

**DRAFT MINUTES**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**Historic Resources Commission (HRC)**  
**Thursday, September 9, 2021 ● 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**

Heather Ferris, Planning Manager  
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](http://www.Carson.org/minutes).

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

(5:30:04) – Chairperson Drews called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL**

(5:30:21) – Roll was called, and a quorum was present.

<b>Attendee Name</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Arrived</b>
Chairperson Mike Drews	Present	
Vice Chairperson Michelle Schmitter	Present	
Commissioner Jed Block	Present	
Commissioner Gregory Hayes	Present	
Commissioner Robert Darney	Absent	.
Commissioner Donald Smit	Present	
Commissioner Lou Ann Speulda	Present	

**3. PUBLIC COMMENT**

(5:30:40) – Chairperson Drews entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

**4. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM MAY 13, 2021.**

(5:31:00) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item and entertained a motion.

(5:31:15) – **MOTION:** Commissioner Speulda moved to approve the minutes from the May 13, 2021 meeting as presented. Commissioner Block seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0-1 with Commissioner Smit abstaining, as he was not present at the May 13, 2021 meeting.

## 5. MEETING ITEMS

**5.A HRC-2021-0176 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR A REQUEST FOR A HISTORIC TAX DEFERMENT ON PROPERTY ZONED SINGLE FAMILY 6,000 (SF6), LOCATED AT 503 WEST ROBINSON STREET, APN 003-232-06.**

(5:32:59) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item. Ms. Ferris presented the Staff Report, which is incorporated into the record. Chairperson Drews entertained Commissioner questions and, when none were forthcoming, a motion.

(5:34:32) – **MOTION:** Commissioner Smit moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of HRC-2021-0176, excluding the detached garage constructed in 2002, 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. Vice Chairperson Schmitter seconded the motion. The motion carried 6-0-0.

**5.B HRC-2021-0265 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR A REQUEST FOR A HISTORIC TAX DEFERMENT ON PROPERTY ZONED DOWNTOWN MIXED-USE (DTMU), LOCATED AT 412 N. CURRY STREET, APN 003-225-10.**

(5:35:24) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item. Ms. Ferris presented the Staff Report, which is incorporated into the record. Chairperson Drews entertained public comments and, when none were forthcoming, a motion.

(5:36:48) – **MOTION:** Commissioner Speulda moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of HRC-2021-0265, 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 Hayes seconded the motion. The motion carried 6-0-0.

**5.C HRC-2021-0295 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR A REQUEST FOR A HISTORIC TAX DEFERMENT ON PROPERTY ZONED RESIDENTIAL OFFICE (RO), LOCATED AT 214 W. KING STREET, APN 003-215-03.**

(5:37:23) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item. Ms. Ferris presented the Staff Report, which is incorporated into the record. Chairperson Drews entertained Commissioner questions and comments. When none were forthcoming, he entertained a motion.

(5:38:29) – **MOTION:** Commissioner Hayes moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of HRC-2021-0295, 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 Block seconded the motion. The motion carried 6-0-0.

**5.D HRC-2021-0274 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR REPLACEMENT OF A LAWN AREA WITH ROCK, REMOVAL OF RAILROAD TIES AND PLANTS, AND THE ADDITION OF TWO NEW TREES ON PROPERTY ZONED RESIDENTIAL OFFICE (RO), LOCATED AT 904 N. NEVADA STREET, APN 001-186-04.**

(6:41:15) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item. Ms. Ferris presented the Staff Report, which is incorporated into the record.

(6:43:14) – Chairperson Drews entertained Commissioner questions, and Pete Sinnott of Western Environments and Ms. Ferris responded to clarifying questions. Commissioner Speulda inquired about whether it would be more appropriate to include some decomposed granite (DG) or some other more formal garden- type materials along with the crushed river rock, as the ornamental grasses were more modern, and Mr. Sinnott stated that the Property Owner wished to keep maintenance costs down. He added that some areas of DG could be incorporated to mix in with the gravel. Commissioner Speulda suggested adding stacked rock walls or sandstone rock walls that could be weaved into the design rather than just having boulders and grass, as those appear to be more modern features. Mr. Sinnott preferred using gravel than DG and offered to mix a couple colors of gravel together to place groundcover around the rock groups. Commissioner Block commented that gravel would at least help mitigate the issue of neglecting grass, which then leads to areas becoming dirt and weeds, as long as water would still be going to the large tree.

