

CARSON CITY HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 12, 2006 Meeting

Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Historic Resources Commission was scheduled for 5:30 p.m. on Thursday, January 12, 2006 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairperson Michael Drews
Richard Baker
Robert Darney
Rebecca Ossa
Peter Smith

STAFF: Walter Sullivan, Planning and Community Development Director
Jennifer Pruitt, Senior Planner
Heidi Eskew-Herrmann, Assistant Planner
Kathleen King, Recording Secretary

NOTE: A recording of these proceedings is available for review, in the Clerk-Recorder's Office, during regular business hours.

A. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM (5:31:07) - Chairperson Drews called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m. Roll was called; a quorum was present. Vice Chairperson Lopiccolo and Commissioner Speulda were absent.

B. ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES - November 10, 2005 (5:31:27) - Chairperson Drews noted a correction to page 6, as pointed out by the recording secretary prior to the start of the meeting. Commissioner Smith noted a correction to a statement made by Jed Block under item D. Commissioner Smith moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner Baker seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

C. MODIFICATION OF AGENDA (5:32:47) - None.

D. DISCLOSURES (5:33:00) Commissioner Ossa advised of having received several telephone calls from members of the press regarding item F-1. Commissioner Smith related details of a telephone conversation which took place earlier in the day with Ernie Adler. Chairperson Drews advised of having met with the First Presbyterian Church Building Committee on a number of occasions, and the Mayor to discuss various options in regard to item F-1. Commissioner Ossa advised that, in her position as staff of the State Historic Preservation Office ("SHPO"), she had spoken with church representatives regarding rehabilitation.

E. PUBLIC COMMENTS (5:34:06) - None.

CARSON CITY HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 12, 2006 Meeting

Page 2

F. PUBLIC HEARING ACTION ITEMS:

F-1. HRC-05-268 ACTION TO CONSIDER AN APPLICATION FROM FRED DOLVEN (PROPERTY OWNER: PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH), TO ALLOW DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING 4,235-SQUARE-FOOT SANCTUARY BUILT IN 1864 AND REPLACEMENT WITH A 9,600-SQUARE-FOOT CHURCH AND NARTHEX, ON PROPERTY ZONED RESIDENTIAL OFFICE (RO), LOCATED AT 110 NORTH NEVADA STREET, APNs 003-214-03, -04, AND -05 (5:34:33) - Chairperson Drews introduced this item, and Ms. Pruitt thanked the citizens for their attendance. She thanked Fred Dolven and his team for “keeping staff in the loop” regarding this project. She reviewed the staff report. She referred to the Draft Seismic Rehabilitation Report and reviewed pertinent portions of the August 14, 2001 minutes, both of which were included in the agenda materials. She referred to the letter from State Historic Preservation Officer Ron James also included in the agenda materials.

With regard to the most recent activity, Ms. Pruitt advised that an application was submitted to the Planning Division in December 2005 requesting a major project review. The major project review was conducted on December 6, 2005, and a written report provided to the applicant. The subject application was submitted on December 20, 2005.

Ms. Pruitt acknowledged the difficulty of the decision before the commission, as well as for the church to have decided to submit the application. In response to the notices sent to adjacent property owners, Ms. Pruitt advised of one letter of opposition, copies of which were provided to the commissioners and the applicant prior to the start of the meeting. She further advised that Planning Division staff had received several telephone calls, and had provided information as appropriate. She further advised that Supervisor Robin Williamson had expressed support for preserving the church, and had offered her services. Ms. Pruitt provided Supervisor Williamson’s telephone number, and advised that Supervisor Shelly Aldean had also expressed support for preserving the church. Ms. Pruitt noted the complicated nature of the project as related to preservation.

