



Historic Preservation Commission Minutes

1. Call to Order

Minutes:

CHAIR WHITE called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

PRESENT: CHAIR WHITE and COMMISSIONERS STOLDAL, HOTCHKISS (via telephonically until 1:30 p.m.), SERFAS, COSGROVE, LARIME, PALENCAR and HOWE (ex-officio member)

EXCUSED: COMMISSIONERS KLENK, LeVINE and BECK

ALSO PRESENT: ROBERT SUMMERFIELD, Director of Planning, SIDNEY NOYCE, Planner II, SETH FLOYD, Deputy City Attorney, and ASHLEY FOSTER, Deputy City Clerk

2. Announcement Regarding: Compliance with Open Meeting Law

Minutes:

ANNOUNCEMENT MADE: This meeting has been noticed and posted at the following locations: City Hall, 495 South Main Street, 1st Floor; Clark County Government Center, 500 South Grand Central Parkway; Grant Sawyer Building, 555 East Washington Avenue; City of Las Vegas Development Services Center, 333 North Rancho Drive.

3. Public Comment: Comment during this portion of the agenda must be limited to matters on the agenda for action. If you wish to be heard, come forward and give your name for the record. The amount of discussion, as well as the amount of time any single speaker is allowed, may be limited.

Minutes:

None.

4. For possible action to approve the Final Minutes by reference of the Regular Meeting of April 24, 2019

Motion made by Robert Stoldal to Approve

Passed For: 7; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 1; Excused: 3

For-Claytee White, Robert Stoldal, Donald Hotchkiss, Richard Serfas, Sondra Cosgrove, Michelle Larime, Mia Palencar; Did Not Vote-Mike Howe; Excused-Patrick Klenk, Jack LeVine, Colleen M. Beck;

5. HPC-76413 – Discussion for possible action regarding an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a wood fence in the front yard, an attached patio cover in the rear yard, and an accessory structure in the rear yard located at 1236 South 7th Street (APN 162-03-515-006), R-1 (Single Family Residential) Zone – Ward 3 (Coffin)

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER HOWE stated that this application was a bit confusing as it has been heard before. Since the time of the Certificate of Appropriateness, there is an outstanding Code Enforcement violation and staff was working with the applicant on remedying this.

SIDNEY NOYCE, Planner II, stated that the application was heard in June 2018 and at that time the Commission had approved the request. Based upon the research as indicated in the Staff Report, staff recommended denial; however, an additional analysis had been conducted for the Commission's benefit in the event they would like to approve this request.

He explained that the fence, as constructed, would exceed two feet in height within the front yard and, by the Department of Planning's standards, this meets the definition of a solid wall. As such, the applicant would be required to apply for a Variance if the request is approved. MR. NOYCE noted that the John S. Park Neighborhood standards do not speak to fences or attached accessory structures which the applicant was also requesting for the rear of the property. The applicant is also requesting approval of an attached patio cover in the rear yard. In the previous approval, there were four conditions that staff recommended that were approved by the Commission. Although staff recommended denial now, MR. NOYCE read the four same conditions that were recommended by staff should the Commission choose to approve the application.

CHAIR WHITE asked for further explanation regarding the rear yard patio structure. ELIZABETH "KATIE" KAEMMER appeared as the representative of JEAN PIERRE LE BOURVEAU and stated that the entire patio is newly built and in place of a previous patio that was in disrepair.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL asked if building permits had been issued. COMMISSIONER HOWE believed some of the issues in regards to the wood fence in the front yard could be resolved by trimming the wood fence and removing every other slat. No requests of building permits have been received, and he explained that typically a Certificate of Appropriateness is secured prior to pulling any building permits. He added that the Code Enforcement violation was issued in part to the applicant building without securing building permits. In response to this comment, MS. KAEMMER noted that MR. LE BOURVEAU came before the Historic Preservation Commission last year and secured a Certificate of Appropriateness. At that time, there were some financial constraints for MR. LE BOURVEAU on the project, and the building permits were not secured. MS. KAEMMER stated that, two months ago, she sought the building permits but was informed the applicant must obtain another Certificate of Appropriateness due to the amount of time that had passed. No work has been done on the structures since the previous approval.

