

MINUTES
Regular Meeting
Historic Resources Commission (HRC)
Thursday, October 14, 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.

1. CALL TO ORDER

(5:31:48) – Chairperson Drews called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

(5:32:02) – 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

(5:32:21) – Chairperson Drews entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

4. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 9, 2021.

(5:32:47) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item and entertained a motion.

(5:32:58) – MOTION: Commissioner Speulda moved to approve the minutes from the September 9, 2021 meeting as presented. Commissioner Block seconded the motion. The motion carried 7-0-0.

5. MEETING ITEMS

5.A HRC-2021-0378 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES FOR THE FEDERAL BUILDING IN CARSON CITY, ON PROPERTY ZONED PUBLIC REGIONAL (“PR”) AND LOCATED AT 705 N PLAZA STREET, APN 004-262-02.

(6:20:38) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item. Ms. Ferris presented the Memorandum and referenced the accompanying documents, all of which are incorporated into the record. She noted that the General Services Administration (GSA) would not be available for this meeting.

(6:21:51) – Chairperson Drews entertained Commissioner questions and comments. Vice Chairperson Schmitter commented that there were some problems with the report related to the Nevada State Capitol and the Plaza, and she believed that the Federal Building does have political significance at the local and State level. She pointed out the windows in Photograph 13 and commented that the architect, Hewitt C. Wells, “really did make an effort to blend it with the existing buildings.” Commissioner Speulda agreed with Vice Chairperson Schmitter’s comment and stated that the sun screens, which were a character-defining element of the style, could be restored along with the columns that are still in place. She also referenced the fundamental characteristics, listed in the Determination of Eligibility Report document, and believed that the building was “a good example of this type of architecture” and eligible at the local level. She wished to suggest that the GSA reconsider its evaluation criteria and submit that to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) with the Commission’s recommendation that the building should be considered eligible within the City. Vice Chairperson Schmitter added that the absence of the sun screens was weighted “fairly heavy,” and she did not believe that was fair because “every other piece of integrity of this building made it through the test.”

(6:26:05) – Commissioner Block commented that the construction of the building was done well, as it emulated elements from the Virginia and Truckee (V&T) Railroad Shops and the Carson Nugget.

(6:27:29) – Chairperson Drews believed that the sun screens that were originally on the building were “pretty significant” and mentioned that the consensus of the architectural historians was to remove the sun screens. He pointed out that one of the arguments in the report is that the building is not classic New Formalism architecture, and he believed that the building being “a great mash of the International style” in addition to exhibiting elements of the New Formalism style is one of the factors that makes the building important locally. He also commented about how the architect paid attention to the environment. Chairperson Drews asserted that the Federal Building is one of the character-defining buildings that Hewitt C. Wells designed in the area.

(6:30:08) – Chairperson Drews requested that Vice Chairperson Schmitter work with Ms. Ferris to write a letter to SHPO summarizing the Commissioners’ thoughts on the GSA’s determination. No formal action was taken on this matter.

5.B HRC-2021-0379 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A SECTION 106 TECHNICAL REPORT PREPARED DUE TO FEDERAL PERMITTING FOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AT THE BRISTLECONE BUILDING ON THE

WESTERN NEVADA COLLEGE CAMPUS, ON PROPERTY ZONED PUBLIC REGIONAL (“PR”) AND LOCATED AT 2201 W COLLEGE PARKWAY, APN 007-521-01.

(6:30:32) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item. Ms. Ferris presented the Memorandum and referenced the accompanying documents, all of which are incorporated into the record, and informed the Commission that nobody was present at the meeting to represent the Section 106 Technical Report.

(6:31:45) – Chairperson Drews entertained Commissioner questions and comments, and he noted that report should have indicated that the V&T Railroad, which is adjacent to the Western Nevada College (WNC) campus, is a historic property within a half-mile of the Bristlecone Building. No formal action was taken on this matter.

5.C HRC-2021-0312 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REVIEW OF THE INFORMATION PROVIDED FOR COMPLIANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE APPLICATION TO SUBMIT TO THE HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION (“HRC”) FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL, ARCHAEOLOGICAL DUE DILIGENCE AND MONITORING AND CURATION PROTOCOLS (CONDITION #7) OF HRC-2021-0312 WHICH PROPOSES THE CONSTRUCTION OF AN APARTMENT COMPLEX ON PROPERTY ZONED DOWNTOWN MIXED USE (“DTMU”), LOCATED AT 222 E WASHINGTON STREET AND 201 E WILLIAM STREET, APNS 002-161-07.