Mr. Sullivan advised of discussions with Supervisors Staub and Livermore regarding this item, and anticipated a call from Mayor Teixeira as well. He thanked Ms. Pruitt for her presentation and concurred that the project is very complex. He advised that staff had reviewed the project, and discussed the importance of identifying and exploring “common ground” to whatever degree possible. He recalled the Olcovich House project, and previous commission meetings related to the Presbyterian Church. He expressed the hope that the commission would support staff’s goal to identify an area of common ground.

Chairperson Drews thanked the citizens for their attendance. He provided direction with regard to the format of the meeting.

(5:45:27) First Presbyterian Church Building Committee Chairman Ken Pearson provided an overview of his presentation and read prepared remarks into the record. He noted the goal of the Building Committee to “build a space dedicated to worship that will reflect the historic character of the original church building and have a simple dignity.”

CARSON CITY HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 12, 2006 Meeting

Page 3

(5:56:29) Jim Robertson, a member of the First Presbyterian Church Building Committee, advised of having lived in Carson City for 45 years. He detailed the various community affairs in which he has been involved over the years, including serving as Mayor for two terms. He further advised of having raised his family here and that they “love Carson City and [the] church.” He stated that the church is like home, and expressed a preference for keeping the old building. He clarified that this would be impossible, however, in the view of the Building Committee. He expressed the opinion that “demolition is the right thing to do,” and referred to the three, separate engineering reports which indicate the old building is seismically unsafe. He reviewed the authors and dates of the three engineering reports, and advised the building has no concrete foundations. He noted the church was constructed in 1864 with an addition constructed in 1896. He related details of an experience with a painting contractor which occurred approximately five years ago. With the three engineering reports and the experience of trying to paint the outside, the sanctuary was vacated in September 2001. No services have been held in the sanctuary for almost five years.

Mr. Robertson advised that Architect Fred Dolven was hired to begin designing the needed space, replicating the architecture of the old church. The Building Committee has expressed a preference for the old stained glass windows to be incorporated into the new building; for new bricks to be identical to the original brick; and for the old bricks to be used in non-structural areas, such as walkways, landscaping, etc. The new sanctuary will be 9,600 square feet, which is 5,365 square feet larger than the present sanctuary. In addition, the bell tower will be replicated from the original.

Mr. Robertson advised that the cost of the new church is estimated between \$2 and \$2.2 million. The 2001 Hyytinen Engineering Report estimates restoration of the old church at \$4 to \$5 million because of the requirement to take the walls down and construct a new foundation. Mr. Robertson advised that the building is economically impossible to rehabilitate. He reiterated that demolition is the right thing to do for the First Presbyterian Church of Carson City. He agreed with Mr. Sullivan’s earlier comments to do as much as possible to mediate the situation. He reiterated that tearing the walls down, constructing a new foundation, and rebuilding the walls is economically impossible.

(6:04:05) Architect Fred Dolven introduced himself, for the record, and reviewed elevation and floor plan drawings which were displayed in the meeting room. He advised that the building foundation is made of rubble, unreinforced brick and stone. The flooring is deteriorated and has decayed in some places. The walls are unreinforced brick construction. The roof is in relatively good shape, although not entirely visible, except there are no connections between the walls and the roof. Mr. Dolven noted that connecting walls to the roof was rarely done during the time of construction. He advised that Mel Green’s report suggested connecting the walls to the roof. He noted that the 1896 addition includes the bell tower, and advised that it is in largely the same condition except that the brick quality is even weaker with less compressive strength than the original sanctuary. He further advised that the foundation of the 1896 addition is made of rubble, the flooring is in better shape, the walls are unreinforced brick. Because the grout has no cementitious materials, it is also deteriorating together with the narthex bell tower. Mr. Dolven reviewed pertinent portions of the Hyytinen Engineering Report and the Green Report, and pointed out portions of the building which were changed to accommodate the 1896 addition.

