

MINUTES
Special Meeting
Historic Resources Commission (HRC)
Tuesday, June 18, 2019 • 4:00 PM
Community Center Sierra Room
851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada

Commission Members

Chair – Mike Drews
Commissioner – Jed Block
Commissioner – Michelle Schmitter
Commissioner – Lou Ann Speulda

Vice Chair – Robert Darney
Commissioner – Gregory Hayes
Commissioner – Donald Smit

Staff

Hope Sullivan, Planning Manager
Ben Johnson, Deputy District Attorney
Tamar Warren, Deputy 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 of this meeting is available on www.Carson.org/minutes.

A. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

(4:01:10) – Chairperson Drews called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m. Roll was called; a quorum was present.

Attendee Name	Status	Arrived
Chairperson Mike Drews	Present	
Vice Chairperson Robert Darney	Present	
Commissioner Jed Block	Present	
Commissioner Gregory Hayes	Present	
Commissioner Michelle Schmitter	Present	
Commissioner Donald Smit	Present	5:17 p.m.
Commissioner Lou Ann Speulda	Present	

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS

(4:01:42) – Chairperson Drews entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

C. MODIFICATION OF AGENDA

(4:02:08) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item and Ms. Sullivan noted that items D-2 and E-2 will be removed from the agenda as the property was no longer in escrow.

(4:03:00) – Mr. Johnson explained that the Commissioners will conduct a site visit, at 4:15 p.m., during which Open Meeting Law rules will apply, even during the drive to the site. He advised asking question and making comments after returning to the room. Deputy District Attorney Ben Johnson also noted that the site visit is open

to the public; however all public comments will be heard after the return to the Sierra Room and the Commission is back on the record. Ms. Sullivan explained that she was aware of Mr. Johnson's request; therefore, she had instructed the applicants to present their proposal and walk the Commissioners through the property, and had advised them that no deliberation or discussion will take place at the site. Mr. Johnson recommended having all disclosures presented prior to the start of deliberations after 5 p.m.

(4:07:25) – Chairperson Drews recessed the meeting at 4:07 p.m.

D. SITE VISITS – BEGINNING ON SITE AT 4:15 PM

D-1. HRC-19-019 SITE VISIT TO 406 NORTH NEVADA STREET TO VIEW PREVIOUSLY APPROVED WORK ON THE SUBJECT PROPERTY, AS WELL AS A STUDIO STRUCTURE PROPOSED FOR DEMOLITION, THE LOCATION OF A PROPOSED GARAGE STRUCTURE, THE LOCATION OF A PROPOSED OFFICE / KITCHEN STRUCTURE, AND THE LOCATION OF A LATTICE PATIO AND WALK COVER ON PROPERTY ZONED RESIDENTIAL OFFICE, APN 003-226-03.

The commission conducted the site visit along with Mr. Johnson.

D-2. HRC-19-019 SITE VISIT TO 507 NORTH DIVISION STREET TO VIEW PROPOSED AREAS WORK ON THE SUBJECT PROPERTY INCLUDING REPLACEMENT OF WINDOWS, REPAIR AND RESURFACING OF ENTRIES, REPAIR AND REPLACEMENT OF FENCING, REPLACEMENT OF GARAGE DOORS, AND INSTALLATION OF PAVERS BETWEEN THE BUILDING AND THE SIDEWALK ON PROPERTY ZONED RESIDENTIAL OFFICE, APN 003-221-01.

This item was removed from the agenda per item C.

*****REVIEW OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WILL NOT OCCUR BEFORE 5:00 P.M.*****

(5:00:07) – Chairperson Drews reconvened the meeting at 5 p.m. A quorum was still present. Commissioner Smit arrived at 5:17 p.m.

E. MEETING ITEMS

(5:00:23) – Chairperson Drews entertained disclosures prior to the item discussions. Vice Chair Darney recused himself and noted that he would be presenting on behalf of the applicant. Commissioner Schmitter disclosed that she had “provided names of professionals qualified to do an assessment of the outbuilding for the project, and also had conversations with the consultant”. Vice Chair Darney left the dais.

E-1 HRC-19-019 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR DEMOLITION OF A STUDIO STRUCTURE, AND CONSTRUCTION OF A GARAGE, AN OFFICE / KITCHEN STRUCTURE, AND AN ALUMINUM LATTICE PATIO AND WALK COVER AS WELL AS REVIEW OF PORCH FEATURES ON PROPERTY ZONED RESIDENTIAL OFFICE LOCATED AT 406 NORTH NEVADA STREET, APN 003-226-03.

