

DRAFT MINUTES
Regular Meeting
Historic Resources Commission (HRC)
Thursday, May 12, 2022 ● 5:30 PM
Community Center Robert “Bob” Crowell Board Room
851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada

Commission Members

Chair – Mike Drews
Commissioner – Jed Block
Commissioner – Robert Darney
Commissioner – Lou Ann Speulda

Vice Chair – Michelle Schmitter
Commissioner – Gregory Hayes
Commissioner – Donald Smit

Staff

Hope Sullivan, Community Development Manager
Todd Reese, Deputy District Attorney
Danielle Howard, Public Meetings Clerk

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. These materials are on file in the Clerk-Recorder’s Office, and available for review during regular business hours. An audio recording and the approved minutes of this meeting is available on www.Carson.org/minutes.

1. CALL TO ORDER

(5:30:44) – Chairperson Drews called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

(5:30:57) – Roll was called, and a quorum was present.

Attendee Name	Status	Arrived
Chairperson Mike Drews	Present	
Vice Chairperson Michelle Schmitter	Present	
Commissioner Jed Block	Present	
Commissioner Gregory Hayes	Present	
Commissioner Robert Darney	Present	
Commissioner Donald Smit	Present	
Commissioner Lou Ann Speulda	Present	

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

(5:31:12) – Chairperson Drews entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

4. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM MARCH 10, 2022.

(5:31:27) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item and entertained a motion.

(5:31:36) – MOTION: Commissioner Hayes moved to approve the minutes of the March 10, 2022 meeting. Commissioner Block seconded the motion. The motion carried 7-0-0.

5. MEETING ITEMS

5.A HRC-2022-0112 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGARDING A REQUEST FOR A HISTORIC TAX DEFERMENT ON PROPERTY ZONED SINGLE FAMILY 6,000 (“SF6”), LOCATED AT 707 W ROBINSON STREET, APN 003-242-04.

(5:31:52) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item. Ms. Sullivan referenced the Staff Report, which is incorporated into the record. When no Commissioner questions or public comments were forthcoming, Chairperson Drews entertained a motion.

(5:33:28) – MOTION: Commissioner Block moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of HRC-2022-0112, based on the finding that the request is consistent with the design guidelines for the Historic District and the Secretary of the Interior Standards as noted in the Staff Report. Commissioner Speulda seconded the motion. The motion carried 7-0-0.

5.B HRC-2021-0203 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST TO REMOVE FIVE BRICK AND MORTAR CHIMNEYS ON PROPERTY ZONED RESIDENTIAL OFFICE (“RO”) LOCATED AT 212 N. DIVISION STREET, APN 003-202-04.

(5:33:58) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item, and Ms. Sullivan referenced the Staff Report and the accompanying attachments, all of which are incorporated into the record. She also responded to clarifying questions.

(5:36:04) – Chairperson Drews entertained Commissioner questions. First United Methodist Church Board of Trustees Chairman Brian Hutchins, representing the First United Methodist Church, referenced the accompanying attachments, during which he indicated that the property “is well-used certainly during the middle of the week” as well as for special events. He noted that there is an operating church next door to the property “consistent with around the time when the State came into being, 1863/1864,” and the property was a part of the church grounds where events take place. He stated that the First United Methodist Church believed that there was a safety concern regarding the chimneys toward young children, staff, and other individuals that “trumps the historic preservation needs here” and that repair is a temporary solution because the chimneys would always be degrading regardless of how well the attempts to preserve the structure are. Mr. Hutchins stated that the last repair on the chimneys was about eight to 10 years ago. He added that the First United Methodist Church appreciates and wishes to preserve history and that those involved with the church “do our best to keep those historic buildings restored and in good, operating condition.” He also stated that the First United Methodist Church believes that the chimneys are relatively minor features and have not been functioning for decades.