(5:33:41) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item. Ms. Ferris presented the Memorandum and referenced the accompanying documents, all of which are incorporated into the record. Chairperson Drews entertained Commissioner questions and comments. When none were forthcoming, he entertained a motion. Chairperson Drews disclosed a possible conflict of interest, pursuant to NRS 281A.420. He did not believe he had a disqualifying conflict of interest, as he had not written the monitoring plan, he was not involved in the current project in any manner, he has no ties to the company involved in the matter, and he was not receiving compensation or gifts related to this project; therefore, he would be participating in discussion and action on this item.

(5:38:16) – The Applicant Agent, Anthony Hama, stated that he could ask the hired Kautz Environmental Consultants Archaeologist, Jason Spidell, to provide any additional reporting, documentation, or guidance specified by the Commission up to the point of construction. He mentioned that Mr. Spidell believed that, after reviewing the 2011 Brownfields study, it was sufficient to follow the procedure.

(5:40:10) – Chairperson Drews requested making the original document more specific to the project, and he pointed out that the previous report was not attached to the application packet. He confirmed that he would be willing to administratively approve the project as long as the documentation and clarification for the preconstruction meeting are specific to the project, and he wished to ensure that the building permit states that monitoring is required as a stipulation for development.

(5:42:43) – In response to Commissioner Smit’s question, Chairperson Drews clarified that he wished to have all the documents attached to the application and believed that the Commission could find the monitoring and curation protocols as proposed adequate, though “we’d just like it tethered specifically to the project.”

(5:46:33) – MOTION: Commissioner Smit moved that the HRC’s approval was subject to seven Conditions of Approval (signed Notice of Decision attached), including Condition #7 that required the Applicant to submit to the HRC for review and approval an archaeological due diligence and monitoring and curation

protocols, with the specific addition that the report and all correspondence be tailored to this specific project, to be located between East Washington Street, East William Street, and South Stewart Street, along with the administrative approval from the Chair moving forward. Commissioner Speulda seconded the motion. The motion carried 7-0-0.

(5:48:22) – In response to Mr. Hama’s question, Chairperson Drews indicated that it may be appropriate to send possible on-site discoveries to the Virginia and Truckee (V&T) Railroad Company or the Railroad Museum if anything is discovered on site.

5.D HRC-2021-0337 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST TO REPLACE WOOD DECKING AND RAILING ON THE PORCH AND LATTICE SKIRTING UNDER THE PORCH; EXTEND AND PARTIALLY ENCLOSE THE PORCH; AND REMOVE THE LAWN LOCATED IN THE PLANTING STRIP BETWEEN THE ROAD AND SIDEWALK, ON PROPERTY ZONED SINGLE FAMILY 6,000 (“SF6”), LOCATED AT 506 W SPEAR STREET, APN 003-232-01.

(5:49:08) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item. Commissioner Block read into the record a prepared disclosure statement, advised of a disqualifying conflict of interest, and noted that he would not be voting on this item. Ms. Ferris presented the Staff Report, which is incorporated into the record along with the accompanying documents.

(5:53:25) – Chairperson Drews entertained Commissioner questions and comments. Christopher White, the Applicant/Property Owner, and Vanessa White, also the Property Owner, responded to clarifying questions as well as provided some background. Commissioner Speulda liked that the wire fence was retained, and Mr. White stated that the latch had been redone to be consistent with the original latch from the 1930s.

(6:00:38) – Mr. White indicated that he and Ms. White were “more than happy” to add the railing or use wood on the west end of the porch, which is also where a large barbeque and smoker are located for outdoor cooking events.

(6:01:34) – Commissioner Block commented that, because he has owned the property across the street from the one in question for 17 years, the referenced picture was during spring when weeds were starting to grow, and there was never a sprinkler system or grass. He mentioned that the property looked “really ratty” because the previous owner “did nothing with it,” and the gravel that was done in the front and on the side looks better than what was there before.

(6:03:02) – Commissioner Smit acknowledged that, when the Property Owners had gotten the building permit to begin modifications on the property, “it could have been a possible trigger ... looking at the address,” and he pointed out that the property was purchased with the gravel in place “and then the City comes and puts more gravel in there.” He did not believe he could tell the Property Owners to remove the gravel, and he was uncertain if the Commission had any “purview” on how the deck can be constructed or what it has to look like, as the porch decking is not historic or a character-defining element since the porch was added in 1975. Chairperson Drews informed Commissioner Smit that the deck, even if not character-defining, does still affect the façade, the character of the house, and the neighborhood, and he believed that was why the Commission needed to review it.

