of the May 15, 1997 Meeting

Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Historic Architecture Review Commission was held on Thursday, May 15, 1997 in the Administrative Complex Conference Room #59, 2621 Northgate Lane, Carson City, NV at 5:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Chairperson Peggy Twedt  
Vice Chairperson Mike Drews  
Scott Brooks-Miller  
Art Hannafin  
Verne Horton  
Scott Klette  
Mark Lopiccolo

**STAFF:** Rob Joiner, Principal Planner  
Tara Hullinger, Associates Planner  
Fran Smith, Recording Secretary  
(HARC 5/15/97 1-0000.5)

**NOTE** - Unless otherwise indicated each item was introduced by Chairperson Twedt. Individuals speaking are identified following the heading of each item. A tape recording of these proceedings is on file in the Clerk-Recorder's office. This recording is available for review and inspection during normal business hours.

**A. CALL TO ORDER** - Chairperson Twedt called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. A roll call was taken and a quorum was present although Commissioner Hannafin did not arrive until 5:37 p.m.

**B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES** - Commissioner Drews moved to approve the Minutes of the March 11, 1997 meeting. Commissioner Brooks-Miller seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

Commissioner Brooks-Miller moved to approve the Minutes of the special March 27, 1997 meeting. Commissioner Drews seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

Commissioner Drews moved to approve the Minutes of the April 22, 1997 meeting. Commissioner Klette seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

**C. MODIFICATION OF AGENDA** - None.

**D. PUBLIC COMMENT** - None.

**E. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**1. H-96/97-36 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FROM CRAIG AND MARILYN CANEPA TO PLACE A 7' X 14' STORAGE SHED ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 310-312 SO. MINNESOTA, APN 3-126-04 - (1-0077.5)** Commissioner Brooks-Miller moved to approve the project. Commissioner Drews seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

Commissioner Hannafin arrived at this point.

**2. H-96/97-37 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FROM JIM KNASIAK - NATIONAL BUSINESS FACTORS, FOR ADDITION OF A RECESSED ENTRY IN AN EXISTING STORE FRONT FACING CARSON ST., AND REPLACEMENT OF AN EXISTING DOOR FACING MUSSER ST. ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 202 NO. CARSON ST., APN 3-213-03** - Architect Scott Barbour said basically the project was a result of internal improvements. He added the proposal was to mimic the other recessed area in the northeast facing of the building which would remain as the Carson Street identity. He noted the other part would be to replace the loading doors on Musser Street. He noted that this would

# CARSON CITY HISTORIC ARCHITECTURE REVIEW COMMISSION

## Minutes of the May 15, 1997 Meeting

Page 2

create a similar facade with an exit on Musser. He said the existing detail and colors would be the same. Commissioner Klette asked if they would be sawing any of the stone and Mr. Barbour said they would not. Commissioner Horton asked if a steel frame door could be installed and painted to match the woodwork and Mr. Barbour said there would be no objection. Commissioner Drews moved H-96/97-37, a request from Scot Barbour, Architect (property owner: Jim Knasiak - National Business Factors) for addition of a recessed entry in an existing store front facing Carson St., PAN 3-213-03; the subject approval is based on the finding that the plans as submitted comply in general conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines, Carson City Historic District guidelines, and with HARC policies; subject to the following conditions, and with the understanding that any stipulations to the Commission by the applicant may be considered as conditions to the approval. He noted that the stipulation was that the applicant would provide Mark Lopiccolo with a brochure depicting a steel door. Commissioner Klette seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

**3. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FROM DR. GARY DANKWORTH TO REPLACE A REAR DOOR AND REBUILD REAR PORCH ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 812 NO. NEVADA AT., APN 1-192-02 - (1-0193.5)** Mr. Joiner noted this had been continued from the previous meeting. Commissioner Lopiccolo said he had visited the site and explained the applicant had removed the shed roof and put in a gable. He noted that the applicant had not added any square footage, had not changed the design of the building, and is using the same kind of siding. He expressed his feeling that the project is a much better improvement over the way it looked. Commissioner Drews moved to approve H-96/97-34 a request from Dr. Gary Dankworth, property owner: same, to replace a rear door and rebuild rear porch on property located at 812 No. Nevada St., APN 1-192-02; subject approval is based on the finding that the plans as submitted comply in general conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines, Carson City Historic District guidelines, and HARC polices, subject to the following conditions with the understanding that any stipulation to the Commission by the applicant may be considered as conditions to the approval. Commissioner Horton seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