(6:52:10) – Commissioner Smit indicated that he has seen Mr. Sinnott’s work and commented that “I have no doubt this is going to look spectacular when he’s done.”

(6:52:58) – Chairperson Drews stated that the only problem with the submission was the drawing for the landscaping because “this drawing doesn’t tell me anything.” Commissioner Smit also explained to Mr. Sinnott that “the next person that comes in may not have that attention to detail, and it will look exactly like the drawing, and there’s nothing we can do about it.” He recommended providing a better drawing in the future. Mr. Reese advised that the Commission could delegate to Ms. Ferris, Ms. Sullivan, or Chairperson Drews the responsibility of approving a new drawing. Mr. Sinnott assured that he would provide a more formalized design plan for administrative approval.

(6:57:58) – Commissioner Block referenced #5 of the Conditions of Approval and discussed with Mr. Sinnott the grass to be located in the planting strips. Ms. Ferris indicated that, per the guidelines for landscape elements addressed in Section 5.25, one of the character-defining features of the property is the planting strips with grass and deciduous trees, though the Commission may eliminate the grass for river rock instead at their discretion. Ms. Sullivan added that Staff will always suggest to the Commissioners that they retain the character-defining features consistent with the guidelines. Chairperson Drews stated that the Commission could go with xeriscape, and grass could easily be planted “if climate change swings back the other way, and we’re inundated with water.” Mr. Sinnott added that ornamental grasses could also be added around the property to avoid it looking plain, and the ornamental grasses are “pretty low maintenance.”

(7:04:29) – Commissioner Smit believed that there should be some planting placed in the strip that could be defined in Mr. Sinnott’s new design plan.

(7:05:22) – Chairperson Drews entertained public comments. Pete (inaudible last name) introduced himself as a new Carson City resident residing in the Historic District and was in favor of the Commission possibly trying to establish some xeriscape guidelines for homeowners in the Historic District. He remarked about how “water is not what it used to be, so I think that’s a forward kind of looking thing,” and he was “all for water conservation.” He

commented that the parkway on Nevada Street looks like a graveyard, and those in the area find it problematic when trying to resolve the issue. He wished to see some due diligence from the officials and “to get the word out.” He also commented that “lawns in a desert are a dying product.”

(7:08:00) – Mr. Sinnott noted that everybody seems to be ignoring the threat of water for everyday use in the west, and he had not seen water conservation addressed by the Carson City Board of Supervisors (BOS) in years. He pointed out the growth in population and houses and did not believe that the community was reacting to the situation like it should. Mr. Sinnott suggested creating some ordinances with the assistance of a landscape architect for the historic landscaping. Chairperson Drews believed some xeriscape guidelines could benefit the Historic District, and Mr. Sinnott agreed to assist with establishing some guidelines.

(7:11:51) – Discussion ensued among the Commissioners regarding a revised motion, and Chairperson Drews entertained a motion.

**(7:16:19) – MOTION: Commissioner Block moved to approve HRC-2021-0274 based on the findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval included in the Staff Report with the addition of allowing only the removal of the lawn in the planting strips for Condition #5, based on the finding that lawns are reversible, while the existing trees must have an adequate water supply so as not to jeopardize them as well as the addition of a requirement to get a better landscape plan drawn based on how the landscape will be once completed upon the discretion of the Chair to approve, Carson City Historic District Guidelines, and consistent with Historic Resources Commission Policies. Commissioner Hayes seconded the motion. The motion carried 6-0-0.**

**5.E HRC-2021-0312 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST TO CONSTRUCT AN APARTMENT COMPLEX ON PROPERTY ZONED DOWNTOWN MIXED USE (DTMU), LOCATED AT 222 E WASHINGTON STREET AND 201 E WILLIAM STREET APNS 002-161-06 AND 002-161-07.**

(5:39:08) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item. Ms. Ferris presented the Staff Report, which is incorporated into the record.

