Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Historic Resources Commission was scheduled for 5:30 p.m. on Thursday, November 13, 2008 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairperson Michael Drews

Vice Chairperson Robert Darney

Rebecca Ossa Gregory Hayes Mark Lopiccolo

STAFF: Lee Plemel, Planning Division Director

Jennifer Pruitt, Senior Planner

Darlene Rubin, Recording Secretary

NOTE: A recording of these proceedings, the commission's agenda materials, and any written comments or documentation provided to the recording secretary during the meeting are public record, on file in the Clerk-Recorder's Office. These materials are available for review during regular business hours.

- **A. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM:** Chairperson Michael Drews called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Roll was called, a quorum was present. Lou Ann Speulda was absent.
- **B. ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Commissioner Rebecca Ossa moved to approve the minutes of October 15, 2008. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hayes. The motion carried 4-0 with one abstention (Lopiccolo).

C. MODIFICATION OF AGENDA: None

- **D. DISCLOSURES:** Chairperson Michael Drews reported that he met with Tom Peters about three months ago to discuss Item F-1 on the agenda. They met at the property and Mr. Drews informed Mr. Peters what the Commission was looking for.
- E. PUBLIC COMMENTS:(5:31:31) Jed Block, Carson City resident, reported that he had acquired some furniture that D. L. Bliss had ordered from George Kitzmeyer in about 1896. Mr. Block also obtained some artifacts from his father. Therefore, Mr. Block and wife Nicole want to start a Carson City history museum. They will have their first meeting in January 2009 and are currently in the process of getting the necessary information for that venture. So far about a half-dozen people are interested in working with them. Anyone of similar interest should contact Mr. Block. He would inform the HRC when the meeting was scheduled.

Chair Drew asked where Mr. Block planned to locate the museum. Mr. Block said he had a 700 sf garage behind his office. He intended to do a focus group and prepare a business plan, and find out what types of articles they wanted to collect and where they could get them. He had been attending the Kit Carson Shrine Club meetings and there were many people from Carson City in their late 80's/early 90's in attendance and he hoped to be able to obtain some things from them. Initially he felt that the museum could be open for the Ghost Walk, maybe for the Kit Carson Trail, until such time as they determined how to obtain funding, probably in a few years given the state of the economy. They wanted to begin collecting memorabilia.

Commissioner Lopiccolo suggested Mr. Block check with the Carson City Building Department for approval.

F. PUBLIC HEARING MATTERS: (5:32:47)

F-1 HRC-08-115: Action to consider an application from Tom Peters (property owner: Don and Rosetta McFadden) to refurbish a detached garage, on property zoned Single Family 6000, located at 711 West Spear Street, APN 003-244-01. Jennifer Pruitt reported that the subject site was approximately 15,000+ sf and currently there was a 2,828 sf single family dwelling unit centrally located on the site. Ms. Pruitt used a PowerPoint presentation to describe that the applicant had proposed to do some work to the detached garage structure. That would entail some repairs to an existing roof structure, siding on the southern portion of the structure—which they would remove (samples of the wood siding and the tin roof material, as well as a cut sheet of the proposed wooden door provided by applicant). The applicant proposed removal of the existing wood shake-shingle roof and replacement with a tin roof similar to the tin roof on the primary structure. Ms. Pruitt gave an extensive description of the proposed changes. Among which applicant proposed removing two of the exterior doors and replacing with a light product. Included in the staff report, attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference, the standards had been identified that were specific to roofs, siding, and doors. Most important to note, the applicant had not proposed any alterations to the primary dwelling unit on site. Conditions of approval were provided in the packet. The applicant was present for questions.

Commissioner Lopiccolo asked applicant Tom Peters if the area that had the shingle siding had ship-lap underneath it. Mr. Peters said it did not. He said he would be using a good-quality cedar siding that was as close a match as he could find to the original, for the west side (Mountain Street). He intended to pull off the existing material and rebuild the wall as necessary, put some sheer where none existed, and re-side it with the cedar to match the west side.

Chair Drews noted that the guidelines specified that old doors should be saved when at all possible, repaired if possible to eliminate warping and leakage. Mr. Peters said the photographs did not faithfully depict the condition of the doors. One door (cut sheet provided) was as close a match as he could find to

the original. The other doors were "1x materials and not much to speak of, and falling apart." He could perhaps save one door however it was deteriorating as well. His plan was to replace the doors with a close match. Gregory Lopiccolo noted the style did closely match the existing doors. Chair Drews asked if the green color would be retained, which Mr. Peters said it would. The roofing on the main structure was corrugated metal and he would use something similar in style and color, with staining on the west side to match.

Vice Chair Robert Darney motioned to approve HRC-08-115 application by Tom Peters, property owner Don and Rosetta McFadden, to refurbish a detached garage, on property zoned Single Family 6000, located at 711 West Spear Street, APN 003-244-01, with all the staff recommendations. It was seconded by Rebecca Ossa. The motion carried 5-0.