(6:05:26) – Ms. Sullivan informed the Commissioners that Staff reviews change of ownership on a monthly basis and sends a copy of the [Historic District] Guidelines with a letter to every new property owner, and when the Property Owners acquired this property in 2016, they should have received a letter from Ms. Sullivan with a booklet

that outlines all of the Guidelines. Mr. White had made some suggestions regarding making people aware of the mandated Guidelines prior to purchasing a home, as “we thought we were doing our due diligence to contact the City.”

(6:08:16) – Commissioner Darney noted that he had no problems with the materials, the railing, or the skirt, but he did not support the barbeque due to the mass of it being in the front and obscuring the elevation of the house from the street. He suggested adding “more character, a little more detail, a little more build in, and a railing blended,” and he stated that Ms. Ferris’ suggestion regarding carrying the railing around would also be acceptable. Commissioner Darney also agreed with Commission Block regarding the gravel. Commissioner Hayes referenced the similarities and the action taken by the Commission for HRC-2021-0274 in the September 9, 2021 HRC minutes. Commissioner Speulda agreed with Commissioner Darney that the planting strip with the rock in it was not something that the Commission should be concerned with given the drought and noted that the Property Owners could plant bushes or a tree in the future to make the property appear more “pedestrian-friendly.” She also believed the iron railing and skirting were fine for the house and agreed that the white barbeque surround is “a little bit bulky” and grabs attention away from the house. She suggested adding a screen that is “a little less obtrusive” or removing the surround to carry the railing through that area.

(6:17:25) – Commissioner Speulda referenced Condition #7 and asked if Mr. White should be given more time because it may be difficult to complete within 60 days during the fall/winter season. Mr. White commented that the problem with completing the condition was the supply chain finding the material, as the fence material was currently out of stock. The Commission agreed that six months was reasonable, and Commissioner Speulda advised that Mr. White contact the Commission if he needed more time.

(6:18:18) – MOTION: Commissioner Darney moved to approve HRC-2021-0337, property located at 506 West Spear Street, based on the findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval included in the Staff Report with the exception of Condition #7, extending what is now written 60 days of approval to six months of approval for this application, and striking Condition #5; Carson City Historic District Guidelines; and consistent with Historic Resources Commission Policies. Vice Chairperson Schmitter seconded the motion. The motion carried 6-0-1 with Commissioner Block abstaining from voting.

6. STAFF REPORTS: DISCUSSION ONLY

- PLANNING DIVISION STAFF REPORT TO THE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION.

(6:33:45) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item. Ms. Ferris stated that she could present an update on the Ferris Mansion and the Brewery Arts Center (BAC) at the next HRC meeting, and she informed the Commission that a presentation on drought-tolerant landscaping or xeriscaping in the Historic District would take her longer to prepare.

- COMMISSIONER REPORTS/COMMENTS.

(6:34:44) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item. Vice Chairperson Schmitter informed the Commission that she was approached by the Carson City Historical Society to do a presentation on windows, which Chairperson Drews and Commissioner Speulda agreed to assist with, and the presentation would take place on November 11, 2021 via Zoom.

- FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS.

(6:35:41) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item and requested agendaizing a discussion item regarding noticing in the Historic District.

(6:36:21) – Commissioner Hayes commented that there needed to be more details and written guidelines regarding the use of solar panels in the Historic District.

- NEXT MEETING: THE NEXT MEETING IS TENTATIVELY SCHEDULED FOR 5:30 P.M., FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2021, AT THE CARSON CITY COMMUNITY CENTER, ROBERT ‘BOB’ CROWELL BOARD ROOM, 851 EAST WILLIAM STREET, CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89701.

7. PUBLIC COMMENTS

(6:37:55) – Chairperson Drews entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

8. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: ADJOURNMENT

(6:38:02) – MOTION: Commissioner Speulda moved to adjourn the meeting, and Commissioner Block seconded the motion. Chairperson Drews adjourned the meeting at 6:38 p.m.

The Minutes of the October 14, 2021 Carson City Historic Resources Commission meeting are so approved this 3rd day of November 2021.