COMMISSIONER LARIME expressed confusion regarding the previous approval which she believed was for a fence and a carport. MS. KAEMMER replied that the carport was an attached lattice structure on the south side of the property to create a courtyard; approval was not given by the Commission for that and it was removed. The applicant would be redesigning the structure and would be submitting a separate application at a later date. She understood the fence and garage to be a part of the original request.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL asked about staff's reason for denial. COMMISSIONER HOWE indicated that it was due to the missing permits. MS. KAEMMER noted that she has worked with the Department of Planning before to obtain permits for her own property in the same neighborhood and asserted that as soon as the Certificate of Appropriateness is granted, she would apply for the permits. She was aware of MR. LE BOURVEAU having met with the Commission previously his desire to bring the property into compliance.

COMMISSIONER HOWE was in support of the Certificate of Appropriateness with some minor changes to the fence to bring it up to code. MS. KAEMMER explained that the owner was interested in applying for a Variance for the fence because he desired to have a dog and emphasized this as one of the reasons for the fence. She felt removing every other slat would defeat the purpose of having a fence. She asked if there was any reason that the fence does not fit with the historic look of the property as it currently is. COMMISSIONER HOWE stated that the fence could be approved as being historically appropriate but does not meet the current code thus having to get the Variance.

CHAIR WHITE noted there were other fences in the area that she thought were attractive and asked if the property owner was attached to the look of the fence. MS. KAEMMER replied that the picket style was time period appropriate and the property owner preferred the redwood look. He preferred to apply for the Variance if there is no issue with the fence being time period appropriate. If the City does not approve a Variance, another option would be thought of. She informed the Chair the garage will be an exact match to the house and will be a miniature version of the house including historic windows that have been sourced.

COMMISSIONER LARIME was confused with the back patio and whether or not it fits into the discussion. COMMISSIONER HOWE explained that the patio requires permitting to reestablish what was an existing patio. ROBERT SUMMERFIELD, Director of Planning, believed there to be confusion in regards to the original Certificate of Appropriateness request. As part of the motion for approval, staff recommended the removal of Condition 1 as the patio was not a part of the Certificate of Appropriateness.

MS. KAEMMER wondered what the Commission was concerned about in regards to the fence as it is time period appropriate. She noted that the solution that has been given to fit City code is to remove every other slat. The property owner did not want to do this because of the dog and it would be costly. It would also not be aesthetically pleasing. If the fence is time period appropriate, she asserted the property owner's desire to move forward with a Variance request. MR. SUMMERFIELD indicated that the Commission was to only vote upon whether the fence is appropriate for and meets the intent of the historic district. Whether or not it complies with the code would be determined in the Variance request process.

Subsequent to COMMISSIONER STOLDAL'S motion for approval, DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY SETH FLOYD clarified that the motion was to approve with an amended Condition 1 and keeping Conditions 2, 3, and 4 as is.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL asked how the fence was built to which MR. SUMMERFIELD stated that it was done without a permit. MR. SUMMERFIELD noted that the Planning Commission would address this.

Motion made by Robert Stoldal to Approve subject to the following conditions and amending Condition 1 as read for the record:

1. This approval is for the fence and detached accessory structure only.
2. The fence within the front yard shall be modified to comply with the requirements of Title 19.06 unless a Variance is approved by the Planning Commission or City Council.
3. The detached accessory structure must be finished with materials that are architecturally compatible with the main dwelling. The Historic Preservation Officer shall review and approve the materials prior to the issuance of a building permit.
4. The applicant shall obtain and finalize building permits within 60 days of final action on this Certificate of Appropriateness. This may be extended administratively an additional 60 days if an application is submitted for a Variance for the improvements.

Passed For: 7; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 1; Excused: 3

For-Claytee White, Robert Stoldal, Donald Hotchkiss, Richard Serfas, Sondra Cosgrove, Michelle Larime, Mia Palencar; Did Not Vote-Mike Howe; Excused-Patrick Klenk, Jack LeVine, Colleen M. Beck;

6. HPC-76417 – Report by Jerry Walker, Director, City of Las Vegas Operations and Maintenance, regarding work related to historic preservation

Minutes:

JERRY WALKER, Director of Operations and Maintenance, stated that he was present to discuss several matters of concern regarding the Blue Angel statue and the mosaic columns at the Moulin Rouge.

MR. WALKER said a presentation was given to the Centennial Commission (Commission for the Las Vegas Centennial) regarding the Blue Angel motel statue and he has reviewed the Request for Proposal (RFP). He explained a brief history in which COUNCILMAN BOB COFFIN'S office contacted him regarding the donation of the statue to the City of Las Vegas. Several signs, including the Blue Angel crescent moon sign and statue as well as a small motel sign, were donated. There was no plan in mind where the Blue Angel statue would be placed, and MR. WALKER considered the East Las Vegas Community Center. After discussing with others, the Five Points median location was decided upon. He noted that there is a median island where Fremont Street intersects with Charleston Boulevard. The area is a Nevada Department of Transportation right-of-way; however, the road will transfer over to the City in June or July. MR. WALKER noted that he is about six months behind schedule but the project has been started and the Office of Communications has documented the statue for future public relations endeavors.