CARSON CITY HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 12, 2006 Meeting

Page 4

(6:10:31) Nancy Grundy, a member of the First Presbyterian Church Building Committee, provided background information on her residence in Carson City since August 1959, and her involvement in the church. She advised of a deep sentimental attachment to the old church building. Her three children were baptized in the old sanctuary, one daughter was married there, and her husband's memorial service was conducted there. She advised there were 8,000 people in Carson City in 1959, and noted that the population has increased nearly seven fold since then. She further noted that the First Presbyterian Church has a sanctuary which cannot be used because of its unsafe condition and inadequate size. The church has been worshipping in the gymnasium. The "stained glass windows and pipe organ languish in a building that is continuing to crumble." Ms. Grundy discussed the need for a new church building, and advised that arriving at the decision to request demolition of the old church was very difficult.

(6:12:45) First Presbyterian Church Senior Pastor Bruce Kochsmeier advised he had lived in Carson City and served as the church's pastor since 1995. He provided an overview of his presentation, and historic information on the First Presbyterian Church. He described the materials from which the original building and the 1896 addition were constructed, and discussed the current condition of the building components. He stated "this building was never meant to last." He advised the original building was built for a city of 3,000 people and now serves a city and outlying areas of over 55,000. He discussed the need for a new building and stated "with extreme respect for our historical setting, the people of the First Presbyterian Church of Carson City are seeking to build a new building on the original site that will greatly emulate ... the original." The new building will serve the needs of the current members and "all of Carson's growing population." Pastor Kochsmeier discussed the importance of the church staying at its current site. He expressed the belief the church "will be a greater statement to tourists and the Carson community in a facility that pays tribute, through the use of historical pieces of the old, while being a vibrant, active church that is able to include others in its building that is currently closed." He advised that the submitted plan will address contemporary worship, fellowship, and mission needs. "To be who we are called to be by God, we need to use our space in its most effective plan. We need more room. We need to use our room more efficiently and effectively."

Pastor Kochsmeier advised that the First Presbyterian Church congregation has researched the best, most cost efficient ways to address the need for a larger and safer sanctuary. "The cost of any retrofitting or rehabilitating, as has been shared, would be significantly more than new construction and still would not meet our worship needs." Pastor Kochsmeier advised that spending "any amount more than is truly needed, regardless of the source of income, would not be something our commitment to missions would allow when there are far greater needs in Carson City and around the world." He disagreed with spending more on retrofitting "that would result in a lesser building." He advised that the First Presbyterian Church's mission is not to take from community revenue, but to "give in word and action and resource." In reference to the Sermon on the Mount, he discussed the need to "let our light shine out of a new and safe, larger structure." Pastor Kochsmeier advised that the request before the commission was not to "abolish our historical presence but to fulfill the very reason Presbyterians built this church 144 years ago." He stated, "An empty building cannot change lives." He requested the commission, as fellow citizens of the community, to help the First Presbyterian Church to fulfill its spiritual mandate by permitting the church "to continue what was started in 1862."

CARSON CITY HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 12, 2006 Meeting

Page 5

Chairperson Drews opened this item to public comment. (6:21:30) Jed Block provided background information on his residence in Carson City and his familiarity with the First Presbyterian Church. He discussed funding available, through the State, for removing the oil tank. He noted the availability of the parking lot behind his 202 North Curry Street property. He suggested the Building Committee could approach the Redevelopment Authority Citizens Committee for funding. He volunteered his services for fund raising.

(6:24:15) Michael "Bert" Bedeau provided background information on his organization, Preserve Nevada. He expressed Preserve Nevada's position that the building should be rehabilitated. He advised that the church building is "unquestionably a significant structure, both in the context of the history of Carson City and in the history of Nevada." He further advised that Preserve Nevada believes in the "definite potential" for rehabilitating the structure for use either by the existing owner or by a potential future owner. He referred to Title 18, and read into the record criteria by which the application should be evaluated. He urged the commission to either deny the application for not meeting the criteria provided in Title 18 or, at the very least, postpone a decision until more investigation can be conducted. He advised there are funds available for rehabilitation work. He offered his assistance and the assistance of the Preserve Nevada Board in identifying a solution to retain the building. He provided background information on his sixteen years of experience in cultural resource management. He expressed the belief that, with the proper approach, a solution to rehabilitate the structure can be identified. He reiterated the distinct possibility that the building could be rehabilitated for use by the current owner or for an alternative use. He encouraged the commission to consider the resources of Preserve Nevada, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the State Historic Preservation Office, the Commission for Cultural Affairs, and the preservation community, to identify funding and the means by which the building can be saved.