(5:42:18) – Chairperson Drews entertained Commissioner comments, and Ms. Ferris as well as the Applicant Agent, Anthony Hama, and the architect for the project, Mike Heinrich responded to clarifying questions. Commissioner Speulda stated that [National Register] Criterion D for archaeological remains has never been addressed at the property, which has high potential for buried components that might be eligible, and she wished to see this addressed before approving the project. Mr. Hamas stated that there had been a peer review done with McGinley and Associates, which was involved with the site during the Brownfields study as well as the engineer who had worked on the peer review, and Mr. Hama did not recall the archaeological components of the report for the Brownfields study. He pointed out that, once the site is under construction, the engineering firm would be monitoring for anything of environmental or archaeological significance, and anything discovered would be addressed. Mr. Hamas assured that he would research the report. Commissioner Speulda noted that the site has significance with the community and there were still remnants from the Virginia and Truckee (V&T) Railroad Shop Complex that need to be addressed before excavation and construction. Chairperson Drews advised contacting an archaeological consultant to obtain the report.

(5:48:30) – Ms. Sullivan recommended continuing the item and providing the Applicant with some guidance other than archaeological resources. Chairperson Drews requested for Mr. Hamas to contact him for assistance through Ms. Ferris. In response to Mr. Hamas’ question, Chairperson Drews indicated that confirmation that items of significance were removed or are not present at the site through State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) records or any other historical records would be sufficient.

(5:49:36) – Mr. Hamas stated that construction would halt if any environmentally- or archaeologically-sensitive items were discovered through any of the excavation process, and the matter would be researched at that time.

(5:50:24) – Discussion ensued among the Commissioners, during which Chairperson Drews clarified that “we know there’s a report; we don’t know what the conclusions are,” and there would need to be another level of investigation if the conclusion confirmed that the site was eligible under Criterion D.

(5:57:02) – Commissioner Hayes referenced the drawings of the proposed structure and wished that the drawings showed a more western structure that “captured some of the old,” as the design appeared more modern and “boxy.” Chairperson Drews commented that the surrounding properties do not retain the historic character of the demolished V&T Railroad Shop Complex, and Commissioner Hayes clarified that he wished there was an element to the proposed buildings to suggest the site’s history. Commissioner Smit pointed out that the guidelines for new construct indicated that *new construction should look new and reflect the technology, building materials and design ideas of the present era*. Commissioner Hayes asserted that the proposed building could still have “a western look” and appear “a bit like the old days and have all those modern things.” Mr. Hamas stated that the current design was an attempt at preserving some of the historical significance of the former V&T site with “quite a bit” of brick veneer and accenting in the corners of the structure. Mr. Heinrich brought to the Commissioners’ attention some of the features, particularly the fenestration and the detailing, on the proposed structure, which were “our reference to the history of the area,” and noted that “we tried to be very disciplined about how we made the buildings look historical but also contemporary.” Commissioner Smit was in favor of the design and believed that the proposed structure would look good in the location. He commented that he did not wish to “take something new and try to mimic something from the past.”

(6:05:22) – Commissioner Speulda pointed out that the proposed structure did not incorporate any elements of the roundhouse, despite being called Roundhouse Apartments, and suggested adding some arched areas or columns to include the historic character of the original building. Mr. Hamas stated that the name was used as a placeholder and can be changed if it is not well-received by the community or the Commission.

(6:06:48) – Chairperson Drews requested replacing the light-colored stucco depicted in the drawings of the proposed structure with sandstone veneer in order to bring some of the historical material out more. Commissioner Block proposed placing some sandstone veneer at the bottom of the structure where the dark brown stucco is on the drawings instead because doing so would not be that difficult to do, it would tie into the brick, and it would provide a hint of the native materials that came from Carson City.

(6:11:48) – Ms. Sullivan commented that, based on the site guidelines, the setting of the site, and the resources that are on the site as well as the design standards of the Downtown Mixed Use (DTMU) Zoning District, Staff believed the proposed design was one that they could support. Chairperson Drews agreed with Ms. Sullivan, though he believed that integrating a little more sandstone or brick into the façade would make the building fit better.

(6:13:53) – Chairperson Drews stated that a HRC special meeting may be scheduled in October 2021 to proceed with the item if the requested documentation is recovered, and discussion ensued among the Commission regarding the Commissioners’ expectation for the Applicant to progress with the item. Chairperson Drews advised putting together a five-page due diligence summary. Based on Chairperson Drews’ feedback, Mr. Hamas assured that he would communicate with the Commission after performing a records search to uncover existing information on the site. Ms. Sullivan noted that the Applicant has been “really, really responsive” with requests from Staff for modifications to the proposal. She asked the Commissioners if they were prepared “to recommend approval subject to the Applicant coming back prior to commencement of construction with all of the archaeological documents that exist on the property, any documents that he found necessary to supplement those documents so that he could prepare a plan to implement during construction so that would give him guidance ... on how to handle the artifacts that he would encounter or should expect to encounter so he will come back to this Commission” with the completed application package. Chairperson Drews agreed with Ms. Sullivan’s idea.