A site review will be completed in June and the RFP will be issued followed by the statue being reviewed by vendors who will provide proposals of their intentions in regards to restoration efforts. The RFP committee will include staff from the Office of Cultural Affairs and the Purchasing and Contracts Division, COMMISSIONER HOWE, someone from The Neon Museum and some of MR. WALKER'S staff. After reviewing the proposals, MR. WALKER anticipated having a contract ready to go by mid- or late July consequently he will extend his contract with the Centennial Commission. He will then sign the contract for the installation and the statue will be refurbished over the Fall.

Acknowledging various concerns he has received, MR. WALKER asserted that he has placed the statue in the safest place he could and plastic has been placed over it. The statue is much different in person than in the air, and he offered to allow the Commissioners to stop by and see the statue. He hoped to have the statue standing by January noting he would also have to complete some site improvements in the area. The Blue Angel crescent moon sign will also stand next to the statue.

He informed COMMISSIONER STOLDAL there is 600-feet of public street parking nearby to which COMMISSIONER STOLDAL explained to the other Commissioners this question had come up at the Centennial Commission meeting.

The Commissioner asked if the City was involved in determining the value of the donation of the signs. MR. WALKER stated that staff worked with former Assistant City Attorney TERI PONTICELLO to create a donation agreement valuing the donation over \$25,000; however, he did not establish a hard value as he did not know what tax considerations the developer might use.

The Commissioner also asked if a representative from the Centennial Commission could be present at the site review to which MR. WALKER welcomed COMMISSIONER STOLDAL to attend.

COMMISSIONER COSGROVE and MR. WALKER shared separate stories regarding the importance of the Blue Angel statue to individuals within the community, and MR. WALKER noted that once the statue is out of the yard, he will work on an informational plaque and will identify the donating entity. He will pay for any remaining costs specifying many of the costs already incurred.

Regarding the Moulin Rouge mosaic columns, MR. WALKER stated that he could pick them up should the Commission desire that. If so, he would need a completed donation agreement verifying the property owner and certifying that MR. WALKER has the right of access to move the columns. The next question he had was where to store them. MR. WALKER noted that the mosaic columns could be transported to his yard; however, he expressed hesitation as things that go into his yard are seldom removed.

The Commission may wish to consider the Centennial Plaza at the Historic Fifth Street School as MR. WALKER is updating the Centennial Plaza to become an event area and will be a secure site. ROBERT SUMMERFIELD, Director of Planning, stated that location could be considered temporarily; however, ultimately, the columns will need to return to the Moulin Rouge site.

CHAIR WHITE wondered how the mosaic columns would be positioned at a location such as the Centennial Plaza. MR. WALKER stated that he would stand the mosaic columns in concrete and connect them so that

they are safe. MR. SUMMERFIELD said the point for MR. WALKER was that the Centennial Plaza would be a secure location. He thought the Westside School was a great alternative location.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL thought of moving the columns in place of the Blue Angel motel sign in MR. WALKER'S yard. MR. WALKER understood the importance of the columns and was happy to secure them. He also noted that the City took over the Cashman Center and offered to locate them inside, but he did not want them to be forgotten about.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL asked about architectural historian being present when the mosaic columns are moved. COMMISSIONER HOWE said that he would be available adding that some of the glass mosaics have been lost so he is reviewing having them replaced. MR. WALKER assured he would take care with moving the mosaic columns.

7. HPC-76418 – Report by the Department of Planning regarding the application process for a Certificate of Appropriateness

Minutes:

SIDNEY NOYCE, Planner II, stated that the item was requested at the last meeting. All of the standards and guidelines governing a Certificate of Appropriateness can be found in Title 19.10.150(K). He explained that anytime work is proposed on a landmark structure or within a district, there is the requirement for the applicant to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness whether from the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) or COMMISSIONER HOWE as the Historic Preservation Officer (HPO). The first step in the process is the receiving of an application which then goes to COMMISSIONER HOWE. He must first determine if the work is minor in nature. If it is, COMMISSIONER HOWE can sign off on the application; if he feels the application falls outside of that, the item is placed on an upcoming agenda of the HPC.

