

DRAFT MINUTES
Regular Meeting
Historic Resources Commission (HRC)
Wednesday, January 13, 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

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

(5:30:49) – Chairperson Drews called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

(5:31:06) – 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

(5:31:23) – Chairperson Drews entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

4. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM NOVEMBER 3, 2021.

(5:31:54) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item and entertained a motion to approve the minutes from the November 3, 2021 meeting as presented.

(5:32:10) – MOTION: Commissioner Hayes so moved. Commissioner Speulda seconded the motion. The motion carried 7-0-0.

5. MEETING ITEMS

5.A HRC-2021-0462 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST TO REPLACE WINDOWS, REPLACE FRONT DOORS, AND REPLACE AND EXPAND FENCING ON PROPERTY ZONED RESIDENTIAL OFFICE (“RO”) LOCATED AT 212 S. NEVADA STREET, APN 003-123-03.

(5:32:26) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item. Ms. Ferris referenced the Staff Report, which is incorporated into the record.

(5:37:48) – Chairperson Drews entertained Commissioner questions and comments. The Applicant, Emanuella Pomerlyan, introduced herself, and she and Ms. Ferris responded to clarifying questions. Commissioner Smit noted that the front of the building had likely undergone extensive renovation without approval because he did not believe the aluminum windows existed in 1985, and he pointed out that the current windows would not meet code. He believed the vinyl portion of the window was the issue. In response to Commissioner Smit’s inquiry, Ms. Pomerlyan believed that the right side of the building was an addition to the property. Ms. Ferris did not believe there was an issue with resizing the windows that Ms. Pomerlyan wished to resize, particularly the windows on the north end of the building.

(5:41:45) – Commissioner Darney supported resizing the windows, and he believed that the windows should be single- or double-hung wood-clad and would look better being similar in size. He agreed that the right side of the property was a more modern addition. He also agreed with Staff’s recommendation requiring the fence boards to be vertically oriented. Ms. Pomerlyan offered to do matching wooden trim around the windows, as she could not afford wooden windows at this time, and noted that wooden windows are “super drafty,” are unsafe, and require a lot of force to slide them.

(5:45:07) – Commissioner Hayes informed Ms. Pomerlyan that the Commission was available to assist with getting oriented on the various components of the proposed project through the Commissioners’ expertise. He brought to Ms. Pomerlyan’s attention that work could be done to make the windows function better.

(5:47:20) – Commissioner Darney added that the aluminum windows were “unvaluable” because they were likely installed without a permit and stated that “you can’t fix a mistake with a mistake.”

(5:47:47) – Regarding the windows, Commissioner Hayes stated that the Commission was “trying to lean away from vinyl and things that are way out of character and go more towards wood ones that might well be more competitive than you think,” and he advised Ms. Pomerlyan to “investigate that.”

(5:48:53) – Commissioner Speulda pointed out that even though the windows had been replaced, the opening was original for where the original windows were, which the Commission wished to maintain rather than putting in a slider. Commissioner Darney indicated that double-hung would typically need to be 30 inches by five feet or three feet by four feet to meet code, and a slider is larger in individual pane, so the window would need to be four feet wide by four feet tall to be code compliant. He did not believe the Commission could approve a horizontal slider for the front of the building.

(5:51:21) – Vice Chairperson Schmitter wished to keep all the windows in the front of the building the same and added that one-over-one windows would make the most sense.

(5:53:52) – Referring to the windows closest to Ms. Pomerlyan’s mailbox, Commissioner Smit commented that it appeared that very little damage was done to the trim and noted that there were at least four companies that he was aware of that could do the same thing with wood to emulate the double-hung window that was previously there. He explained what installing a vinyl window would involve, including removing the trim and likely manipulating the opening size when purchasing a standard window, and doing so would result in “a lot of destruction” to the exterior of the building. He believed it would be beneficial for Ms. Pomerlyan to meet with such a company as Capital Glass regarding what could be done to help, as it would be “less disruptive to your home,” and she can also be provided with concepts for what could be done with the windows underneath the porch overhead that are set higher. Commissioner Smit added that the Commission’s decisions cannot be based on budget, and the decisions must be based on the historic nature of the building in question and what the Commission is trying to preserve.