(5:40:51) – Commissioner Smit indicated that he was “disturbed” that Resource Concepts, Inc. Professional Engineer Keith R. Shaffer did not provide how the chimneys could be restored in his Structural Evaluation Report, and he noted how easy it is to do the work with the chimneys, having had the opportunity to assist in two projects in the Historic District involving saving the chimneys. He believed that the chimneys are character-defining and should stay. Commissioner Speulda agreed with Commissioner Smit’s input and added that it would be “quite a loss” to have the chimneys removed. She pointed out that the chimneys were built with soft mortar that comes out and could easily be replaced, which would not be a major expense. Discussion ensued, during which Commissioner Darney agreed with much of what Commissioner Smit stated and indicated that, based on experience with chimney

repairs, the chimneys in question were “actually in pretty good shape.” He also explained that the chimneys could be repaired by taking them down and adding steel anchors, or clips for structural integrity to “make them as good as new and for another 100 years” after building them back up. He was willing to entertain consideration for removal or shortening of the fifth chimney that stands alone along the north side of the building, as he believed that there was an argument regarding its historic significance on the building. Commissioner Darney also believed that the north chimney was likely the most dangerous of the chimneys and would cost the most to repair as well as be the most difficult to support.

(5:46:35) – Commissioner Block commented that some bricks had come down off of the three chimneys at his own house, which was constructed in 1875, approximately nine years ago, and the brick masons that he was able to find “went down about six courses” and used structural wiring before rebuilding and capping the chimneys. He noted that his chimneys “still looked really good.” He also pointed out that the north chimney may be considered a historic improvement at that time if it has been on the house for over 50 years.

(5:48:00) – Vice Chairperson Schmitter agreed with Mr. Hutchins regarding the safety issue posed by the state of the chimneys, and if there is a seismic event, all of the bricks would come down potentially on the children outside. She supported removing the chimneys and appreciated that the building was being used by the First United Methodist Church. She added that “strapping does have an impact on those features that we describe as historically significant,” including the building, and she suggested compromising, as the documentation of the chimneys was available, and the way the chimneys were built did not consist of a rare pattern. Commissioner Smit clarified that all of the work done to strengthen and hold up the chimneys he was involved with were concealed within the attic space of the building, and he indicated that the work on the chimneys could be done without any strapping on the exterior. He also offered to share the drawings from the referenced project with Mr. Shaffer. Commissioner Darney reiterated that the chimneys were reparable with hidden internal structural elements and added that the Commission “owe[d] it to the Historic District to make that attempt” to restore the four historically significant chimneys. He also pointed out that the Commission has the recommendation to retain windows and fences; therefore, chimneys “should be no different.”

(5:53:12) – Chairperson Drews noted that all the Commissioners agreed that the chimneys are character-defining features and stated that there were few buildings in the Historic District with five chimneys, with the chimney caps themselves being another element that defines that character. He referenced Division 5.14.1 of the Carson City Development Standards for the Historic District and indicated that Mr. Hutchins was fortunate that the maintenance was done on the chimneys with mortar because the brick would be falling apart into dust otherwise. He indicated that if the chimneys were to be rebuilt, it was critical for the brick mason to be sure to use lime mortar again and not Portland cement.

(5:55:08) – Commissioner Darney pointed out for consideration that the daycare may be moved after the chimneys had already been removed. Chairperson Drews indicated that the Commission may only consider within its purview for this item. Commissioner Hayes commented that, while safety is not within the Commission’s purview jurisdiction, he cares about safety, and he believed that if the restoration was handled correctly to take care of the elements that “deserve” to be cared for as they age, the safety issue would be addressed at the same time. He was open to suggestions regarding how to address the north chimney

(5:58:20) – Mr. Hutchins reiterated his previous explanation and asserted that the First United Methodist Church would still be contributing to the Historic District by keeping the building. He also stated that the Commission had

photographs of the chimneys that could be shown and asked if the Commission was authorizing a rehabilitation if the Commission moved to deny the request. Discussion ensued, during which Commissioner Smit indicated that by owning a building in the Historic District that requires a certain amount of maintenance, the Property Owner needs to vacate the building if the Property Owner is unable to afford the maintenance. He also pointed out such examples as the State Capitol Building being “gutted” and its mortar being replaced to keep it from collapsing as well as the building’s windows using plate glass that could also hurt the children.