Within the guidelines, there are four types of criteria the Commissioners must review when addressing an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness. He summarized the criterion determined by Title 19.10.150(K)(4) listed in the Background portion of the Agenda Memo attached as backup.

Once approval is given, the applicant is able to apply for building permits. Approval by the Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness does not confirm compliance of other development standards; this is taken care of in other venues whether it be Planning Commission, City Council, or administratively.

COMMISSIONER LARIME wished to understand more of what the application requirements are. She felt that applications have been received with little information which makes it hard to visualize what the applicants are requesting.

MR. NOYCE stated that it is the responsibility of the HPO to decide whether an application includes enough information so that either he or the Commission can make a determination. Usually, the application process requires a form and a set of plans whether that be a site plan, building elevations, etc. COMMISSIONER HOWE added that he would like to propose cleaning up the process so that when a Certificate of Appropriateness comes to the HPC, there are substantially cleaner documents being submitted. He noted that typically, applicants are individuals trying to satisfy government requirements for a permit as quickly as possible. Generally, these individuals are not in the position to hire a draftsman; so, pictures end up being the most communicative item.

CHAIR WHITE also suggested the Commissioners drive by the property of an application.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL felt that solar panels were not within the purview of the Commission but could look at other things such as moving the panels around the property. ROBERT SUMMERFIELD, Director of Planning, confirmed the location of the solar panels are within the purview of the Commission not whether or not solar panels are acceptable or not.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL commented that certain solar panels are more absorbent than others. He assumed the Commission would have some jurisdiction over reducing the number and size of solar panels and

still achieving what the property owner is looking for. COMMISSIONER HOWE confirmed this was correct adding that the Commission sees these types of requests after the applicant has exhausted all suggestions he has made.

MR. SUMMERFIELD, MR. NOYCE and COMMISSIONER HOWE explained what determines whether a property contributing or non-contributing to COMMISSIONER PALENCAR indicating that it is based upon the historic district is nominated. He provided an example stating that when the John S. Park Historic District was nominated, a survey of all the properties within the historic district was compiled and indicated whether they are contributing or non-contributing. If an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness is received for the John S. Park Historic District, the list is reviewed and staff will specify in the Staff Report whether the application is contributing or non-contributing. If it is a non-contributing property, it must achieve guidelines applicable at the district level. When an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness is received, staff will look at whether the proposed change is compatible with the overall district.

8. HPC-76419 – Report by Department of Planning regarding the Historic Preservation Commission budget

Minutes:

A handout was distributed and submitted for the record of a simplified budget. COMMISSIONER HOWE pointed out the amounts awarded for the Motor Court Survey of \$29,118. The amount for the Las Vegas High Nomination Update has not yet been awarded; therefore, it has not been deducted from the budget. He noted that \$500 was still due to North Wind Resource Consulting for the Las Vegas Medical District Historic Markers. Additionally, the full award amount for the Las Vegas Genealogical Society for the Woodlawn Cemetery Project has not yet been dispensed, and the oral history project for The Neon Museum has been completed but staff was still pending payment on the invoices; therefore, \$5,000 still remains. Taking into account the above-mentioned amounts in addition to various operational expenses for books and the NAPC FORUM (National Alliance of Preservation Commissions) for COMMISSIONERS BECK and LARIME, there is a remaining balance of \$50,849.

COMMISSIONER HOWE pointed out that the handout that was distributed had the \$5,000 grant for The Neon Museum's oral history project omitted. He confirmed he would send a corrected copy to the Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL inquired about the two books that were purchased. COMMISSIONER HOWE stated that they were ordered by PAUL BENGTSON and were available to the Commission for viewing. ROBERT SUMMERFIELD, Director of Planning, commented that the Department has an extensive library of planning and historic preservation related books. A list could be made available to the Commissioners and if anyone would like to lend a book, they can.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL stated that money was available from the Centennial Commission (Commission for the Las Vegas Centennial), potentially \$75,000 per year, that could be allocated to the Historic Preservation Commission for small grants. He thought if there was something the Commission felt strongly about it would have the money to ask staff to move forward on it. The Commissioner asked about the status of the Las Vegas High School Nomination and the Motor Court Survey.

MR. SUMMERFIELD stated that the RFP (Request for Proposal) has been issued for consultancies to provide staff with documentation. In regards to the Motor Court Survey, COMMISSIONER HOWE stated that work with North Wind Resource Consulting has been initiated, a contract agreement is in place, and a kickoff meeting would be held. He noted that the company was looking at motel and hotel signage as a component of the property already within their proposal.