(6:29:23) Doug Southerland expressed the opinion that demolition of a significant historic structure which could be saved and maintained "is similar to castration. Once it's over, there's no putting it back and the whole community will suffer and never be quite the same again." He reviewed his background and experience. He acknowledged increasing construction materials costs, but questioned the cost estimates provided for rehabilitating the church. He expressed the belief that to lose the church, as part of the historic district, "would be a travesty."

(6:32:17) Guy Rocha, a Nevada historian for over 30 years, considers the church a national treasure. He advised of having conducted research attempting to identify, in terms of inventory, the number of Nevada buildings which have a documented direct association with Mark Twain. His research revealed only two buildings: Mark Twain's brother, Orion Clemens' home, who was a First Presbyterian Church parishioner, and the First Presbyterian Church itself. Mr. Rocha provided historic information on Mark Twain's involvement in completing the church building. He recognized the architectural and structural concerns, and expressed the opinion that saving the church is incumbent upon those who have argued in favor of it. He expressed the hope there will be a way to rehabilitate the church. He offered his support, and commented that the process shouldn't be adversarial. He expressed understanding for the "real, compelling needs" expressed by the First Presbyterian Church representatives. He expressed the hope that a common ground can be identified. He reiterated the opinion that the church is a national treasure.

CARSON CITY HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 12, 2006 Meeting

Page 6

(6:36:35) Mary Sitts, a First Presbyterian Church Elder, agreed that Mark Twain was a great man. She discussed the need for a church to “grow in and that other people can come to and grow in;” for a sanctuary that can be used. She commented that the church is “a great building, but the history that it teaches is Jesus Christ, not the history of Nevada, not the history of the United States.” She assured the commissioners that the same First Presbyterian Church will be there, just in a different structure. She advised that the church will still be the oldest in Nevada “because it’s still the First Presbyterian Church.” She reiterated the Building Committee’s desire to utilize the historic materials.

(6:38:17) Jim Robertson read into the record a portion of Section 18.06.075 of the Carson City Municipal Code. He advised of having spoken with Roger Hyytinen, of Hyytinen Engineering, earlier in the day to inquire as to whether his estimate to restore the building remained the same. Mr. Hyytinen advised that restoring the building would now cost more than the \$4 to \$5 million estimate he provided approximately five years ago. Mr. Robertson expressed dismay over considering demolition of the church building, but advised that \$2.2 million “is a maximum effort” for the First Presbyterian Church to raise. He advised that the choices are to either demolish the building or “not do a thing” because the difference in cost estimates “is too great.”

(6:40:59) Gale Thompson advised that she values the history of Carson City “immensely” and the church building “for very personal reasons.” She expressed support for rehabilitating the building. She suggested that if the First Presbyterian Church cannot afford to rehabilitate the building, it should be sold to someone who could rehabilitate it.

(6:41:59) Beverly Mobely, a resident of the historic district, expressed the opinion that “we all have an obligation of stewardship.” She discussed the value of the historic blue line to provide people an opportunity to see historic buildings. She noted that Nevada “is peppered with historical landmark signs describing buildings that are no longer there.” By virtue of its name, the historic district “hints at something that is old and of significance to the community, not something made to look old or to blend with the neighborhood.” Ms. Mobely stated, “Once our physical heritage is gone, it’s gone forever.” She noted the efforts to rebuild a portion of the V&T Railroad because of its historic significance. She expressed the opinion that solutions are possible “with the right process.” She agreed with identifying an area of common ground. She requested the commission to consider all the options “before deciding to turn another piece of Nevada heritage into dust or another historical landmark sign.”