F-2. HRC-080117 (5:40:54) Action to consider an application from Ben Smith of BSA Construction (property owner Adaven Investments, LLC) demolition of an existing 954 square foot-detached garage and the exterior alterations associated with the conversion from an existing multi-family four-plex use to a professional office use, on property zoned residential office, located at 503 North Nevada Street, APN 003-222-05. Jennifer

Pruitt described the subject property as a two-story structure built in 1915. The subject site was approximately 3,332 sf and currently the primary structure on site was a four-plex with 2,948 sf. There was also a detached garage structure of approximately 954 sf on site. Presently the applicant was proposing some exterior alterations that include the removal of the vents and the flues as well as the existing windows in the porch and balcony areas. Other proposed alterations were new exterior stairs on the northern facade with wrought iron railings, as well as columns on the western facade, in addition to a handicapped ramp required by the Building Division, and replacement of all windows and doors for the structure. The applicant had provided cut sheets for the windows and also for the proposed door product, the column product, and the siding product, all contained in the packet attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference.

Ms. Pruitt said her understanding was that the primary structure currently had a stucco finish. Most of the windows on the southern facade and the eastern facade were two-over-twos, there were some small bathroom windows, photographs of which were depicted in a PowerPoint presentation that followed, and included the various facades as well as patio areas which were enclosed with windows. The applicant proposed to eliminate all of those windows. The applicant proposed to replace the two-over-twos on the southern facade. The porch windows on the front facade appeared to have been painted multiple times. Ms. Pruitt was unsure whether applicant proposed replacing the smaller bathroom windows at this time, however the applicant could address that. There was also a photo of the garage structure which the applicant had proposed to demolish.

One important aspect of the project, Ms. Pruitt reported, was the change of occupancy of the structure and

the proposed use for professional offices would require additional parking on site. It was her understanding that in place of the garage to be demolished they would add handicapped parking space as required by the Building Division, as well as additional parking on site. The staff report provided additional information regarding the appropriateness for the types of material the applicant had proposed and there was a request to provide as much information as possible to the applicant if there were some concerns regarding any of the proposed materials. There were some significant changes to the site. The applicant had undergone a major project review in the Planning Division therefore, comments had been provided to the applicant from the Building Division, Engineering Division, Planning Division and the Health Division. The applicant was present for questions.

Contractors Ben Smith and Steve Hendricks, BSA Construction, came forward. Vice Chair Robert Darney asked when the garage was built. Mr. Hendricks did not know, and Ms. Pruitt confirmed staff had no documentation on date of origin. Commissioner Gregory Hayes asked if the proposal to remove the garage was to create parking. Mr. Smith said that was correct. Vice Chair Darney asked Ms. Pruitt if the garage was demolished and handicapped parking on the side installed, was other on-site parking required in addition. He referred to the blueprints on which tandem parking was proposed which he understood was not allowed. Ms. Pruitt confirmed he was correct; they had been in contact with applicant to make them aware the tandem parking spaces proposed would not be acceptable. They were working on an application for a special use permit to utilize some parking within 300 feet of the site, and also they did have five parking spaces on the street that were used for that structure as well.

Gregory Hayes asked about the porch area; it appeared to him that it had been closed in at some later date and whatever windows could be found were "slapped" up there. He was unsure why it was proposed to remove all the 2x2's (which looked a lot like his home just down the road in the historic district), because the whole notion of historic districts was to try to salvage whenever possible. He assumed the two-over-two's were a single pane, so achieving energy conservation in historic districts across the country would mean removing tens of thousands of windows if that were the highest value, but it was not the only value. He had retained all the single-pane, low R-value windows in his house; he pulled them off and sealed them to prevent leakage, and did other things on the inside to add R-value. He thought the windows on the subject property were "rather attractive," and perhaps they could be worked with rather than discarded.

Commissioner Ossa stated that the application she received did not have cut sheets therefore she did not know what the proposed windows were and she would like the contractor to speak to that, as well as how the siding would be done. Ben Smith stated that the existing windows were in "bad shape" and the energy efficiency of the new structure was what his client had in mind. He wanted to have the same look as the existing windows offered but in a colored vinyl, which he felt would allow for increased efficiency while keeping the two-over-two look in the way the new windows were installed. As to the siding product, the stucco had been built out over the existing structure. They were unsure what was under it and as tenants were moving out of the space he had not yet been able to pull that off. He was assuming it to be a brick structure underneath. The way it was built out off the windows it was not even on the outside surfaces, so

they would probably have to remove the existing stucco to place the new siding material. Ms. Ossa said that the way it was designed on paper, she had some issues with it. She felt it significantly altered the building to the point where it was no longer contributing to the district. She understood the energy efficiency issue with the windows but wondered if the owner had looked at possibly doing storm windows. The other issue she had was with the siding; adding the hearty plank siding significantly altered the look and made the wall thicker. There were several historic houses in the district that had stucco siding—one, the Clemens house, was originally ship-lap siding, but sometime in the 40s or 50s the stucco salesman came by and did a lot of homes. She wondered how wedded the owner was to putting that new siding on. Further, the columns and the architectural detailing, the dentil, and the light fixtures, looked very modern and forced. "It was like adding history to the building that really did not exist," she said, so she was concerned. As to the iron railing, she could see it on the stairs only. She could see the windows coming off the porch and leaving it open, but leaving the stucco wall as on the porches.