**4. H-96/97-38 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FROM FREEDOM PROFESSIONAL VENTURES FOR FINAL ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN APPROVAL FOR A PROPOSED BUILDING TO BE LOCATED AT 611 NO. NEVADA ST., APN 3-285-01 - (1-0335.5)** Mark Palmer and Robert Lauder of Freedom Professional Ventures - Mr. Lauder noted they had previously come before the Commission for a demolition. He also said at that time they had provided draft plans and said they are still basically the same except for some minor variations. A lengthy discussion ensued on changes the Commission wanted made. This included visual demonstrations of the drawings which covered windows, building materials, colors, roof materials, a possible porch, location of doors, parking requirements and waiver request from Downtown Redevelopment for two off site spaces, landscaping, sidewalks, columns, and width of an easement. Mr. Palmer then asked for support from the Commission on issues that relate to Public Works. Mr. Joiner suggested that the Commission have a subcommittee to work with staff and the applicant on the landscaping. Commissioner Horton noted that once that is taken care of the Commission could probably approve the project. Commissioner Hannafin commented that their main concern is the exterior of the building and that the elevation on the south side is not what could be expected. Mr. Palmer explained that after the previous meeting it was his understanding that they were to try to create some symmetry on both sides. The discussion turned to the windows with shutters and Commissioner Brooks-Miller expressed his belief that the shutters were inappropriate. He suggested instead a crown and described how it should look. Commissioner Drews then moved to approve Item H-96/97-38 a request from Freedom Professional Ventures for final architectural design approval for a proposed building to be located at 611 No. Nevada St., APN 3-285-01; subject approval is based on the finding that plans as submitted comply in general conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines, Carson City Historic District guidelines, and HARC policies; subject to the following conditions: an additional post to be placed left of the doorway that mimics the approach from the roof on the original structure, realign the windows, south elevation, remove the shutters on the building and apply 1 x 4 side trim to the windows, landscape plans will be discussed with the sub-committee for approval, and recommend to Carson City Redevelopment that the project be allowed two off street parking places, and with the understanding that any stipulations to the Commission by the applicant may be considered as conditions to the approval. Commissioner Brooks-Miller seconded the motion. Chairperson Twedt suggested adding to the motion that on the structure of the post that the Commissioners involved confer with the sub-committee dealing with landscaping and that they assist the staff on that element.

# CARSON CITY HISTORIC ARCHITECTURE REVIEW COMMISSION

## Minutes of the May 15, 1997 Meeting

Page 3

Commissioner Drews amended his motion to reflect this. Commissioner Brooks-Miller accepted the amendment. Motion carried 6-0. Commissioner Horton left the meeting at 6:30 p.m. during the discussion.

### **5. H-95/96-30 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REVIEW OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL ON REQUEST FOR DESIGN APPROVAL FOR REHABILITATION OF AN EXISTING BUILDING AND NEW CONSTRUCTION - (1-1223.5)**

Commissioner Drews had requested this be on the agenda. He expressed his concerns with the renovation and reconstruction of the medical office primarily because he saw more and more of the old structure disappearing for no apparent reason.

(1-1249.5) Commissioner Drews said the first condition noted extensive demolition and modification of the existing historic structure destroyed significant historic details that characterized the property and that the project does not comply in general conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for historic buildings. He added as a result it will not qualify for the open space use assessment.

(1-1256.5) He continued by saying the second condition was that the rehabilitation of 1,100 square feet of the remaining historic structure provides two on street parking spaces under Title 18, two fewer than required by code, additional parking will be provided on the southwest corner of the property with an entrance on Minnesota, blue spruce will be retained as shown on the amended plans which is consistent with historic landscaping, original siding will be restored and maintained on the structure, the Division Street side of the historic structure itself as shown on the amended plans, landscape plans will be modified to provide a six foot wide side cover between sidewalk and curb, the plans for street parking on the north side of the property were submitted for approval, and any changes in the corporate design and on site plans to meet code restrictions should be submitted for approval.

