



108 E. Proctor Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701
(775) 887-2180
Hearing Impaired: 711

MEMORANDUM

Historic Resource Commission meeting of November 3, 2021

To: Historic Resource Commission Item 5.C

From: Heather Ferris, Planning Manager

Date: October 27, 2021

Subject: For discussion only- Update on the status of the Brewery Arts Center Steeple

On September 9, 2021 the Historic Resources Commission (“HRC”) requested staff to provide an update on the status of the work at the Brewery Arts Center specifically related to the steeple.

On January 14, 2021 the HRC considered a request for exterior work to the buildings and grounds at the Brewery Arts Center. The HRC approved the reroof, denied the removal of the cross and louvers, requested additional information on the trash enclosure, exterior lighting fixtures.

On September 28, 2021, Mike Wiencek with the Brewery Arts Center provided the attached memorandum outlining the progress they have made specifically regarding steeple louvers. Staff have requested Mr. Wiencek or Gina Lopez, Brewery Arts Center Executive Director attend the November 3, 2021 meeting to participate in the discussion and provide any additional information.

MEMORANDUM



To: HRC/Planning Division

From: Mike Wiencek, BAC

Date: September 27, 2021

RE: Update on Steeple Louver project at Brewery Arts Center

The Brewery Art Center is happy to announce that we have a Project Consultant/Manager to assist us in handling the fabrication/replacement of the louvers/slats on the Bell portion of the Steeple on the Brewery Arts Centers' Performance Hall, the former St Teresas church.

Eric Bevans, a local custom fabricator, has agreed to work with the Brewery Arts Center on finding viable options and resources to restore the look of the louvers/slats on the steeple. The louvered openings no longer serve their intended purpose as a method for the peal of the bells to emanate, and there is still questions regarding whether they need to be vented, or just decorative in nature. Any guidance from the HRC would be helpful in these matters.

Thank you for your patience in this matter – this project is a priority for us due to its high visibility and one we knew that we had to get the right person to manage it. We are happy to be making progress on this issue, and now with the addition of Mr Bevans to the team, we feel that the project can proceed forward. We plan to have some rough drawings and proposals to the HRC soon.

lose this little building,” referring to the garage, as it represented a type of architecture not often seen in the Historic District.

(5:40:57) – Commissioner Smit inquired about contacting the City to have the garage relocated, and Mr. Damm agreed to Commissioner Smit’s request for 60 days to possibly find someone with the City who would be willing to take the garage.

(5:45:27) – Discussion ensued regarding the Licensed General Contractor referenced in the Staff Report, during which Chairperson Drews pointed out that per the Carson City Municipal Code (CCMC), the HRC needed more details from the contractor and commented that there was no indication in the Applicant’s packet that the contractor has any experience with historic preservation and rehabilitation, nor could the claims that were made about the state of the garage be substantiated. He wished to see more background on the garage and to have more time to find out if anything could be done with the garage before demolishing it. Commissioner Smit agreed with Chairperson Drews and offered the expertise of a friend who is a Structural Engineer as well as his own expertise from having built two structures that have ended up on the National Historic Record. Commissioner Smit clarified that he wished to assist Mr. Damm with the garage as a member of the public.

(5:53:30) – Ms. Sullivan explained to the Commissioners that a Commissioner that decides to be the Applicant must recuse him/herself from participating in making the findings on the application and acknowledged that it appeared that some of the Commissioners could not make the findings. She suggested that exploration into relocating the building could only be pursued by the property owner, as Staff do not have the capacity to do so.

(5:55:33) – Vice Chairperson Darney agreed with Commissioner Smit and believed that the matter “is a fine example of demolition by neglect.”

(5:58:41) – Ms. Sullivan confirmed that action could be postponed on the item so that the application could be updated to include more information and suggested including in the motion “that the Commission finds that the application is not responsive to [CCMC] 18.06.075, and the continuation is to provide the Applicant with the opportunity to provide the evidence the Commission needs to make one of the two findings.”

(6:01:12) – Chairperson Drews entertained public comments and, when none were forthcoming, a motion.

(6:01:23) – **MOTION: Commissioner Smit moved to continue this item [for HRC-2020-0036] to the regularly scheduled March HRC 2021 meeting, finding that the application before the Commission is not responsive to CCMC 18.06.075 and giving the Applicant the opportunity to supplement the application to be responsive. Vice Chairperson Darney seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0-0.**

F-3 HRC-2020-0038 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR EXTERIOR WORK TO THE BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS AT THE BREWERY ARTS CENTER ON PROPERTY ZONED PUBLIC REGIONAL (PR) AND HISTORIC DISTRICT (HD), LOCATED AT 449 AND 501 WEST KING STREET, APN’S 003-207-05, -06, -07.

(6:02:48) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item. Ms. Sullivan presented the Staff Report and the accompanying photographs, all of which are incorporated into the record.

(6:10:17) – Chairperson Drews entertained Commissioner questions and comments, and the Applicant, Michael Wiencek, and BAC Executive Director Gina Lopez responded to clarifying questions. Vice Chairperson Darney wished to see the trash enclosure painted to match the building and the gates “screened visually.” Commissioner Smit preferred to have a drawing to show what the trash enclosure with the gates would look like.

(6:13:13) – Commissioner Smit wished to have clarification on the lighting included in the packet.