Chair Drews felt similarly. The whole notion of the historic district was to retain what could be retained. There were modern materials that were sometimes appropriate to use, but that was always in debate, as he was more of a traditionalist in terms of material. If the contractor was replacing the windows, Mr. Drews would think of wood first and not plastic because that was the material used at that time in that building. He reiterated that the guidelines specified to retain and repair when at all possible. Sometimes replacement was necessary but there was much that could be done to salvage with properly executed repairs and/or replacement of jambs, thresholds, stop moldings, hinges, etc., which would provide the same energy efficiency as the new door and maintain the historic value. He also agreed with Ms. Ossa that stucco had a certain historic value (as evidenced by the old Clemens house on Division). Ms. Ossa added that the house was repainted within the last year and that had improved it greatly, for which she commended the property owner. Now to put on the fake hearty plank siding, she felt, would cause a loss to its historic character.

Chair Drews said he would be interested to see what was under the stucco, and if the stucco was to be removed to try to replace it with something that was under there before. He felt the hearty plank was the worst option, because basically that building would be taken down to the studs and turned into something different. Ms. Ossa asked if there was a photo of the northwest side of the building, however the one available was not too helpful. She had driven by the property earlier and noticed that the front porch balcony or porch area looked to be a later addition, as the stucco that was applied went over all the trim work which along with the windows gave it a 1930s to a 1950s feel. In response to a question about the interior wall behind the porch, Ben Smith said it was finished out with drywall. However, the owner's representative was present and perhaps she should be asked if stucco was possible; it was definitely considered as an option. He believed the siding was looked at, going back at where the structure may fit in its time and the type of siding materials put on at that time. He believed the owner was open to other exterior options.

Chair Drews said if the structure could be brought back to its original appearance that would be "great,"

but if something else was being made out of it, then it would not meet the guidelines. Rebecca Ossa suggested Jed Block might have some historic photos of that building. Jed Block said he would talk to his father about it. Ms. Ossa said if the house was built in 1915 it was highly likely to have had wood ship-lap siding. Steve Hendricks said that was the reason for their research and why they put the siding on because that seemed to be the trend then for a colonial revival house. If hearty plank was not the option, they were open to other suggestions. The iconic columns were another item in that time frame, as was the dentil moulding around the trim. If the balcony was not wrought iron but was a wood railing, then that would be all right. They were desirous of low maintenance as well as a look from the past.

Vice Chair Darney agreed with most of what had been stated about the balcony railing. He felt the overall structure was a very simple, rectangular shape with the hip roof and very simple trim. The columns were fine but needed to be simplified, clean columns with a simple capital, and not a lot of detail. He did not think the dentils were going to fit and added an Early American style that was a little overdone for the simplicity of the building. He also felt the railing should mimic more of a bungalow style like the neighborhood, and the open railing may need to be "stylized railing" or solid railing as Rebecca had suggested. Otherwise, he added that he liked the rearrangement of the windows, taking some out and adding doors in the back cleaned up the lines. They all supported salvaging the windows, if possible, but if necessary to replace them, the exterior should be a wood product; they generally tried to discourage vinyl windows.

Commissioner Lopiccolo asked about vents on the roof and Ben Smith responded that they had to do with mechanical systems and they would definitely update that. Ms. Ossa did not have a problem with the demolition of the garage because it looked like a much later addition, perhaps the 50s or 60s, nor did she have a problem with the new stair, but the detailing on the front and not having the window cut sheet concerned her. She wanted to know what that would look like—there was a two-over-two in the drawing but in the photographs it looked as though on some of the sides there were one-over-one's. Mr. Lopiccolo asked about the cut sheet for the windows. He asked if they replaced those windows would they have the mullion in the middle so they would be two-over-two. Ben Smith said they would do that, and he did not believe the client would have a problem with "True Light." The initial thought was for low maintenance and energy efficiency, but he realized they definitely had to consider the historic value of the property so he felt they could come up with a window that met those needs.