(5:00:51) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item. Ms. Sullivan introduced the property and presented the Staff Report which is incorporated into the record. She also noted that the applicant had mentioned the removal of trees during the site visit, which was not on the agenda; therefore, she had requested a stand-alone application from the applicant for the removal of trees. Ms. Sullivan also responded to clarifying questions and expected the applicant representative to walk through the modifications outlined in the late materials.

(5:12:26) – Commissioner Hays noted that the railing they had seen was different from the architectural drawing being presented. Applicant representative and project architect Rob Darney explained that the correct railing drawings were the ones in the packet. He also relayed conversations with the building department and insurance representatives that the railing would be installed for safety issues, adding that the lattice work will match the railing and the elevation. He also outlined the lighting and the column placements and stated that they had planned to use wood decking instead of the existing concrete. Discussion ensued regarding the posts and the railings on the decks and comparisons were made to the historic photograph incorporated into the record. Applicant representative Chris Fredlund gave the dimensions of the deck components as “top skinny part of the column is 8 and 7/8 [inches] wide, the top of the railing is 8 and 1/4 [inches], the balusters are 1.5 inches wide, and the bottom rail [will be] totaling 4.5 inches (sandwiching the balusters)”. Chairperson Drews indicated that the deck elements were added but not approved. Mr. Darney explained that the columns were “mock-ups” for the Commission’s review. Mr. Fredlund believed that during the previous approval, they had been asked to “make sure [anything new] looked different”. Commissioner Block explained that the request to move the new chimney which had used “dissimilar materials” was different from the decking. Chairperson Drews cautioned against calling the home a historical landmark and clarified that it was not, but it was on historic property. He also noted that the base looked heavy. Mr. Darney believed that the consensus was that “the columns are fine, the heads are fine, the railing and the post bases we can work with”. He also offered to “mock up another one and have you come take a peek just to verify”.

(5:36:45) – Ms. Sullivan reminded the Commission that the guidelines for historic buildings indicated “a porch that has part of the original design of a historic building shall be maintained in its original configuration, design, style, and detail if at all possible. If suitable documentary evidence can be presented which demonstrates the original existence of a porch which no longer exists, the porch may be constructed to match the original as best as possible. If a porch cannot be demonstrated to have originally existed at a building, a porch may be added with the condition that the configuration, design, style, and detailing are suitable and compatible with the architectural style of the building and does not adversely impact the historic integrity of the building. Any new additions to the building shall be performed in such a manner that if removed from the future, the original building will not be adversely affected.” She added that the Commission’s July 2018 approval had referred to these guidelines.

(5:40:26) – Commissioner Schmitter inquired about the porch lights and Mr. Darney explained that they were submitted as part of his drawings. Mr. Darney reminded the Commission that only one photograph of the building exists and it’s not proof that a railing “never existed”. Further discussion ensued regarding different railing options and it was agreed that the seams could be hidden by a wrap. Chairperson Drews entertained public comments, and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

(5:50:17) – MOTION: [This motion is relative to the columns and railing on the front porch for HRC-19-019.] Commissioner Block moved to approve the top element of the column as shown on the left side of the photograph that Bob Fredlund is in [made a part of the record – see on the next page]. The column will then continue down with the slender post. Where the column intersects with the top of the rail, a block will be put around that to pipe the cut and also give it an attachment point for the front rail to go into, and the front rail will be at a 45 degree angle with the top on it. Pickets an inch-and-a-half square every inch and a half shall go along with the bottom plate. The bottom plate of the post will also mimic the ones that are 36 inches high, where the railing attaches. Railings for the steps in front and also to the south side of the building will utilize the same railing. Lights will be able to be put on top of posts because they can always be removed, and it’s not a contributing element. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Schmitter. Motion carried 6-0-0.

(5:51:48) – Chairperson Drews requested that Mr. Darney provide him the information for the items that will require administrative approval.



(5:52:03) – Chairperson Drews requested discussion on the trees. Mr. Fredlund explained that three trees would be removed “due to their health” and will be replaced with appropriate trees, possibly Maple trees. Ms. Sullivan explained that this discussion had not been agendized; therefore, she suggested a discussion to be followed by a new application specifically for trees. Commissioner Smit was against the removal of the Linden trees. Mr. Darney cautioned of the damage the tree would cause; however, Commissioners Smit and Hayes disagreed. Mr. Johnson suggested waiting to discuss the trees after an application has been submitted and Chairperson Drews proposed hiring an arborist prior to the discussion. There were no public comments regarding the trees.