COMMISSIONER LARIME wondered when the Commission should expect to review the 2020 budget. MR. SUMMERFIELD stated that the Commission is a little bit different than other areas of the city in that a bucket of funding exists until depleted. This bucket is replenished from the allocation of \$75,000 yearly from the Centennial Commission through a request. Typically, the Commission should see the budget annually but an item could be placed on the agenda quarterly should that be the Commission's desire. He noted that the Commission does not approve a budget but rather projects that are added to the budget; when funds are depleted, staff will request permission to make a request to the Centennial Commission for more funding.

9. HPC-76420 – Report by Department of Planning regarding Director’s updates

Minutes:

Regarding the recruitment for the Historic Preservation Officer (HPO) position, ROBERT SUMMERFIELD, Director of Planning, stated that there were 36 applications referred by the Department of Human Resources to the Department of Planning. Potential candidates were separated into three tiers with the top tier being the most qualified for the position. Approximately eight people were selected for the top tier and several of them were scheduled for interviews; however, these individuals accepted employment somewhere else prior to interviewing. Of the eight top-tier candidates, only one interview was conducted and this individual also accepted a position elsewhere. He believed this could have been contributed to the salary range and the close of the academic year as a lot of the individuals were connected to academia.

The salary range has been augmented with assistance through the General Fund. The job description will be slightly modified to address some things the Centennial Commission (Commission for the Las Vegas Centennial) wanted to be added. The new salary range will be a range from \$52,991 to \$90,085. The hiring amount will be somewhere in the middle of that range. MR. SUMMERFIELD estimated recruitment would be done in mid- to late June and will be a minimum of three weeks. He hoped to have a new HPO hired by the end of August. COMMISSIONER STOLDAL has agreed to stay on the interview panel as a representative of the Historic Preservation and the Centennial Commission.

CHAIR WHITE asked if COMMISSIONER STOLDAL thought anyone in the middle tier to be a good candidate. MR. SUMMERFIELD stated that the Commissioner was not able to see the middle tier of applicants.

CHAIR WHITE thought the applicants accepting employment elsewhere alluded to the value of historic preservation. MR. SUMMERFIELD agreed this was a trend across the country and asserted that staff was optimistic the position would be filled by August. COMMISSIONER HOWE would continue to serve as the interim HPO through the summer.

10. HPC-76421 - Report by Department of Planning regarding Project Update list

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER HOWE clarified that on the Update List, staff has included a list of future agenda items from the past which it is trying to keep track of.

He stated that the contract for the Motor Court Survey has been awarded to North Wind; the next update will include the initiation of the project. From there, a consultant will be made available to go over some of the milestones, key deliverables, and the timelines of the project.

Regarding the Las Vegas High School nomination, COMMISSIONER HOWE has received confirmation from staff that the RFP (Request for Proposal) has been issued.

COMMISSIONER HOWE acknowledged the report given by JERRY WALKER, Director of Operations and Maintenance, regarding the Moulin Rouge and stated that he would work with DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY SETH FLOYD to review the donation agreement and to determine how soon an RFP can be issued. In regards to the donation agreement, ROBERT SUMMERFIELD, Director of Planning, explained some of the complications he anticipated would be experienced because there is no property owner but there is a receiver. He assured staff will do what they can.

COMMISSIONER HOWE provided an update regarding the Blue Angel statue noting installation should be done in January and the project completed by May of 2020.

He indicated that the Scenic Byway survey is ongoing and there is an ongoing project with the Department of Public Works to locate refurbished and retro-inspired neon signs in the medians; this project will run concurrently with the Las Vegas Boulevard improvements between Mesquite Avenue and Sahara Avenue. He

would like a presentation given to the HPC (Historic Preservation Commission) by the Department in regards to the proposed signage and locations. With this report, COMMISSIONER LARIME wondered if the information could be obtained regarding how the street improvements would affect existing signage.

Regarding the Floyd Lamb Hay Barn and the ongoing work to retrofit and renovate the hay barn as an event center, COMMISSIONER HOWE said there are some proposed ideas and the services of MEL GREEN, Structural Engineer, have been obtained to go over code analysis requirements. Ideas will be shared with the SHPO (State Historic Preservation Office). MR. SUMMERFIELD said that he and other senior staff members met with SAM TOLMAN, the project architect, at the hay barn to discuss options for the hay barn that maintain historic significance while providing continued use. The hay barn will probably not be an event center but a pavilion as part of event space. A report will be given to the HPC on plans and options on how adaptive reuse and historic maintenance can be done to the structure.