(5:57:13) – Chairperson Drews understood why Ms. Pomerlyan wished to replace the windows and believed that it was “a really good idea” to replace the aluminum sliders in a house that “dates this period.” He advised Ms. Pomerlyan to replace the two smaller windows first in the area that appears to be the oldest part of the building because he believed that if Ms. Pomerlyan could get the windows sized to code, she could save some money on replacing the windows. He stated that replacing the windows with vinyl windows would not get Ms. Pomerlyan the results she wants, and the Commission does not support vinyl windows in the Historic District. Chairperson Drews agreed with using a wood-clad product.

(6:01:16) – Commissioner Darney advised Ms. Pomerlyan to verify with the U-Values of windows when purchasing windows because the codes have become more stringent.

(6:02:21) – Commissioner Speulda believed that, because the existing front doors were not the original doors, keeping the opening and replacing the existing doors with a more wood door with windows would be “a nice compromise.” She also believed wood fencing would look nice on the property. In response to Ms. Pomerlyan’s question, Chairperson Drews indicated that fencing with a three-foot height and painted wood pickets would be the most consistent with the time period of the property, and Commissioner Darney supported the use of the vertical columns as long as the paneling in between is a vertical-type picket. Chairperson Drews added that if Ms. Pomerlyan submitted an application with a six-foot vertical wood fence, the Commission would have likely approved it, and Ms. Pomerlyan stated that she could submit what was needed to get that fencing approved.

(6:04:36) – Commissioner Smit clarified what a wood-clad window is, and discussion ensued among the Commissioners, during which Commissioner Darney and Chairperson Drews agreed that they should be consistent in the decision to not allow vinyl and to use solid wood window without cladding. Commissioner Hayes pointed out that the all-wood windows for his house have weathered well, and the cladding was not necessary. Chairperson Drews also stated that using wood, aluminum, or steel windows would be faithful to what was available in the 1940s.

(6:09:29) – Commissioner Darney stated that because the existing windows were four-feet-wide, he supported a two-over-one divider.

(6:09:49) – Chairperson Drews indicated that Ms. Pomerlyan could use vinyl-clad sliders that meet the egress conditions on the 1940s right addition to the building if she wished to and commented that if Ms. Pomerlyan “wanted

to keep kind of the character of that and distinguish it from the other house, that would work well; you don't necessarily have to have all the same windows that look like 1800s/19th century historic windows on a 1940s plus addition." He added that Ms. Pomerlyan could use "whatever works in that space."

(6:12:36) – Vice Chairperson Schmitter believed that there should be some consistency with dealing with the primary elevation and pointed out that "there's so much going on with this building, and here's our opportunity to make it read a certain way." She believed that "we should look to the precedent that's already there, which is the one-over-one and then continue that along if she could find that window, and then anything else can happen on the other elevations." Commissioner Darney agreed with Vice Chairperson Schmitter's input and believed it would be "a mistake to mix and match."

(6:13:27) – Ms. Pomerlyan agreed to return to the Commission with some other window ideas, and after further discussion on the matter, Chairperson Drews entertained public comments and a motion.

(6:17:20) – MOTION: Commissioner Darney moved to approve the request from Property Owner at 212 South Nevada Street, APN 003-123-03 (HRC-2021-0462) to replace windows and the front doors and build yard fencing with the following stipulations:

- **The windows must be a wood product**
- **The Applicant is to submit [an application] to the [HRC] for reapproval of the windows, the doors, and the fence placement**
- **The fence must be a vertical design and a wood or metal product**

Vice Chairperson Schmitter seconded the motion. The motion carried 7-0-0.

5.B HRC-2021-0469 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO ELECT A HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN FOR THE PERIOD OF FEBRUARY 2022 TO JANUARY 2023.

(6:18:54) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item and entertained nominations.