(5:59:16) – Mr. Darney suggested discussing the garage demolition because “it kills the entire backyard”. He wished to repurpose whatever material is possible and believed that the roofing could be saved for future use. Ms. Sullivan mentioned that there were two conflicting documents regarding the National Register and had been advised by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to leave the interpretation to the Commission. Chairperson Drews believed that the outbuildings would be considered contributing to the historic building.

(6:03:22) – Corri Jimenez introduced herself as the architectural historian who had evaluated the building and offered to respond to questions. Commissioner Block gave historic background and believed that because the building has been around for over 79 years, it should be considered as contributing to the Historic District and believed “you can do cool things with it”. Ms. Jimenez noted that she had not seen any architectural integrity as “it had been altered too many times” and did not consider it as “contributing”. Commissioner Smit spoke in favor

of the demolition due to alterations. Mr. Darney explained that the placement of the building did not allow doing much with the yard. Commissioner Schmitter was informed that moving the shed had been considered, “but it’s probably not going to make it”. Commissioner Speulda also believed that the building had been significantly altered. Chairperson Drews clarified “if we do approve the demolition, that doesn’t mean you can demolish it”, adding that no demolition should occur until the setback and plans are approved. Ms. Sullivan noted that critical paths to the demolition are the garage, the kitchen, and the office/studio which is “contemplated but not immediate”. She inquired whether the demolition could occur to accommodate the garage construction only and the Chair stated that “it has to be the complete package”. Ms. Sullivan clarified that a permit may not be issued for demolition of a structure until a permit for the replacement construction is in place, and she recommended articulating that in the motion. Commissioner Smit received confirmation that replacing and outbuilding with outdoor space was acceptable. Mr. Johnson noted that the way the demolition was agendized, approving an alternative that hasn’t been formally presented should not be allowed. In response to a question by Mr. Fredlund Ms. Sullivan explained that the agenda itemized what was listed on the application by the applicant; however, she advised taking the first step of determining whether the outbuilding meets the National Register criteria. Secondly, she advised looking into “what needs to get permitted for you to be prepared to allow this demolition to occur”, which may be landscaping. Discussion ensued and Mr. Fredlund suggested taking the building off the “[historic] registry”. Chairperson Drews believed that the landscaping may be done administratively should the Commissioners agree. There were no public comments; therefore, Chairperson Drews entertained a motion and hoped it would address the architectural resource assessment and integrity for SHPO clarification.

(6:36:43) – Ms. Sullivan suggested a motion “to find that the subject resource does not meet the National Register Significant Criteria, and in making this finding, the Commission is relying on the architectural resource assessment as a Curry House Outbuilding circa 1943, located at 406 North Nevada Street, prepared by Corri Jimenez, June 2019”.

(6:37:51) – MOTION: [This motion is relative to the demolition of HRC-19-019.] – Commissioner Schmitter moved to approve the demolition “as stated [above] by Staff, with the addition that the building lacks architectural integrity as determined by the consultant, and justified on page 23 of the report”.

(6:38:25) – Commissioner Smit proposed adding an amendment to read “it’s contingent upon the garage and/or coming back with a landscaping plan that could be submitted and reviewed administratively for approval”. Chairperson Drews believed “that would be a good idea). Commissioner Schmitter agreed to the amendment. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Speulda. Motion carried 5-1-0 with Commissioner Block as the nay vote.

(6:39:36) – Mr. Darney explained that the property owner intended to phase the construction of the separate buildings and would request separate permits. He also presented the plans for a tandem garage, incorporated into the record, and responded to clarifying questions. Discussion ensued regarding installing windows to break up the solid garage wall and Commissioner Smit stated that would not be possible due to code requirements. Mr. Darney noted that only half of the wall will be visible to the neighbors. Commissioner Block expressed concern over the painted walls chipping or peeling and recommended cinderblock. Commissioner Schmitter believed that the doors would not relate. Commissioner Smit requested to stay consistent when making decision and was informed that the Commission had purview over the doors.

(7:01:20) – Chairperson Drews indicated the discussion should proceed to the trellises. Mr. Darney gave a presentation on the planned shade structures, incorporated into the record. Ms. Sullivan noted that the structure is “technically a roof-type structure” and noted that the description she is currently hearing is that it will be for plants, or a support system for a vine.

(7:10:21) – Ms. Sullivan cited the design guidelines that state: “If windows and doors typically have fanciful trim, incorporate trim with architecturally equal weight. If trim work is typically simple, do not use ‘gingerbread’.