COMMISSIONER HOWE reviewed the list of potential HPC projects which included an amendment to the Floyd Lamb Park NRHP (National Register of Historic Places) to include the Old Adobe and including the area as a national level of significance, including the JCPenny building on Fremont Street for a potential nomination, and looking at a conservation ordinance and an adaptive reuse ordinance.

He quickly reviewed the attached list titled Future Agenda Items. COMMISSIONER STOLDAL commented on the idea to have a historic portion on the City's website and noticed the omission of the Reed Whipple Building nomination on the Future Agenda Items list. MR. SUMMERFIELD stated that updates to both items would be provided at a future meeting.

CHAIR WHITE acknowledged that the Reed Whipple Building will be leased by The Neon Museum. MR. SUMMERFIELD confirmed that at a recent City Council meeting, the Council voted on a lease and operating agreement with The Neon Museum to occupy the Reed Whipple Building for additional exhibit space. A second item was also voted upon to accept funding for improvements to the building.

COMMISSIONER HOWE continued to read the remaining items on the Future Agenda Items list. MR. SUMMERFIELD reminded the Commission that a sponsor will be required for the adaptive reuse ordinance and some lobbying of the Council will be required. Staff has presented such an ordinance to the current Councilmembers; however, none showed an interest in sponsoring the ordinance. He recalled several past ordinances similar to the topic but not as comprehensive as what is being discussed.

COMMISSIONER LARIME added that three new Councilmembers would be elected in June and thought the Commissioners should consider bringing the ordinance to their attention. COMMISSIONER SERFAS echoed COMMISSIONER LARIME'S comments and believed in following through with COMMISSIONER STOLDAL'S suggestion to obtain some best practices from other communities in regards to their own adaptive reuse ordinances and where they have been successful.

COMMISSIONER COSGROVE said SB (Senate Bill) 448 regarding tax credits for redevelopment was still alive.

11. HPC-76422 - Report by Department of Planning regarding historic and archeological resources in local media

Minutes:

CHAIR WHITE confirmed the Commissioners were able to access the links for the historic and archeological resources provided by staff in the backup. No comments were made.

12. HPC-76463 – Report by Department of Planning regarding Historic Preservation Month

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER HOWE announced that May is Historic Preservation Month.

CHAIR WHITE remembered that, in the past, the Commission would provide nominations and present awards during this month. She wished to develop a list to be prepared for next year.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL pointed out that the awards not only benefit the recipient but also keep the Historic Preservation Commission at a level of value to the city.

COMMISSIONER LARIME asked if something could still be done this year sometime in Summer. COMMISSIONER SERFAS agreed this was an excellent suggestion and would be a nice and informative introduction to the newly elected Councilmembers.

13. HPC-76423 - Discussion regarding topics for future agenda items by the Historic Preservation Commission. Comments made during this portion of the agenda by individual Commission Members shall refer solely to proposals for future agenda items and any discussion shall be limited to whether or not any such proposed item(s) is/are within the purview of the Commission and/or whether such proposed item(s) shall be placed on a future agenda. No discussion regarding the substance of any such proposed topic shall occur and no action shall be taken regarding the proposal.

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER LARIME wished for an item to be placed on next month's agenda regarding the Historic Preservation Month awards.

COMMISSIONER HOWE asserted he had proposed a report from the Department of Public Works regarding the Las Vegas Boulevard Improvement Project as it relates to signage renovation.

ROBERT SUMMERFIELD, Director of Planning, proposed an item to direct staff to begin the process for an adaptive reuse ordinance. COMMISSIONER LARIME suggested that when the conversation is held regarding adaptive reuse, there also be an agenda item about additional public policy.

14. **Citizens Participation:** Public comment during this portion of the agenda must be limited to matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission. No subject may be acted upon by the Commission unless that subject is on the agenda and is scheduled for action. If you wish to be heard, come forward and give your name for the record. The amount of discussion on any single subject, as well as the amount of time any single speaker is allowed, may be limited.

Minutes:

None.

15. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Ashley Foster, Deputy City Clerk

Michael Howe, Planning Section Manager

THIS MEETING WAS PROPERLY NOTICED AND POSTED AT THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS:

City Hall, 495 South Main Street, 1st Floor
Clark County Government Center, 500 South Grand Central Parkway
Grant Sawyer Building, 555 East Washington Avenue
City of Las Vegas Development Services Center, 333 North Rancho Drive