(6:19:40) – Commissioner Smit moved to nominate Mike Drews to the position of HRC Chair. Vice Chairperson Schmitter seconded the motion. Chairperson Drews entertained additional nominations and, when none were forthcoming, called for a vote. **The motion carried 7-0-0.**

(6:20:39) – Commissioner Speulda moved to nominate Michelle Schmitter to the position of HRC Vice Chair. Commissioner Smit seconded the motion. Chairperson Drews entertained additional nominations and, when none were forthcoming, called for a vote. **The motion carried 7-0-0.**

5.C HRC-2021-0466 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE THE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2021 TO BE PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.

(6:21:11) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item. Ms. Ferris entertained Commissioner questions regarding the draft report, which is incorporated into the record and outlined in the Memorandum. Chairperson Drews also entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

(6:22:15) – MOTION: Commissioner Smit moved to approve the 2021 Historic Resources Commission Annual Report to the Board of Supervisors as presented by Staff. Commissioner Block seconded the motion. The motion carried 7-0-0.

5.D HRC-2021-0465 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING POTENTIAL NOMINATIONS FOR THE 2022 CARSON CITY HISTORIC PRESERVATION AWARDS FOR OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENTS IN HISTORIC PRESERVATION.

(6:22:55) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item and entertained suggestions for nominations. Vice Chairperson Schmitter pointed out that the Commission had not nominated the Bank Saloon for the previous year and suggested doing so for the 2022 Carson City Historic Preservation Awards. Ms. Ferris indicated that the item would also be on the agenda for the March 2022 HRC meeting along with a list of possible selections, including the Bank Saloon, and Chairperson Drews added that members of the public may also provide input. No formal action was taken on this item.

5.E HRC-2021-0467 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REVIEW OF THE NOTIFICATION PROCEDURES FOR NEW OWNERS WITHIN THE HISTORIC DISTRICT.

(6:24:49) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item, and Ms. Ferris referenced the Memorandum, which is incorporated into the record. During discussion on the matter, Chairperson Drews believed that the Commission could be more proactive by supplying maps of the Historic District to realtors so the clients can be made aware of the Guidelines for when a property is available.

(6:26:48) – Commissioner Block pointed out that most realtors announce that the properties they are advertising for sale are located in the Historic District, and he believed that the Carson City Planning Division’s packets will be sent out in such instances as when somebody refinances a property. He also believed that most people are generally excited about living in the Historic District and getting a tax deferment, but they oftentimes would prefer to “beg for forgiveness, then act like they didn’t know” instead of asking for permission or assistance.

(6:28:17) – Chairperson Drews noted that the consensus among the Commission was that the current procedure is adequate. Vice Chairperson Schmitter suggested inviting new property owners to a “welcome to the neighborhood” HRC meeting from the list of the names and addresses, and if the property owners do not wish to attend, the Commission would still have the addresses on “the welcome list.” Commissioner Darney inquired about whether the idea could be discussed with the Carson City Assessor’s Office. Chairperson Drews brought to the Commission’s attention that a list with all the properties that were sent notifications could be presented during Staff Reports, and he proposed including something in the packets that informs the property owners of the bi-monthly HRC meetings.

(6:30:47) – Commissioner Smit explained that efforts by the Carson City Building Division needed to be done at the permit level, and if the property owners have not done their due diligence when purchasing the properties, there is nothing the Commission could do about that. He also referenced Section 105 of Carson City Municipal Code (CCMC) 15.05.020 and pointed out that fences, one of the Commission’s “primary obstacles,” do not require a building permit. Commissioner Darney added that there should be a notification to identify a parcel’s location in the Historic District when typing in the parcel for a permit. In response to Commissioner Darney’s input,

Chairperson Drews indicated that the Planning Division was currently doing due diligence on that matter and asserted that the consensus was that the new owner notifications are adequate.

(6:34:30) – Ms. Ferris offered to include a sentence in the packets stating that the property owner can attend the HRC meetings and to “report out on change of ownerships.” Chairperson Drews noted that “if nothing else, it’s a heads-up to us that if someone comes back two years later and says, ‘I never got the packet,’ we at least have it on record.”

(6:35:07) – Commissioner Block believed that informing the Planning Division and the Building Division of Guideline violations was dependent on most of the neighbors, and he complimented Staff.

No formal action was taken on this item.