Chair Drews said there had been a number of articles in *Old House Journal* that addressed how to replace the double-hung. The Adams House, built about the same time, used storm windows, which "if you get too close to it you'll hurt your face because you can't tell it's there." It worked very well. In terms of cost, good wood True Light double-hung would cost about the same as cleaning up the existing ones. Commissioner Ossa noted that Mr. Waterhouse's home on the corner of Musser and Division may have all the windows replaced, he had come in to make his case and had very detailed photos, but he had windows to match the originals. In this case, she wondered if it would be a "sealed system," that perhaps those windows would not be operable, which would be an excellent opportunity to put a storm window

on the outside and not have to worry about opening or maintaining them. Commissioner Hayes noted again that the guidelines spoke of preserving windows and doors, if at all possible, so how did they help applicants determine whether that seemed feasible. Jennifer Pruitt said it was her understanding that they needed to be properly evaluated, that was how one knew if they could be salvaged or not. Mr. Hayes asked by whom was that done. Ms. Pruitt said the Commission could make that decision; the concern was that they did not have anyone available to evaluate them free of charge. In the past there had been some occasions where someone had come forward and evaluated the product proposed for replacement, or perhaps the applicant was willing to have them evaluated and provide the report back to the Commission. Both had happened in the past. Vice Chair Darney asked if the Commission could vote on something for the applicant so they could continue, but to stipulate that HRC might visit the site at the point where the windows, as well as the siding, became accessible for inspection. At that time the Commission could make its decision by addendum on what type siding and windows.

Chair Drews asked about the time frame. His feeling was that the Commission had no problem with garage demolition, and it all centered on the house, in which case he wanted to know when the remodeling could get started. Ben Smith said his client was ready to move forward immediately. They wanted to occupy that space for offices. He had gone to the major plan review so they could try to get issues flushed out and be able to bring in a full permit submittal for demolition and remodeling of the structure soon.

In Chair Drews' view, there were some major questions—stucco versus wood, what would it look like, and where were they going with final, and without answers to those it was hard to approve. Vice Chair Darney believed they could approve some things: one, the stucco as it now was had some historic significance because of the length of time on the building. If it was repaired or fixed then that would be acceptable. If it was revealed that underneath it was originally ship-lap, then it was also acceptable to scrape that off and replace it with what was original to the house, or as close as possible (a ship-lap, most likely). That would be an option the Commission could agree to as part of its approval. Chair Drews, however, said that if they gave them the two options, how did they get the option that they (the Commission) wanted. Mr. Darney said both options would be acceptable, that was the way they would be voting it, and it would be what was called "contractors' option." Commissioner Ossa reiterated that the demolition of the garage was not an issue with her, only the exterior alterations to the building. She wondered if they could meet on site to talk about it, or get more details to review, or look at alternatives and work with the property owner to come up with some solutions that pleased everyone.

Commissioner Lopiccolo noted they were going for a change of use, from residential to commercial, and he asked if the contractor thought it would pass the check with the windows in there, even with the addition of storm windows. Chair Drews was not sure, he doubted the existing windows would pass. He felt they could definitely get the look that they needed but definitely felt they had to be updated. Mr. Lopiccolo said to look at that avenue to see what the Building Department would allow them to do. He believed that as soon as they changed the use, the "whole thing was going to get upgraded to today's

code." Vice Chair Darney asked again if there was any way they could approve it with stipulations that they return with samples of materials once they determine what the existing wall construction was. Commissioner Hayes wondered how long it would take to find some old photos that showed what the place looked like. There was a better starting point to bring it back to that original look—they were going for either that original look, or some point in time where it had taken on the stucco and had the current look. He felt those were the two big decisions that had to be made. If the applicant decided they wanted to stay with stucco, the Commission could move on that right now once they knew how to work the design into the stucco. If they wanted to take the stucco off and go with the siding, then more research was needed. Mr. Drews asked in that case would the applicant return with supplementary information.

(6:12:32) Debbie Vaughn, speaking on behalf of the owner, stated they were fine with the stucco (they would prefer it to "go away") but if it was a stipulation that would prevent them from moving forward, they would repair the stucco. Regarding the windows, they would like to replace them with something with a look that was similar to existing. Energy efficiency was a concern, as well. Chair Drews said in that case to assume they would stay with stucco, replace the windows with a like style, and work on the porch. Vice Chair Darney interjected to make a stipulation that if the stucco was not repairable, they could come back with an alternate plan. He could see why they wanted to change the windows, and if they stayed with stucco they were going with a slightly different design than they had and he wanted to be consistent with the period of that alteration.

There was extensive discussion on the pros and cons of stucco versus siding, and that the simplicity of the structure would lend itself to either style and would be appropriate. Also additional comments regarding the guidelines in reference to window replacement, if that must be done then try to retain the original trim and put back the older look. Wooden trim could be remanufactured to match the original, and if it could be remanufactured to replace one that had deteriorated to do it. The idea was not to make the structure look like an old dilapidated structure, but to make it look like it did when first built. Commissioner Ossa said that only a few windows needed to be replaced, but what about the other ones; she felt she did not have information about the windows or doors. Commissioner Hayes pointed out that it [windows] had to be taken apart to fix and in doing so half the material was lost due to years of glue, paint, and dry rot. Salvaging as much as possible was the first step, however, if it had to be remanufactured then it needed to mimic the original design as closely as possible. Vice Chair Darney believed the old wide-gapped shiplap was still being manufactured. Chair Drews said the ship-lap siding would put everything off for at least a month and it appeared as though the applicant would like to get moving sooner than that, therefore, they were looking at leaving stucco and replacing windows.