(1-1283.5) At this point he reported there had been a meeting in March on site and they had talked with Mark Beachum and a number of representatives from Anderson Construction. He noted the Commissioners had expressed their dissatisfaction with the remodeling. He said at that time they had complained that the siding on the north elevation had been removed, the reason being it had to be sheeting. He said at that time there was sheeting attached to the original 2 x 4 studs with new windows framed in. He noted that a subsequent visit was inside and they had realized that all the 2 x 4 studs with the exception of two had been removed from the north elevation and sheeting re-applied. He said standing on the inside of the building the only thing he saw left of the original building was the Division Street facade and the ceiling joists. He noted that the floor had been removed, as had both north and south walls and the roof. He felt it was so far away from doing any kind of restoration to the structure that the project was ridiculous. He said previous to that it had been had clarified with the contractor what the Commission meant by restoration but it had fallen on deaf ears. He felt that he and Mr. Joiner had gone out of their way to try to keep the lines of communication open. He said he could understand why some shearing on the walls had to be done but a couple of weeks later the studs were gone and they were re-sheared. He said he could not understand why when someone had been told they needed to save as much of the original materials as they could that they would tear them out and put new 2 x 6 pieces in.

(1-1343.5) John Anderson said when Commissioner Drews had visited the site was after the siding on the north wall was taken off. He added in order to hold that area together they had installed plywood which was not sheared at that point. He said there were three door openings on the north wall and they had ended up framing in two window openings on that wall. Commissioner Drews said he and Mr. Joiner had talked about the siding issue and how, when restoration is being done, the contractor is to try and save as much as the old material as possible. He noted they had told Mr. Beachum that after two thirds of the original structure had been demolished that there remained plenty of material if removed properly could have been salvaged and used to replace damaged siding. He added they had also specifically pointed to the wall where there was a stud that had other studs scabbed to it and had said if the contractor was doing restoration what should be done is to pull that stud out and replace it with one of the other studs from the demolition or from an interior wall. Mr. Joiner said something else that was important was because of some of the comments made to him prior to visiting the site that day were that Mr. Beachum had said how it had to be done. Mr. Joiner said he had told him they were dealing with a historic building and there is a conservation code. He noted that Mr. Beachum had told him they checked this out and this was what had to be done. Mr. Joiner said Larry McPhail, Deputy Building Official, had also been present and confirmed that there are

# CARSON CITY HISTORIC ARCHITECTURE REVIEW COMMISSION

## Minutes of the May 15, 1997 Meeting

Page 4

alternatives and that the materials that are there can be used. Mr. Joiner added that all of the building inspectors and officials are versed in that. Commissioner Drews then said he had asked if the north wall was sufficient to carry the load of the new roof and had been told they had looked at that and it could. He commented that the only thing that had been saved was the facade of the building and that was not what the Commission approved and it does not meet the conditions set for the project. He said if they have to check every page of the plans to make sure the work is done properly they can but the process would take four times longer. Mr. Anderson said that they, as the contractor, had followed the drawings and did not do anything they did not feel they had permission to do. He also said it was his understanding that in one of the conditions the fabric on the Division Street side needed approval for any changes to it. He expressed his belief there was a further amendment to include the north and south sides. Commissioner Drews said the last time the Commission heard this project the motion motion was in condition three that the original siding will be restored and maintained on the signature Division Street side of the historic structure as shown on the amended plans. He said Commissioner Klette had then pointed out that the plans indicated the siding for the remaining portion of the building was to be matched on the north, south and could be restored and maintained and also on the Division Street side of the historic structure. He said that was an amendment to his conditions at that meeting which then became part of the conditions. Mr. Anderson said they got the final set of drawings from the architect approximately two months after that last meeting and that they had not done anything they did not think they had approvals for in the process. Commissioner Brooks-Miller said after the Commission gave approval in December and January he did not feel Mr. Anderson was absolutely forthright with the Commission when they removed the original structure off the foundation to the west side of the site. Mr. Anderson said he had called Mr. Joiner a week before planning to move it and asked if there was a problem. He expressed his feeling that the floor structure was shot, that being structurally inadequate. Mr. Anderson said he had a problem with his integrity being questioned in a public meeting by the statement he had not been forthright. Commissioner Drews asked who is responsible for overseeing a project like this. He felt there had been a lack of communication on this and it concerned him because he felt it was a worthwhile project and a case where the 1,100 square feet of that house could have been saved if done properly. Commissioner Brooks-Miller felt this has been a learning experience for the Commission and noted most architects are trained to design not rehabilitate. A citizen expressed his feeling that some contractors who work in the District should have a background in historic work. Chairperson Twedt said many projects have been done in the District since the beginning of the Commission and this is the only one she was aware of where there has been this sort of mis-communication. She also commented on the things the Commission had believed would be preserved. Commissioner Drews said they had never approved demolition. He added in terms of the roof the structural engineer had said there were too many cracked members and deflection. Mr. Anderson noted that it was not in their best interest to be chastised publicly for how they handle a project. He noted they build according to the set of drawings and could lose his license if they do not. He agreed that he, too, had learned from the project. Commissioner Drews felt it is time to meet with contractors to review what terms like restoration and rehabilitation mean. Dr. Schnaser felt those involved should make sure this doesn't happen again. Mr. Joiner noted that the Commission had done well in the District in fifteen years because they had dedicated people serving on the Commission. He added on this project, because the Commission is user friendly, conceptual approvals were made but that would not happen again. He felt that a person or a sub-committee should check all the plans as they come through for plan check and the Commission perhaps needs to certify who will work on a project or have a qualified professional on site at all times to monitor the progress. He added this would be at the expense of the contractor. Commissioner Drews asked what had happened to the old beadwork and trim. Mr. Anderson said they had saved what was left of that side but a lot of it had to be built new because there was not enough left to install. Mr. Joiner commented that more than one opinion should have been sought when there was a question of what could be saved and what could not. At this point Commissioner Hannafin said he had noticed some lights that were recently put up and expressed his concern that they were very bright and glaring. He noted he had written to Dr. Schnaser who had agreed and that they would be replaced. Mr. Joiner then provided information on the standards for lights. No formal action was taken.