(6:44:03) Carl Dahlen, a member of the First Presbyterian Church Building Committee, agreed with much of what had been previously stated. He advised there are no public dollars available for the building as long as it is an active church. He provided background information on the church’s decision to stay in its present location. He advised of having served as the Executive Director of the Brewery Arts Center for five years, during the time the building was being salvaged. He further advised that the City “took 25 years and very little ... City resource to make that building what it is today.” He noted that the exterior of the Brewery Arts Center building continues to deteriorate. “Knowing that the City is unable to care for its own historic structures,” he suggested that it is unreasonable to expect a local congregation to be able to rehabilitate and maintain a historic building. He advised that stabilization of the Brewery Arts Center “has only done that.” He expressed the opinion that the Brewery Arts Center will not be usable following a major earthquake.

CARSON CITY HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 12, 2006 Meeting

Page 7

Mr. Dahlen discussed the need for a church building to be used into the future. He suggested considering that the building served for 140 years as the sanctuary of the First Presbyterian Church. He advised of the need to “build something that will last another 140 years to serve Carson City and to be servants of Jesus Christ as we are here in Carson City.” He reiterated the church’s decision, over fifteen years ago, to stay downtown in its present location. Knowing that repairing the building will still leave the church with an inadequate sanctuary and that it will leave a burden of maintenance on future generations is not acceptable. Mr. Dahlen assured the commissioners that no member of the Building Committee was excited to tear down the building. “This has been a long, difficult decision.”

(6:48:47) Jed Block suggested, since many people seemed to be interested in the building both from its historic and religious standpoints, the possibility of going outside the congregation to help raise funds to restore the historic building. He expressed an interest in seeing the whole town “pull together ... and make it work.”

Chairperson Drews read into the record a letter he received earlier in the day from the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

(6:51:52) Pastor Kochsmeier advised that church representatives are very sensitive to the historic building and structure, “the literal bricks and building.” He advised that the church, as a sectarian entity, is ineligible for public funding. He reiterated the church’s commitment to remaining in its present location. In reference to the church’s spiritual identity, he discussed the inability to receive or spend funding that could otherwise be used for people in need. “We can only spend for ourselves, because of our spiritual identity, that which is utterly pragmatic.” Pastor Kochsmeier expressed appreciation for the suggestions to raise funds on behalf of the church. He advised that funding used to rehabilitate at a greater cost than new construction would have to be politely refused.

Chairperson Drews called for additional public comment; however, none was forthcoming. He expressed dismay over Pastor Kochsmeier’s previous comments, and suggested they were not in the spirit of cooperation. Pastor Kochsmeier clarified that the church would be unable to accept funding “that could be used for something else that is more important than what we would do.” He explained that “the church is people ... not a building of any kind, new or old.” He clarified that the congregation could continue to worship in its Family Life Center. He reiterated that the church would be unable to spend money “other than what is most utterly pragmatic, whether it’s our own or that which others would give us, that could be used for other people in other ways.” Chairperson Drews expressed understanding for Pastor Kochsmeier’s position, and that a church “is wherever two or more people meet in His Name.” He suggested considering this as the common ground starting point. He noted that St. Theresa’s had moved, and further suggested this may be the only other alternative for preserving the First Presbyterian Church. He suggested finding a place “where the church can go about its divine business,” and that the only way to balance preservation and the church’s mission may be to somehow separate the two.