(6:17:00) Jennifer Pruitt asked to summarize the foregoing discussion for the applicant's understanding and her own. If the applicant decided to keep the stucco, HRC was agreeable. Regarding the windows, replacement was a possibility, however, salvage was best if that was possible. Demolition of the garage would be acceptable. The stair proposed on the north elevation would be acceptable, but the railing was a question mark. Commissioner Ossa said she was agreeable to the railing on the new stair piece, but not

on the front porch. She liked the idea of the small stucco "pony wall," and then to replace the columns with square posts or something similarly simple, and remove the dentil moulding. Ms. Pruitt asked about the light fixtures and the proposed signage. Ms. Ossa said that the lighting was "very modern" and she wondered about alternatives. Ben Smith said they had other options on the exterior lighting. Art Deco was suggested, or Craftsman, like the house on the corner of Division and Washington, or the Adams House at 901 North Minnesota. Ms. Pruitt advised that one of the aspects to be aware of was that typical residential style lighting would not be acceptable and Planning would be asking for a product that was "dark sky" friendly, of which the applicant was aware. Chair Drews said that with lights in the past (on the Waterman house, for example) there were a couple of submissions. Ms. Pruitt said the major issue with that was it was residential and the code did not address residential lighting fixtures as much as commercial. Chair Drews felt they could handle it the same way: if they did not approve the lighting fixtures, the applicant can bring them in and he could do it administratively.

(6:19:54) Chair Drews reiterated that the applicants would stay with stucco, replace the windows with two-over-twos, retain the stucco on the porch with a simpler column, more of a Craftsman style solid rail with a post. He confirmed they would need another set of plans to stamp with those modifications. Debbie Vaughn asked if there was alternative to making the porch sealed up with the stucco look on the front. They were going to remove the windows but they wanted to open it up so it looked and felt like a porch and not additional living space, they wanted the front of the building to feel more open as opposed to closed up as it was now. Mark Lopiccolo commented that they had recently seen intermediate posts with railing between them, as opposed to one long line of railing as shown on the photo, it was broken up into segments. He believed they had just approved a similar situation with the bed and breakfast on Robinson and Minnesota. What it consisted of were intermediate posts similar to the full-size posts that broke up the railing so a segment had to be put in between each post. Those posts were about one foot square. They used wrought iron railing ("stylized" but not ornamental) between the posts to break up the length; perhaps three panels instead of one large one. Chair Drews noted there were spaces between the pairs of windows and doors, and they could use 10x10 posts on corners. Ms. Ossa noted that the spacing of the center columns made it appear as though the pediment (the triangular piece on top) was floating up there. They should spread apart a little more to appear as if they were providing structural support.

Steve Hendricks asked if they proposed to leave the open rafter tails the way they were. Ms. Ossa described where to put the columns. He confirmed they would keep the soffit open, open up the porch and open up the railing. It was just the west elevation on the plans that needed to be changed, and if they (contractors) could bring it to the office, HRC could stipulate that in the motion. At the same time they could show photos of another light fixture. Ms. Pruitt suggested that what they needed to do was to provide a couple of fixtures that HRC was comfortable with then it would allow them to have a choice. Commissioner Ossa recommended a website that offered historic or reproductions of light fixtures, one was rejuvenation.com, and a search for "historic lighting" would bring up other sites.

(6:27:01) Commissioner Hayes asked about the door–was it as sad as the windows–or could he be saved,

or was it being widened for commercial reasons. Steve Hendricks said the doors would need to be widened from 2'8", and was a plain plank with no style. From a safety standpoint they would have to be replaced. They were not original to the house. Mr. Hendricks returned to the issue of the light fixtures and asked if frosted glass would work, which Ms. Pruitt said it could. Another question was asked about the light fixtures, if they were going to be under the porch would that contribute to the "dark sky" effect. Ms. Pruitt said it would especially if a portion of the light was screened from the porch itself.

Chair Drews asked for additional public comment, if any. Jed Block advised that the contents of the building had been there since 1960. His father started "hanging around" that neighborhood about 1950, and Jed would talk to him about the structure. Nothing had been done to the building until about one year ago, the stucco was pulling off the wall and he was surprised when Mr. Millard put some money into it. Mr. Block believed there was ship-lap behind it. He would contact Bob Nile to see of there were any photographs, as well as Ron Machado was also a possibility.

Chair Drews advised the contractors that if they got into the exterior and decided that stucco would not work, HRC could probably call a special meeting to look at the siding so they could go forward in that direction.