5.F HRC-2021-0468 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REVIEW OF CARSON CITY DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS RELATED TO LANDSCAPING IN THE HISTORIC DISTRICT.

(6:35:37) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item. Ms. Ferris referenced the Memorandum and the accompanying attachment, both of which are incorporated into the record.

(6:37:37) – Chairperson Drews entertained Commissioner comments. Commissioner Darney congratulated Chairperson Drews for “keeping his cool” regarding a previous agenda item discussing the Ferris Mansion. He commented that the 5.25.1 Guidelines for Historic Properties is “pretty weak,” and he believed it could be worded to indicate the purpose of requiring maintenance for existing features on historic properties. He added that demolition by neglect is not addressed even though demolition by neglect is “where the problem really lies.” Ms. Ferris pointed out that CCMC 18.06.090 may be a better section to address maintaining existing features of historic properties.

(6:41:42) – Commissioner Block believed that property owners should be required to address the trees getting water when switching from lawn to xeriscape. Commissioner Darney suggested verbalizing guidelines to enforce a standard with the Historic District for landscaping similar to fence, window, and roofing replacements, as the landscaping has as much historic value to the property as such features as the fence or the vinyl windows, and he believed that applicants should present a xeriscape plan to the Commissioners that demonstrates that the applicant is “not degrading the integrity of the property by making it all pea gravel.”

(6:46:16) – Ms. Sullivan supported the CCMC section because the introductory paragraph identifies the character-defining features of the landscaping, which allows the Commission to be “very deliberate” when making decisions, and the Commission has flexibility to work with property owners within the context of the guidelines. Commissioner Smit echoed Ms. Sullivan’s input and added that he liked having discussions with the applicants. During discussion on the matter, Commissioner Smit also noted that the HRC did not have “those kind of teeth” to enforce fixing homes in the Historic District, and he believed that adding more restrictions would make the Commissioners’ actions more difficult.

(6:50:28) – Commissioner Speulda indicated that one of her concerns about the proposed xeriscaping designs was that they were not tied to the time period of the house or the design elements of the time period, and the Commission did not have guidance on what would be an appropriate landscape for the style of house. She suggested internally developing design elements to fit each of the houses. Commissioner Darney pointed out that homeowners

associations (HOAs) have stipulations listed for maintaining landscaping and proposed making the expectations of property owners clearer. He proposed developing a list of suggestions for landscaping features. Chairperson Drews suggested putting together a handout or referring property owners to helpful material in the Carson City Library to give them an idea of what would be appropriate, and he believed it would be beneficial to review the ordinance addressing demolition by neglect. He also mentioned proposing to the Board of Supervisors a grant program to offer some incentives and help for those having problems maintaining their property.

No formal action was taken on this item.

6. STAFF REPORTS: DISCUSSION ONLY

- PLANNING DIVISION STAFF REPORT TO THE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION.

(6:57:23) – Ms. Ferris did not have any additional items to report.

- COMMISSIONER REPORTS/COMMENTS.

(6:59:36) – Chairperson Drews introduced the item. Commissioner Block reported that the owners of the Rio Tinto house at 506 West Spear Street were removing some of the material around the front, including the fence, and were expected to replace the material with wrought iron. He commented that the property looked better than it did before because “it doesn’t look so massive in front of the house.”

- FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS.

(6:57:46) – Commissioner Hayes inquired about adding “a final signoff” to the approved applications, and Chairperson Drews requested making that matter a future agenda.

- NEXT MEETING: THE NEXT MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR 5:30 P.M., THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 2022 AT THE CARSON CITY COMMUNITY CENTER, ROBERT ‘BOB’ CROWELL BOARD ROOM, 851 EAST WILLIAM STREET, CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89701.

7. PUBLIC COMMENTS

(7:00:02) – Chairperson Drews entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

8. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: ADJOURNMENT

(7:00:06) – MOTION: Commissioner Darney moved to adjourn the meeting, and Commissioner Hayes seconded the motion. Chairperson Drews adjourned the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

The Minutes of the January 13, 2022 Carson City Historic Resources Commission meeting are so approved this 10th day of March 2022.