Commissioner Ossa expressed the opinion that the Presbyterian Church, as part of the community, is in need. She suggested the community should band together to help the church. She discussed neighborly assistance which she observed during the most recent flooding event, and expressed the opinion there are

CARSON CITY HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 12, 2006 Meeting

Page 8

other alternatives to consider. In reference to the application packet, she advised of having lots of questions. She inquired as to the seating capacity designed for the new building versus the old historic building. In reference to the \$2.2 million budget estimate, she inquired as to the costs associated with demolition of the old building versus rehabilitation. She advised there was no information in the application materials indicating demolition costs. She reviewed research materials regarding building condition surveys, copies of which she provided to the commissioners and staff. She questioned the background information for the cost estimates and the "lengthy construction" time frame referenced in the Hyytinen Report. She expressed curiosity over application of the provisions in the historic buildings section of the International Building Code. She expressed appreciation for Mel Green's report, but noted that it is ten years old. She provided background information on a preservation group called Partners for Sacred Places, and read portions of their mission statement and other anecdotal information into the record. She provided additional information on assistance available through the National Trust for Historic Preservation. She suggested that the proposed design is too much trouble. She referred to previous advice provided by the commission to leave "the three walls, taking out the west wall, adding your space there." She inquired as to what happened between the 2001 and 2005 proposed plans to "totally change the interior layout from the traditional plan." She referred to the most recent proposed design and suggested it seems to be "shoe horned into the original space of the building."

Commissioner Smith advised of having reviewed the agenda materials and referred to the August 2001 meeting at which a number of the same issues were discussed. He advised that his opinion had not changed much since the 2001 meeting. He referred to the Historic Resources Commission ordinance, portions of which had been read into the record previously. He noted that the commission's charge is to allow demolition if repairs are not feasible. He further noted that no dollar amount is attached to the decision over feasibility, but suggested that costs should be considered, as a practical matter. He inquired as to costs associated with saving the existing east, south, and north walls and building the new church inside those walls. He referred to the \$4 to \$5 million estimate, and expressed the understanding that the figure represented costs associated with rehabilitating the existing church. He acknowledged the church's need for a larger sanctuary, but reiterated there was no information provided as to costs associated with saving the existing exterior walls. He referred to the information provided in Mel Green's report regarding instability of the walls, and suggested making the width of the wall bases wider. He reviewed other possible solutions provided in Mr. Green's report, and the corresponding cost estimates. He suggested that there is a feasible way to preserve the structure, and therefore the commission should deny the demolition permit application. He referred to the August 10, 2001 memo from State Historic Preservation Officer Ron James, included in the agenda materials, and suggested that the options listed therein indicate the possibility for preserving the north, east, and south elevations and incorporating them into a larger rehabilitation project. He advised he would vote against approving a demolition permit because insufficient information had been provided to indicate that repairs to the exterior surfaces of the building are not feasible.

Commissioner Darney advised of having been involved in the subject project on and off for about ten years, both as an architect and as a member of the commission. He expressed the opinion there is no answer that will please everyone involved, and that the decision will be made based on listening to everyone's input and formulating an opinion. He expressed the belief the church had proven a hardship in that "they have to start from somewhere lower than the rest of us to raise money." He expressed understanding for the

CARSON CITY HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 12, 2006 Meeting

Page 9

church's perspective with regard to available funding, but stated that historic preservation isn't about making or breaking the property owner. He acknowledged the church is more than a building, and that it has been in existence for 142 years. From a technical standpoint, he expressed doubt for attempting to save the entire building. He agreed that, in some form or another, the façade should be preserved or incorporated into an addition or rebuild. He noted there are two kinds of structures to be considered for historic rehabilitation. He referred to the mention of the V&T, and noted this is not an "occupiable entity. People are not going to use the space; ... it's a railroad, has tracks, and sits out in the desert." He acknowledged the possibility the church could move to another location, but expressed the opinion that "they've been here for 142 years and deserve better than that." He expressed the further opinion that the church being part of the downtown neighborhood is as important as the building. He agreed that the church should be used, occupied, and maintained, but inquired as to the church's future plans for growth. He agreed with placing limits on feasibility as well as consideration given to "how far can you go with this neighborhood and this block before you realize you have to have a secondary means for providing services." Based on what had been presented, Commissioner Darney advised he would not agree to demolition of the entire building. He advised he would agree to some "give and take on preserving the exterior façades, blended into a new facility." He provided suggestions with regard to methods by which to accomplish the same.