Vice Chair Robert Darney moved to approve HRC-08-117 request from Ben Smith of BSA Construction (property owner K. C. Neilen & Associates) to allow the demolition of an existing 954 square feet detached garage and exterior alterations to the existing structure for the conversion from an existing four-plex to the use of professional office on property zoned Residential RO located at 503 North Nevada Street, subject to the conditions of approval contained in the staff report, as well as stipulations being that the front colonnade columns are simplified to a simple square shape; the front railing on the existing porch where the existing windows will be removed be redrawn to spread the columns further apart at the main entrance; and secondary square columns to break up the railing so it is not one long stretch of rail; also removal of the dentil; the windows need to be salvaged if possible, if found they need to be replaced then HRC will need to see a submittal on the windows and the door cut sheets at that date; the exterior siding is currently stucco and if it can be repaired that is acceptable, if not, then we will need to have a follow up submittal for an alternate; light needs to be "dark sky" Carson City-approved and of context with the time period. The motion was seconded by Gregory Hayes, and carried 5-0.

The applicants agreed to the stipulations. Chair Drews thanked the applicants and advised them that if they had any questions to contact Jennifer Pruitt who would get in touch with HRC and they would help.

F-3. Discussion and possible action to consider future Certified Local Government (CLG) grants for 2009. (6:33:29) Jennifer Pruitt had prepared a memo that included the list of proposed projects from the Historic Resources Commission. The first item specific to the Historic

Structures Report identified the structures as: The Brewery Arts Center, the Performance Hall, and the Civic Center. There was also mention of Jack's Bar. It was her understanding that the Civic Center had a report that had been created in 1990 through the CLG. Also on Jack's Bar, a report was completed in 2005 by Mel Green, of which she would provide copies. She was unsure if any reports were created after the 2005 report on file. Of that list, the Brewery Arts Center and the Performance Hall were probably the major candidates for the Historic Structures Report. Also on the list were updates to the handouts, *Carson City Walking Tour, Historic Driving and Bicycle Tour*, and *Welcome to Carson City*. All were available in the Planning Division and given out often. The final item on the list was Training Opportunities for 2010.

Ms. Pruitt also noted some information Commissioner Rebecca Ossa had provided to Planning Division in the past and they had added onto it. From 1987 there had been approximately \$300,000 of CLG grants provided to Carson City for all different types of projects from surveys to rehab work. But that was not "free" money, there was definitely a match associated with those funds. That was very important to note. Currently, they were working on a grant for which State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) provided \$20,000, and of that amount \$13,000 would be a match that needed to be provided. Accordingly, she wanted everyone to be aware that there would be a match associated with whichever project HRC proposed.

Chair Drews asked Lee Plemel if that was a concern for Planning Division to find that match in the next fiscal year. Mr. Plemel said it certainly was. He explained that under the current project they were doing the same thing and there was no money funding that had been provided, nor did he anticipate any funding to match a grant like that in the foreseeable future. Ms. Pruitt said that in the past they had utilized their staff and continued to do so, as well as utilized members of the HRC, but it was an important element of the grant process and she brought it up for that reason. It did take a tremendous amount of tracking, many hours to manage the grants, and there had been a lot of discussion about Historic Structures Report and that was the other issue. More than likely, if HRC were to select that, that would be between \$20,000 and \$30,000, and probably they would be able to come up with the match, but it would take HRC's participation, Planning Division's staff, and others including whoever they selected, for the report to be completed.

Chair Drews said he would like to go with Brewery Arts Center (BAC), and have Redevelopment and BAC put in some time as well. His fear was that they would overextend and if there were staff cuts they could not make the match out of Community Development and they would be in trouble.

(6:38:26) Commissioner Ossa said the BAC had access to other funding sources that were not federal that possibly other grantees in similar situations had used to match federal grants, so that could be an opportunity. Ms. Pruitt noted that in the past Redevelopment had definitely come through to provide cash to help with matches so that, too, was always an option. But there was a process for that, as well. Therefore, her recommendation would be that the project selected should be one that would be attainable

and something that they all could manage. There had been times when many different facets of great projects were very difficult to manage. There were some instances where the match pulled out, and Carson City had that issue before.

Commissioner Ossa asked if they could add to that list, or did they have to stick to it for this motion. Ms. Pruitt said they could add to the list. Ms. Ossa commented that it would be wonderful to get the "Walk Through Time" online. She had attended a Carson City Arts Initiative lecture where they were talking about historic photography combined with the use of software programs where those old photographs were morphed into the modern (current) view. It would be interesting to get that online so that people could actually use it. She would like to add that to the list for consideration.

Vice Chair Darney noted that Jennifer had mentioned Jack's Bar earlier and asked her for any updated contact information about what Mr. Lear's plans were with that. Chair Drews said that was not agendized and therefore could not be discussed. It could be agendized for a future meeting if desired.

(6:41:14) Chair Drews noted there were now four different projects to look at and approve some or all. He asked how much funding was available and Commissioner Ossa said she did not have a specific number but she felt the money was shrinking, based upon what was happening with state funds. She suggested putting forth as many projects as necessary but realize that the list would have to be pared down to one or a half of one. She believed all three items suggested were excellent; she would not comment on the one she suggested. Chair Drews commented that at the last meeting they had the handout and it was relatively out of date as some things had changed. Ms. Ossa thought it would be a good idea to update the Walking Tour item to add some modern/mid-century architecture. Mr. Drews said that in terms of Walk Through Time, he thought it would be appropriate to advertise that as just putting Walk Through Time on the web. The morphing was a big project. He added that he felt the Walk Through Time could use some updating and new photos. One item that could be done, he said, was to put what they had on the web, the second was doing the updates, which could be ongoing. Ms. Ossa asked if Walk Through Time would wait until the following year so they could concentrate on the other three items. He responded that Walk Through Time had been mentioned to him many times by Walt and he would like to see it done. There was no reason not to consider it now.