### **6. H-96/97-40 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING DEVELOPMENT OF A MISSION STATEMENT FOR THE HISTORIC ARCHITECTURE REVIEW COMMISSION - (1-2319.5)**

Mr. Joiner said at the most recent workshop the Commission had indicated a desire to have this on a regular agenda. He provided copies of a progress report from the workshop. An extensive discussion ensued on possible changes in the language which were agreed to. No formal action was taken.

**CARSON CITY HISTORIC ARCHITECTURE REVIEW COMMISSION**

**Minutes of the May 15, 1997 Meeting**

Page 5

**7. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE STRATEGIC PLANNING WORKSHOP HELD ON APRIL 22, 1997** - (1-2541.5) Commissioner Drews proposed another workshop and felt that all the Commissioners should attend. Chairperson Twedt suggested that they review the document and then discuss a date.

**F-4 STRATEGIC PLANNING WORKSHOP DATES** - (1-2589.5) This item was taken out of order so that possible dates could be determined. They agreed that the first choice would be June 12, the second was June 17, and the third was June 10. Following discussion they agreed to have the workshop June 12.

**8. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE CARSON CITY HOUSING MASTER PLAN ELEMENT DRAFT AS IT RELATES TO HISTORIC PROPERTIES WITHIN CARSON CITY** - (1-2771.5) Mr. Joiner provided copies and expressed his feeling that they had finally integrated the language they wanted. Commissioners agreed it was a good document.

**9. H-96/97-41 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FROM PATRICIA A. COOPER-SMITH FOR INCLUSION IN OPEN SPACE USE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM FOR PROPERTY TAX DEFERMENT ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1206 NO. NEVADA ST., APN 1-172-02** - (1-2803.5) Commissioner Drews moved to approve the request for inclusion. Commissioner Hannafin seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

**F-1 1. COMMISSION MEMBER REPORTS (NON-ACTION)** - (1-2895.5) Commissioner Brooks-Miller suggested in the future on motions the words "for preservation" follow Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines. Commissioners agreed to add this.

Chairperson Twedt provided copies of the Sierra Sage publication and said there was an article by Guy Rocha on the Phillips House which is the location of the Schnaser project.

**2. STAFF REPORTS (NON-ACTION)** - (1-2817.5) None.

**3. FUTURE COMMISSION ITEMS** - Suggested earlier.

**G. ADJOURNMENT** - Commissioner Brooks-Miller moved to adjourn. Commissioner Klette seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0. Chairperson Twedt adjourned the meeting at 8:10.

The Minutes of the May 15, 1997 meeting of the Carson City Architecture Review Commission

ARE SO APPROVED \_\_\_\_ 7/8 \_\_\_\_, 1997

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Peggy Twedt, Chairperson