Chairperson Drews agreed that the building condition report is a great starting point. He advised that the commission is very accustomed to working with applicants to find the common ground between historic preservation and new construction or adaptive reuse. He expressed the opinion that the concept between the 2001 and the 2005 designs seems to be the same, although the plan was different. He expressed frustration over the "road blocks we keep hearing about 'no, we just can't.'" He advised that the National Trust for Historic Preservation representative's immediate response was to make grant funding available for rehabilitation. He further advised that the National Trust is a private, non-profit organization not funded by the federal government.

(7:21:55) Mr. Bedeau acknowledged that Preserve Nevada is very active in historic structure preservation. Chairperson Drews inquired as to the feasibility of Preserve Nevada partnering with the National Trust to help bridge the gap between the \$2.2 million and the possibility of \$4 million. Mr. Bedeau advised that Preserve Nevada has expertise, connections with all levels of preservation groups, and is a partner with the National Trust for Historic Preservation. He further advised that Preserve Nevada is "more than happy to work with all building owners and public and private entities to try and find solutions to be able to rehabilitate historic buildings." He acknowledged that each individual building and set of circumstances is different. He advised that the Preserve Nevada Board has a wide range of experience in the technical, financial, and political aspects of historic preservation. He expressed a willingness to work with the National Trust and any other individual to find solutions. He expressed the opinion "there is a number out there that is at least equivalent to what would be spent on a new building or possibly even less than what would be spent on a new building that could get the congregation where it wants to go. We have to work within the programmatic needs of the institution." He expressed a willingness to work with the First Presbyterian Church, and the hope that the congregation, the commission, and the public would be willing to commit as well.

CARSON CITY HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 12, 2006 Meeting

Page 10

Chairperson Drews inquired as to the Building Committee's willingness to work with the commission. He suggested that the building condition report will provide answers to the commission's questions and the findings required by Title 18 for the commission to make a decision. Mr. Pearson expressed support for exploring the possibility, and the preference to meet with the Building Committee before responding to the commission. Chairperson Drews offered to start the process of identifying available funding for the building condition report, and to form a subcommission and meet with the Building Committee. He expressed the opinion there are a number of options to create a win-win situation for both parties.

Commissioner Darney agreed with Chairperson Drews' comments, and expressed support for a partial restoration. He acknowledged feasibility problems associated with rehabilitating the entire building, and that code requirements and issues of life safety were not considered at the time of original construction. He reviewed circumstances associated with the various building additions over the years, and noted the issues of preserving an historic building as well as rehabilitating it to current code requirements. He advised of being acquainted with Fred Dolven and Roger Hyytinen, and of having reviewed the structural problems associated with the building. He reiterated his support for partial rehabilitation, including the façades, not necessarily the entire structure. He expressed an interest in cost estimates to save the façades and building behind them.

Commissioner Ossa agreed with Chairperson Drews' and Commissioner Darney's comments. She considered the subject project more rehabilitation than restoration, reconstruction, or preservation. She advised that rehabilitation provides for the most flexibility and focuses more on helping to continue to use and adapt properties according to changing needs rather than historical interpretation. Preservation takes a building back to a certain period of time to be preserved like a museum piece. Restoration designates a significant era of the building and strips everything else away. Commissioner Ossa reiterated the project should be considered for rehabilitation. She commented that the project is "all about compromise." She expressed a willingness to give and take, roll up her sleeves, and work together.

In response to a question, Chairperson Drews advised the item could be continued and that meeting dates could be scheduled allowing the Building Committee to factor in its next meeting. Commissioner Smith advised the commission could meet more often than once a month.