(6:43:45) Jennifer Pruitt suggested that HRC allow Planning to research the *Walk Through Time* and bring that back as a discussion item at the next meeting. She would provide them with what it would take to get it online, and then it could always be placed on a list for next year.

Ms. Ossa asked if she was looking for guidance on the three items listed on the motion, as to order of preference. Ms. Pruitt said it was her understanding the application staff would be preparing would include whatever projects they proposed, and it would be helpful to know the order of preference. Chair Drews said that the order in which they were listed was their priority. Ms. Ossa asked if they had to specify a specific building for the HSR or could it be open-ended. Chair Drews felt it should be specified,

that way they knew which building they were getting into, they could supply the background material. Ms. Ossa said that of the three buildings mentioned perhaps the brewery building because it was the oldest. Ms. Pruitt said she became aware just today that the Civic Center was completed in 1990. Chair Drews believed that the BAC had an HSR earlier; Ms. Pruitt said not through the CLG grants, nor could she find any evidence of an HSR, however, after some discussion it was agreed that the motion could note the BAC and the Performance Hall and then if she did determine that there had been a report completed on the BAC she would update the Commission. Ms. Ossa commented that on a Historic Structures Report the whole building was being looked at not just the structure; what was historic, what to do with the exterior, the masonry of the windows, basement, foundation, and so on, and priorities for rehabilitating whatever was left, and a maintenance preservation plan for the building so the property owner could apply it even years from now. Ms. Pruitt noted another item to be aware of was that the BAC was looking at a master plan for their campus and this Historic Structures Report would help them tremendously with their overall plan. That was another positive aspect of selecting the BAC. Ms. Ossa agreed and added that this HSR could also include preservation plans and those two would dovetail into their master plan (a series of documents in one binder).

Chair Drews asked for public comment. There was none.

Vice Chair Darney moved to approve the following projects for consideration for the 2009 NHPA application including the following, a Historic Structures Report (HSR) for the structure selected by the HRD: the Brewery Arts Center and its Campus; updates to the following handouts, the Historic Carson City Walking Tour, the Historic Driving & Bicycle Tour and the Welcome to Carson City's Historic District, and HRD training opportunities for the year 2010 with the understanding that the actual proposal will be subject to the budget criteria identified in the 2009 NHPA manual. The motion was seconded by Gregory Hayes and it carried 4-0 with one abstention (Ossa).

F-4. HRC-08-119 (6:49:36) discussion and possible action to change the Historic Commission Policy and Procedure Manual regarding the monthly meetings (sub-

section 7, meetings) and the 2009 Historic Resources Commission schedule. Jennifer Pruitt advised that in the packet was information on the possibility of having meetings every two months rather than monthly. Currently, whether there were any action items or not, the Commission was obligated to have a meeting. She had provided a list of reasons why one meeting every two months would be a positive move. At present there was one vacancy on the Commission, and it had been so for more than ten (10) months. They had been actively advertising for that position and the position clearly called for a ten (10) hour per month commitment. If that commitment were reduced, it was possible that maybe the recruitment opportunities would be increased. She also thought that if the meetings were reduced to bimonthly it would help with the assurance that a quorum could be achieved. One of the important aspects of 2009 was that three of the HRC members seats were up in February; Michael Drews, Robert Darney,

and Mark Lopiccolo. Perhaps if the commitment were reduced that might assist in retaining the current members. She said that it was also important to note that the 2008 applications for HRC were about 40 percent below the 2007 numbers. The "numbers" being the actual applications that came through the door. In 2007 there were approximately 30 applications that came through, and in 2008 there were 18. Further, it was important for the public as well as the Commission to note that if the Commission decided to go to bimonthly meetings, the Planning Division's commitment would not change. If a project came through that needed to be heard in a timely manner they would be able to touch base with the chairman and the possibility for a special meeting would not change. She offered a proposed calendar which showed the meetings every two months, then she also included the standard calendar. She noted that the month of May was Historic Preservation Month and the Commission would still have a May meeting. In 2009, the Planning Division would be working with a gentleman to do some training for them; it was proposed for May 28, but that may be different. Ms. Pruitt added that the Planning Division supported the change.

(6:53:36) Chair Drews asked if the meeting was at the end of May and Preservation month was the beginning, it pushesd all of their decisions for preservations awards to March 12, and perhaps they would have a special meeting just to discuss the awards. He felt as long as they could hold special meetings and be accessible to the public he saw no problem with going bimonthly.