(6:05:05) – Commissioner Speulda commented that she had experience repointing and rebuilding chimneys on an 1855 house that was still standing 25 years later. She noted that mortar is “pretty cheap,” and, because the roof was being repaired, there would be an opportunity to support the chimneys below the roofline.

(6:08:30) – Mr. Hutchins pointed out the separation of the north chimney from the building on pages #8 and #13 of the accompanying attachments and stated that “it would certainly take quite a[n] initiative to get that restored back to the way it should be and really safe.” He also indicated that he knew what a large earthquake would do to the chimneys. Commissioner Hayes mentioned how a large earthquake caused the chimney at an apartment he previously lived in to partially collapse because it did not have “a great support system underneath,” and he stated that the chimneys could be rebuilt to be stronger than they ever were. Commissioner Smit commented that the City was in the same seismic zone as San Francisco, so the chimneys he was involved in designing were designed to withstand the same kind of earthquakes that San Francisco would have and used wooden timbers in the attic, and he noted that the project was completed in two days.

(6:12:13) – Commissioner Darney was not opposed to removing the north chimney, as it was an “afterthought,” and he did not consider it historically significant for the building. Addressing Mr. Hutchins’ “case of assurances,” Commissioner Darney stated that “this would have to go through the Building [Division] and be engineered and be approved and be scrutinized, and it would come with the same assurances that you would get if you were to drive into the Nugget’s parking structure.” He pointed out that the entire building was a threat to children’s safety during an extreme seismic event or high winds since it was built in 1874, and the First United Methodist Church should consider relocating the daycare center if safety was its main concern. He added that it was not within the Commission’s purview to consider costs or financial burdens for restoration.

(6:15:22) – Commissioner Block brought to the Commission’s attention that the north chimney was installed before the wrought iron fence was, and he inquired about how long the fence had been on the property, as it gives an indication of age. He noted that while the north chimney was added onto the building, the chimney on the property of 412 North Curry Street was also added on, and the owners of that property went through the process of restoring the chimney because it is part of the history. He suggested lowering the north chimney below the eave to install the fasteners and connect the chimney to the building. He pointed out that the wrought iron fence had been on the property for a long time, and he commented that “there [are] ways to make it safe and to keep it.” Commissioner Block also believed that the north chimney “tells part of the story, as well.”

(6:17:15) – Chairperson Drews pointed out that if the north chimney is removed, there would be extra brick to use to repair any of the broken brick on the remaining four chimneys, and he noted that any repairs would need to be consistent with the building design. Commissioner Block offered some of the brick from another house as well as from his chimneys that were inside bricks.

(6:18:08) – Ms. Sullivan wished to modify the recommended motion in the Staff Report based on the Staff recommendation and the discussion. Chairperson Drews wished to add to the motion that the four remaining

chimneys are a character-defining feature of the property, and there are methods to repair the loose mortar on the other chimneys. Ms. Sullivan indicated that the modified recommended motion would read:

“I move to deny HRC-2022-0203 based on the finding that the request is not consistent with the design guidelines for the Historic District and the Secretary of Interior Standards as noted in the Staff Report and as discussed by the Commission on the record at its meeting of May 12, 2022, although the newer chimney on the north side may be removed, as it is not original. The four interior chimneys are original and character defining, and there are methods to repair.”

(6:21:46) – Chairperson Drews entertained additional discussion and public comments; however, none were forthcoming. He entertained a motion.

(6:22:05) – MOTION: Commissioner Block moved to deny HRC-2022-0203 based on the finding that the request is not consistent with the design guidelines for the Historic District and the Secretary of Interior Standards as noted in the Staff Report and as discussed by the Commission on the record at its meeting of May 12, 2022, although the newer chimney on the north side may be removed, as it is not original. The four interior chimneys are original and character defining, and there are methods to repair.

(6:23:00) – Based on Mr. Reese’s clarification, Ms. Sullivan suggested the following amended motion:

“I move to approve the removal of the chimney on the north side, as it is not original, and the request for the removal of the four original, character-defining chimneys is denied based on the finding that [the request] is not consistent with the design guidelines for the Historic District and the Secretary of the Interior Standards as noted in the Staff Report and as discussed by the Commission on the record at its meeting of May 12, 2022, and noting that there are methods to repair these chimneys.”