Seek to design the new building so that the trim and architectural details complement the existing buildings in the area.” Commissioner Schmitter noted that she did not have any issues with the covered area. Mr. Darney explained that he did not intend to have the garage be so exposed and “if it’s too much gingerbread then we’re not married to that”. Chairperson Drews stated that the trellis on the garage would be removed. He also suggested not having different sets of plans including those in late material. Mr. Darney explained that the earlier plans were part of the original application which did not get voided, and that the late material was based on a request from a Commissioner. Chairperson Drews requested complete packets in order to “try and get it right the first time, or if not get it right the second time” so that the Commissioners would have time to review the packets and ask questions. Commissioner Smit stated that he preferred to see one column completed instead of doing a lot of work at the site, because he did not wish to see work redone. He also commended the applicant and representatives for hiring Ms. Jimenez. Commissioner Schmitter suggested removing all trellises.

(7:18:32) – Mr. Darney wished to use a wood door currently on the north elevation of the studio in a closet between the kitchen and the office, because it would not be used frequently. He also noted that a large window, on the west end of the studio, will be placed on the corner of the office and would match a “like window” on the opposite end. In response to a question by Chairperson Drews, Mr. Darney indicated that the patio will be stamped concrete. Discussion ensued regarding the sidings and Ms. Jimenez indicated that she had not mentioned saving the sidings in her report. Chairperson Drews suggested saving pieces of the sidings and Mr. Darney noted that they would be salvaging all the old lumber and repurposing it. Commissioner Hays was informed that powder-coated/painted aluminum will be used for the lattice. Mr. Darney also noted that the new outbuilding structures would have metal roof because they would like to differentiate what is new and what is old, and that the color may be charcoal or green. Commissioner Schmitt was informed that the lattice will most likely be ivory or another light color. Chairperson Drews entertained public comments, and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

(7:28:19) – Ms. Sullivan recommended two changes when making the motion. Condition seven to read: The lattice structure must be wood framed and Condition nine to read: The trellis above the garage doors and the office/studio window is to be removed.

(7:28:56) – Commissioner Smit moved to approve HRC-19-019 as presented and subject to the conditions of approval included in the staff report [with the following changes to conditions number seven and number nine to now read:]

- **#7. The lattice structure must be wood framed.**
- **#9. The trellis above the garage doors and the office/studio window is to be removed.]**

(7:29:13) – The motion was seconded by Commissioner Schmitter. Motion carried 6-0-0.

(7:29:50) – Mr. Fredlund thanked the Commission and explained to Commissioner Smit “we didn’t intend to come here and actually make up for what we did wrong”, calling the project evolving. He stated that they were advised to “bring everything to you, and that’s what you got this time”, adding that they will “go back and redo a couple of things”. Mr. Darney confirmed that he would provide Chairperson Drews with cut sheets for lighting, a new drawing on the porch posts, the cut sheet on the fixture for the lighting of the steps, and a rough landscaping plan.

E-2 HRC-19-092 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR REPLACEMENT OF WINDOWS, REPAIR AND RESURFACING OF ENTRIES, REPAIR AND REPLACEMENT OF FENCING, REPLACEMENT OF GARAGE DOORS, AND INSTALLATION OF PAVERS BETWEEN THE BUILDING AND THE SIDEWALK ON PROPERTY ZONED RESIDENTIAL OFFICE LOCATED AT 507 NORTH DIVISION STREET, APN 003-221-01.

This item is no longer applicable.

F. STAFF REPORTS

F-1 DISCUSSION ONLY

PLANNING DIVISION STAFF REPORT TO THE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION

(7:32:06) – Ms. Sullivan did not have a prepared Staff Report.

COMMISSIONER REPORTS/COMMENTS

(7:32:22) – None.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

(7:32:29) – Chairperson Drews indicated that he had informed the City Manager, the Open Space Administrator, and Ms. Sullivan to inform them that “Kings Canyon Road is falling apart”, which had been brought up as an issue by SHPO. He also noted that Cavell House on Robinson Street “is falling on the wayside”.

G. PUBLIC COMMENTS

(7:33:12) – Chairperson Drews entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

H. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT

(7:33:24) – MOTION: Commissioner Block moved to adjourn and Commissioner Hayes seconded the motion. Chairperson Drews adjourned the meeting at 7:33 p.m. and stated an Open Meeting Law Workshop conducted by Mr. Johnson will follow.

The Minutes of the June 18, 2019 Carson City Historic Resources Commission meeting are so approved this 11th day of July, 2019.

MIKE DREWS, Chair