Ms. Pruitt reported that the gentleman with whom they were working to train had a conflict (which was the reason for the late meeting date in May) and she hoped he would be able to make it in May, in order to be able advertise and give sufficient time to inform anyone who wanted to attend. Also in May, they would also be presenting the Historic Preservation Awards, which would probably be at the Board of Supervisors Meeting, at the second meeting in May.

Commissioner Hayes said he had no problem meeting every month, and it seemed there was usually always an action item. It may turn out there were more special meetings to deal with action items.

Ms. Pruitt said part of the reason they were trying to get it resolved at this time was because special meetings did take quite a bit of staff time to prepare and they were definitely willing to do that, however, sometimes it was a problem to get the meeting televised and the room (Sierra Room) was very difficult to reserve. Therefore, they would always reserve the room for their scheduled meeting dates but as far as special meetings, they would find an acceptable room for them to meet in but could not guarantee that it would be televised. Mark Lopiccolo moved to approve the amendment of the HRC Policy and Procedure Manual amending the frequency of the HRC meetings from a month to once every two months, with the opportunity for special meetings per the discretion of the HRC chairman. Vice Chair Robert Darney seconded the motion and it carried 4-0 with one abstention (Ossa).

Chair Drews noted there was still a vacancy for an architectural residential designer/design professional. Commissioner Hayes asked if they had considered bringing in someone with experience other than

architectural. Vice Chair Darney said that particular role was needed for sure, and there were actually two spaces for that. Chair Drews said it was in the original Title 18. Ms. Pruitt noted that it was very specific; it had been widened to include a designer as a possibility, but it was very specific what was being advertised. She had passed that information on at the last meeting but currently there were 19 volunteer positions for various commissions, committees, or boards in Carson City. Of those, two were open for architects. Vice Chair Darney thought at one point it had been widened to include engineers. Chair Drews remarked that if an engineer came forward and said he was a design professional it would work. Mr. Darney said often engineers had experience in structural rehabilitation. Mr. Drews said they were trying to broaden it so it was not strictly architecture, rather for people with that kind of design experience. They could go back to SHPO and ask to modify qualifications and bring other people in, or they could change the structure of the Commission as well, if they decide it had to go that way. The addition of "design professional" had broadened the scope so anyone with that kind of experience could apply. The applicants had to be residents of Carson City. Ms. Pruitt noted that the position was being advertised and it was amended to include the "design professional" description.

F-5 HRC-08-118 Discussion and possible action regarding a request from John R. Johnson for Carson City to honor A. W. Nightingill. (6:59:55) Jennifer Pruitt referred to the letter contained in the packet from Mr. Johnson requesting to honor Mr. Nightingill, but he also asked for a street to be named after the gentleman or something of that nature. She provided some background on Mr. Nightingill in the packet referred to herein and made a part hereof by reference. The state also received a similar request from Mr. Johnson. The State Archives also received several letters from Mr. Johnson and had responded in writing. Ms. Pruitt had also been in contact with Mara Jones from the SHPO office where they had a request as well. At this time they hoped to get information from the state regarding Mr. Nightingill. Among other things contained in the background summary, Mr. Nightingill was instrumental in the design of the Nevada State Seal. From the data Ms. Pruitt obtained online it seemed that by some accounts he was instrumental while other accounts were unsure. She had put in a request for additional information from the state, but she had prepared a motion regarding the possibility of a recommendation for a Historic Preservation Award, because that was something this Commission had the authority to do. She hoped when further information from the state was received there might be a way for the city and the state to partner to honor Mr. Nightingill.

Chair Drews said at this time he would simply like to accept this as a nomination. As other nominations came in they could probably pick three or four. He felt this one was deserved as a good nomination. He liked the idea of partnering with the state if it was merited. At this time he would like to continue to the next meeting to see what other recommendations came in. He asked if a motion was needed and Ms. Pruitt said she would like one. Commissioner Mark Lopiccolo motioned to continue this nomination to the next meeting. It was seconded by Gregory Hayes, and carried 4-0 with one abstention (Ossa).

CARSON CITY HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION

Minutes of the November 13, 2008 Meeting Page 16

| F-6. Presentation of Wrought Iron Fencing Repair video presented by the National Center for Preservation Technology & Training. (7:04:07) Jennifer Pruitt introduced this 10-minute video, the contents of which were self-explanatory. |
|--|
| G. FUTURE COMMISSION ITEMS: (7:13:32) Jennifer Pruitt stated that the item regarding the <i>Nevada Appeal</i> article proposals would come back next month. They would include the list that was currently created and hopefully they would add to that list. Item F-5 would probably be on the next agenda as well, and depending upon information received Chair Drews would be able to prepare a list and make a selection in March. |
| H. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT: A motion to adjourn was made by Rebecca Ossa, seconded by Mark Lopiccolo, and carried unanimously. |
| Chair Drews adjourned the meeting at 7:15 p.m. |
| The Minutes of the Carson City Historic Resources Commission meeting of November 13, 2008 are so approved this 11 th of December, 2008. |
| |

Michael Drews, Chair