(6:24:57) – MOTION: Commissioner Block so moved with the amendments as articulated by Staff. Commissioner Smit seconded the motion. The motion carried 7-0-0.

6. STAFF REPORTS: DISCUSSION ONLY

- PLANNING DIVISION STAFF REPORT TO THE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION.

(6:26:22) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item. Ms. Sullivan reported that the Carson City Board of Supervisors (BOS) passed a proclamation to recognize the month of May as Historic Preservation [and Archeological Awareness] Month, and the BOS and Chairperson Drews awarded the Bank Saloon with the award for the Outstanding Historic Preservation Project for 2021. She informed the Commission that the Scavenger Hunt was underway. Ms. Sullivan indicated that when Chairperson Drews presented his Annual Report to the BOS a couple months ago, there was discussion about maintenance issues in the Historic District after Chairperson Drews brought the matter to the Board’s attention, and Ms. Sullivan noted that the BOS did not want to pursue expanding the Façade Grant Program to include the residential properties for contributing properties in the Historic District, as the BOS wished to focus redevelopment funds on infrastructure programs and not private property. She also stated that she instructed one of the compliance officers to inventory the areas in the Redevelopment Areas and the Historic District for weeds so Staff and the Commission were proactively addressing the matter instead of waiting for complaints to be made.

- **COMMISSIONER REPORTS/COMMENTS.**

(6:28:18) – In response to Chairperson Drews’ inquiry regarding identifying other monies to start a separate Historic Preservation Fund, Ms. Sullivan clarified that the BOS manages public funds, and if Chairperson Drews was interested in private funds, he may need to consider such entities as the Historical Society as a place to house the funds as opposed to combining the private and the public funds. She also pointed out that the Carson City Parks and Recreation Department had some private funds, and she stated that the Commission could discuss the matter as well as ways to create incentives for the Historic District. Mr. Reese believed that the Foundation for Carson City Parks and Recreation, which is an umbrella 501(c)3 organization that assists other nonprofits with projects, would be a better possibility to consider than the Historical Society because he believed that there was more guidance with the Foundation.

(6:30:08) – Ms. Sullivan also wished to publicly thank Jim Phalan and the Fox Brewpub for continuing to supply and donate the prize for the Scavenger Hunt for the past three years, and it was appreciated that Mr. Phalan continues to support the event. Vice Chairperson Schmitter also thanked Commissioner Inversin for organizing the Scavenger Hunt. Commissioner Block wrote a letter on behalf of himself and the rest of the Commission to thank the Fox Brewhub for the donation.

(6:31:05) – Chairperson Drews recognized the need to apologize to Nevada Builders Alliance CEO Aaron West for addressing him as “Adam” West.

(6:31:33) – Commissioner Block indicated that a brand-new house was being built next to the George L. Sanford House on the corner of Proctor Street and Roop Street, and he thought it was “kind of cool” that somebody was doing something new that was emulating the historic house using shiplap board and batten on the top.

- **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS.**

(6:32:30) – Chairperson Drews entertained requests for future agenda items; however, none were forthcoming.

- **NEXT MEETING: THE NEXT MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR 5:30 P.M., THURSDAY, JULY 7, 2022 AT THE CARSON CITY COMMUNITY CENTER, ROBERT ‘BOB’ CROWELL BOARD ROOM, 851 EAST WILLIAM STREET, CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89701.**

(6:32:40) – In response to Commissioner Hayes’ question concerning the scheduled date for the next HRC meeting, Ms. Sullivan indicated that Carson City Associate Planner Heather Ferris would look into the matter and follow up with the Commission.

7. PUBLIC COMMENTS

(6:33:15) – Chairperson Drews entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

8. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: ADJOURNMENT

(6:33:18) – MOTION: Commissioner Hayes moved to adjourn the meeting, and Commissioner Block seconded the motion. Chairperson Drews adjourned the meeting at 6:33 p.m.

The Minutes of the May 12, 2022 Carson City Historic Resources Commission meeting are so approved this 8th day of September 2022.