(6:27:18) – Ms. Ferris reiterated the following Condition of Approval based on the Commission’s input:

*“Prior to commencing construction, the Applicant shall submit to the HRC for review and approval an archaeological study including archaeological due diligence and monitoring and curation protocols.”*

(6:30:30) – Mr. Hamas indicated that additional accenting could be considered without violating the requirements of the DTMU guidelines and balancing what the Commission wished to see.

(6:30:53) – Chairperson Drews entertained public comments. The Property Owner, Louis Larquier, introduced himself and stated that during the Brownfields study, which was a Phase 3 Environmental [Site Assessment], two different types of ground-penetrating radar was used so any anomaly could be marked and recovered. He added that there was nothing of historic significance saved during the study, which was recorded in the Phase 3 report. Chairperson Drews reiterated that the Commission needed the Brownfields report with the archaeology component included as part of the application package.

(6:33:12) – Children’s Museum of Northern Nevada Executive Director Christine Brandon introduced herself, and she was concerned about the impacts with traffic due to the size of the proposed structure and other issues. She wished to be included on other Carson City Planning Commission meetings that the Applicant would be attending. She mentioned that the land of the site and museum is ancestral Washoe Tribal land. Ms. Brandon also requested that the structure blend in with the surroundings, and she was concerned about the exits and entrances with the number of vehicles in the area.

(6:35:28) – Chairperson Drews entertained a motion.

**(6:35:31) – MOTION: Commissioner Smit moved to approve HRC-2021-0312 based on the findings and Conditions of Approval contained in the Staff Report, Carson City Historic District Guidelines and consistent with Historic Resources Commission Policies along with the following additional Conditions of Approval:**

- **A thorough, in-depth archaeological study with any additional mitigations that are required**
- **When archaeological artifacts are located/identified/discovered, the plan would be to preserve [them]**
- **The Applicant agrees to continual, on-site observation during construction of the facility**

- Prior to commencing construction, the Applicant shall submit to the HRC for review and approval an archaeological due diligence study and monitoring and curation protocols

Commissioner Hayes seconded the motion. The motion carried 6-0-0.

**6. STAFF REPORTS: DISCUSSION ONLY**

**- PLANNING DIVISION STAFF REPORT TO THE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION.**

(7:20:48) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item. Ms. Ferris presented her report, which included that Commissioner Block had brought to Staff’s attention a potential property maintenance issue at 402 West Robinson Street, and the Carson City Code Enforcement Division was addressing the matter.

**- COMMISSIONER REPORTS/COMMENTS.**

(7:21:34) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item. Commissioner Hayes informed the Commission that the owners of the Ferris Mansion had “let it go to seed,” and much of the landscape had died. He mentioned that the windows on the little building behind the Ferris Mansion had been repaired with plywood. Commissioner Block believed that after the Commission had given the owners approval for the windows, the mini split had been removed, and the owner had not yet replaced the siding. Ms. Sullivan noted that the owners had been in touch with Staff and stated that Staff could follow up with the owners.

**- FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS.**

(7:24:02) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item and requested Ms. Ferris to conduct research on other Historic Districts to agendize discussion on xeriscape guidelines during the November 2021 or January 2022 meeting.

(7:24:37) – Commissioner Smit wished to see an item agendized regarding the graffiti applied to the 501 King Street property, as the steps were also painted.

**- NEXT MEETING: THE NEXT MEETING IS TENTATIVELY SCHEDULED FOR 5:30 P.M., FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 2021, AT THE CARSON CITY COMMUNITY CENTER, ROBERT ‘BOB’ CROWELL BOARD ROOM, 851 EAST WILLIAM STREET, CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89701.**

**7. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

(7:25:35) – Chairperson Drews entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

**8. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: ADJOURNMENT**

**(7:25:41) – MOTION: Commissioner Block moved to adjourn the meeting, and Commissioner Hayes seconded the motion. Chairperson Drews adjourned the meeting at 7:26 p.m.**

The Minutes of the September 9, 2021 Carson City Historic Resources Commission meeting are so approved this 14<sup>th</sup> day of October 2021.