Pastor Kochsmeier advised that the building, as it exists and would be rehabilitated, will not serve the current worship and fellowship needs of the First Presbyterian Church. He noted the changes between the 2001 and 2005 designs, and discussed the differences between new construction and rehabilitation costs. He advised that the building needed is the one described at the cost estimated.

Mr. Sullivan explained the commission's need for additional information in order to satisfy the ordinance criteria. He advised that the building condition report would provide the necessary information. He expressed the opinion it would be in the best interests of the church for the Building Committee to discuss details of this meeting and the commission's offer to work together. Mr. Sullivan explained the commission is bound to make a decision on the demolition application based on the requirements of the ordinance. He reiterated that the building condition report would provide additional information with regard to feasibility. Pastor Kochsmeier advised that the "ultimate product" is a "key dilemma" for the

CARSON CITY HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 12, 2006 Meeting

Page 11

church. Mr. Sullivan encouraged the Building Committee to discuss the question at hand and return to the commission at a future meeting. At Pastor Kochsmeier's request, he provided clarification on the commission's offer to work together to request a building condition report and determine whether there is additional common ground to be identified. Mr. Sullivan acknowledged "this is not a black and white issue" of whether to save the existing structure. Future discussions are needed with church representatives to determine what, if anything, can be saved. Mr. Sullivan requested the Building Committee to discuss the commission's offer and provide a response. He advised that staff would need at least ten days to notice the next commission meeting.

Commissioner Darney expressed concern over the impression that the commission was considering the entire building should be saved. He expressed the opinion that portions of the building can be incorporated into a new building from a design standpoint. Whether or not that's feasible from an economic standpoint is the question. Commissioner Darney expressed no problem with the new structure design, and discussed various alternatives. Chairperson Drews advised that the commission was seeking a request from the church to continue the item, to work together to secure funding for the building condition report, in order that the commission could make an evaluation based on the requirements of the ordinance.

Commissioner Smith moved to continue HRC-05-268, a request from Fred Dolven to allow demolition of existing sanctuary, on property located at 110 North Nevada Street, APN 003-214-03, -04, and -05, pending additional information as requested by this commission. Commissioner Darney seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0. Chairperson Drews advised this item would be reagendaized for the next meeting. He expressed the hope that, by that time, the commissioners and staff would be able to meet with National Trust for Historic Preservation and Preserve Nevada representatives. He reiterated the request for the Building Committee to provide a response to the commission with regard to whether or not to "fast track" the next meeting. Mr. Pearson requested a couple days to respond to the commission. [Chairperson Drews recessed the meeting at 7:43 p.m. and reconvened at 7:58 p.m.]

F-2. ACTION TO CONSIDER POLICY REGARDING COMMISSIONERS PRESENTING PROJECTS; and F-3. ACTION TO SELECT CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR (7:58:48) - Chairperson Drews suggested continuing these items to the next meeting. **Commissioner Smith so moved. Commissioner Baker seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.**

G. FUTURE COMMISSION ITEMS (7:59:20) - Commissioner Ossa requested staff to agendaize discussion regarding the possible use of training funds to bring Partners for Sacred Places representatives to Carson City to conduct a workshop on saving historic churches.

H. INTERNAL COMMUNICATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

H-1. COMMENTS AND STATUS REPORTS FROM STAFF (7:59:44) - None.

H-2. COMMENTS AND STATUS REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS (7:59:49) - Commissioner Ossa advised that the SHPO received Carson City's application for HPF funds. SHPO representatives are in the process of compiling information and reviewing applications. Chairperson Drews

CARSON CITY HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 12, 2006 Meeting

Page 12

provided Ms. Pruitt informational materials from recent National Trust for Historic Preservation meetings, and a 1998 Sacred Places at Risk report for the commission's files.

I. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT (8:00:39) - Commissioner Baker moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 p.m. Commissioner Ossa seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

The Minutes of the January 12, 2006 Carson City Historic Resources Commission meeting are so approved this 9th day of February, 2006.

MICHAEL DREWS, Chair