(6:16:08) – In response to Chairperson Drews' question, Mr. Wiencek stated that he was not aware that permission was needed for removing the chimneys from the building and informed the Commission that the chimneys were crumbling. He commented that the chimney on the eastern side of the building had degraded to approximately a quarter of its original size, and the bricks had all fallen off when the chimney was removed. He added that the other chimney looked like it was ready to fall down at any point and felt that it was in the best interest of the building to remove the chimneys and roof over them. Chairperson Drews commented that it was unfortunate that the chimneys were gone, as a stone mason could have taken the chimneys apart and put them back.

(6:19:18) – Commissioner Smit commented that removing the chimneys “appeared to be a case of asking for forgiveness instead of approval” and wished to have the chimneys placed back on the building. Discussion ensued regarding reconstruction of the chimneys, during which Commissioner Smit stated that there exist numerous types of brick to match the original chimneys. Vice Chairperson Darney was concerned about whether there was value in adding the replicated chimneys “for solely the illusion of what was there,” although he agreed with Commissioner Smit’s suggestion of readding the chimneys if matching brick could be found and used.

(6:21:28) – Commissioner Block pointed out that the chimneys were not visible from the view of the front of the building. He believed the chimneys were a character-defining feature and agreed with both Commissioner Smit’s and Vice Chairperson Darney’s points. He noted that there would be structural support to reconstruct the chimneys if the original chimneys were still under the roof. He also supported giving approval to remove the cross on the top of the building, as the cross for the original building had been replaced. Commissioner Smit, however, believed the cross is a defining character of the building. Vice Chairperson Darney viewed the cross as a form of signage to go with the tenant unless it was the original cross.

(6:27:05) – Chairperson Drews posed the question regarding whether the building is a significant building because it is one of the three oldest churches downtown or because of its architecture, and he stated that the cross would be one of the character-defining elements if the building is important because it is a church.

(6:31:10) – Chairperson Drews entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming. Vice Chairperson Darney mentioned that the steeple was no longer vented due to the removal of the louvers, which could cause further deterioration and possibly collect mold due to there being a concealed enclosed space with no vent. He believed that the vents are a “hugely significant to the contributing factor of this building architecturally” and commented that he could accept if they were replaced with glass and changed into windows.

(6:32:48) – Commissioner Schmitter strongly believed that there needs to be some airflow where the louvers are located and preferred keeping the louvers as they originally were and operable. Commissioner Speulda agreed with Commissioner Schmitter’s comment, and she believed that the steeple, as the symbol of the church and the architecture it represents, is the most important element when people see the building. She added that she did not believe the mural that was painted on the steeple was appropriate and suggested that the steeple be characteristic of the time period during which it was built, the architectural style, and its importance as a symbol. Commissioner Smit agreed with both Commissioner Schmitter’s and Commissioner Speulda’s comments, and he was disappointed in the mural and stated that, as a sign, a mural must be approved by the HRC.

(6:34:57) – Commissioner Block believed that the louvers should be restored and commented that wire mesh could be placed behind the louvers for venting. He mentioned that a donor from approximately 15 years ago was willing to donate funds for fans to be placed where the louvers are located due to how hot that area of the building can get. He wished to see some artistic details on the inside of the building.

(6:39:05) – Chairperson Drews stated that the HRC trusts the people who manage historic properties like the BAC and needs them to understand the importance of ensuring that these properties last for generations.

(6:40:58) – Commissioner Speulda appreciated the large amount of money that was spent working on replacing the roof. She wished that the HRC would have been spoken to regarding the steeple before the work had been done on it, as seemingly small decisions like this one “are really critical to our interpretation of these buildings,” and some really important design elements of the building had been lost.

(6:42:03) – Chairperson Drews entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming. The discussed consensus among the Commissioners was also to keep the cross on the building, restore the louvers back to their original appearance, approve the reroof, provide clarification on the light fixtures, and provide clarification on the trash enclosure screening.

(6:54:34) – MOTION: Vice Chairperson Darney moved to approve HRC-2020-0038 to reroof, to deny the removal of the cross, and to deny the removal of the louvers, in keeping with the Guidelines for Historic Buildings under section 5.20.1 that the “original trim elements should be retained and repaired when at all possible, [and] trim that is inconsistent with the original building style and design shall not be added” as well as the finding by the Commission that the two denied elements hold historic significance to the building, with the following additions:

- Additional information on the trash enclosure including whether it will be painted or brick with the gates that are screened [around] the trash dumpsters visually
- Maintain the existence of the cross at the top of the steeple
- Provide administrative clarification of the color of the selected light fixtures as well as a site map or building map that indicates the placement of the installation in addition to how the light is attached to the brick through the mortar with some sort of a sconce to come through the mortar joint and not through the brick itself
- Maintain, Restore, and replace the louvers on the steeple in like with the existing to be functional to all intents and purposes of function
- Defer the removal of the brick chimneys at the rear of the building to the next scheduled meeting

Commissioner Block seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0-0.

F-4 HRC-2020-0214 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING POTENTIAL NOMINATIONS FOR THE 2021 CARSON CITY HISTORIC PRESERVATION AWARDS FOR OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENTS IN HISTORIC PRESERVATION.

(7:00:13) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item. Ms. Sullivan presented an overview of the Staff Report, and Chairperson Drews entertained ideas for potential nominations. Commissioner Block wished to select Carson City Culture and Tourism Authority (CTA) Executive Director David Peterson for consideration for the markers that were done for the Kit Carson “Blue Line” Trail and for repurposing the stone from the prison farm and the medallions from Carson Street. Chairperson Drews added Silver State Industries (“Prison Industries”) and the Carson City Public Works Department for their work on the project.

(7:01:50) – Chairperson Drews entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming. No formal action was taken on this item.

F-5 HRC-2020-0031 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE THE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2020 TO BE PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.