



## Historic Preservation Commission Minutes

### 1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Minutes:

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

PRESENT: CHAIR WHITE and COMMISSIONERS STOLDAL, LeVINE, BECK, HOTCHKISS, SERFAS, COSGROVE, LARIME, PALENCAR, PALACIOS, LONG and SIEBRANDT (ex-officio member)

ALSO PRESENT: MICHAEL HOWE, Planning Section Manager, JIM LEWIS, Deputy City Attorney, and GABRIELA PORTILLO-BRENNER, Deputy City Clerk

### 2. Announcement Regarding: Compliance with Open Meeting Law

Minutes:

ANNOUNCEMENT MADE: This meeting has been properly noticed and posted at the following locations in accordance with the State of Nevada Executive Department Declaration of Emergency Directive 006: The City of Las Vegas website – [www.lasvegasnevada.gov](http://www.lasvegasnevada.gov) and The Nevada Public Notice Website - [notice.nv.gov](http://notice.nv.gov).

### 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:

CHAIR WHITE welcomed recently appointed COMMISSIONERS PALACIOS and LONG. COMMISSIONER PALACIOS is an architect and COMMISSIONER LONG is from Ward 5.

### 4. For possible action to approve the Final Minutes by reference of the Special Meeting of July 15, 2020

Minutes:

CHAIR WHITE asked for a motion, and COMMISSIONER BECK announced that COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT'S last name was misspelled in the sixth paragraph of Page 8 and should be corrected.

Motion made by Robert Stoldal to Approve as corrected

Passed For: 11; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 1; Excused: 0

For-Claytee White, Robert Stoldal, Jack LeVine, Colleen M. Beck, Donald Hotchkiss, Richard Serfas, Sondra Cosgrove, Michelle Larime, Mia Palencar, Craig Palacios, Rhonda Long; Did Not Vote-Diane Siebrandt;

### 5. HPC-78529 - ABEYANCE ITEM - Discussion for possible action regarding updating the language on the Las Vegas Historic Preservation Commission Centennial Legacy Grant Program applications

Minutes:

This item was heard subsequent to item 9, which was called forward and heard after Item 4.

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT stated that proposed changes for the grant applications were provided to the Commissioners for review, and she received some suggestions, which were incorporated. The revised grant was included as part of the backup documentation for this meeting item. She asked if it was the Commissioners' desire to approve the revised grant applications or if they felt further revisions were necessary.

CHAIR WHITE called for a motion. COMMISSIONER STOLDAL asked if two separate motions were necessary because there are two grant applications, one for the Centennial Grant Program and one for bricks and mortar. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT explained that they are both Historic Preservation Commission grants. The only reason they are separate is because one is specifically for bricks and mortar projects and the other is for projects that do not deal with structural repairs. DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY JIM LEWIS said there was no issue with taking two motions and votes.

COMMISSIONER LARIME suggested adding language to the evaluation criteria of the bricks and mortar grant, on Page 5 as follows and read: Applicant must be able to demonstrate past experience or knowledge of successfully managing and completing a grant funded project or other property improvement project. She felt this program could be very valuable for homeowners in historic neighborhoods, and although many of them have probably never worked on a grant project, they have experience with home improvement or in managing other types of projects that need to be budgeted. At the request of MR. LEWIS, COMMISSIONER LARIME stated her exact motion.

After the vote, COMMISSIONER BECK commended COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT for her work on updating the document, and CHAIR WHITE commended her as well.

Motion made by Michelle Larime to Approve with an amendment to Page 5 of the Brick and Mortar Evaluation Criteria to read: Applicant must be able to demonstrate past experience or knowledge of successfully managing and completing a grant funded project or other property improvement project.

Passed For: 11; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 1; Excused: 0

For-Claytee White, Robert Stoldal, Jack LeVine, Colleen M. Beck, Donald Hotchkiss, Richard Serfas, Sondra Cosgrove, Michelle Larime, Mia Palencar, Craig Palacios, Rhonda Long; Did Not Vote-Diane Siebrandt;

6. **20-0119-HPC1** - Report by Gina Venglass, Engineering Project Manager with the Public Works Department, regarding how historic preservation issues are addressed by the Department of Public Works

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT said GINA VENGLASS, Engineering Project Manager, was invited but she could not attend. The Commissioner requested an abeyance of this item.

Motion made by Robert Stoldal to Hold in Abeyance to 9/23/2020

Passed For: 11; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 1; Excused: 0

For-Claytee White, Robert Stoldal, Jack LeVine, Colleen M. Beck, Donald Hotchkiss, Richard Serfas, Sondra Cosgrove, Michelle Larime, Mia Palencar, Craig Palacios, Rhonda Long; Did Not Vote-Diane Siebrandt;

7. **20-0120-HPC1** - Report by Patricia Cabrera, Enterprise Records Officer with the City Clerk's Office, regarding records management practices and procedures

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT introduced, PATRICIA CABRERA, Enterprise Records Officer with the City Clerk's Office, who was invited to report on this matter as part of the Guest Speaker Program. She added that COMMISSIONER COSGROVE asked how the City retains and archives records.

MS. CABRERA said she would be reviewing a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was submitted for the record, covering the seven topics listed on Slide 2: Who We Are, Background, Governance, ARC (Archives and Records Center), Public Records Requests, Records Collections and Challenges and Potential Solutions. Before proceeding with her presentation, MS. CABRERA emphasized that at some point the City's records management will affect what the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) does, because they will eventually all become historical.

Office of the City Clerk - Enterprise Records Management Division - An organization chart was shown, and MS. CABRERA indicated that she reports directly to LuANN HOLMES, City Clerk. She explained that she wanted to show this chart so the Commission could get a better understanding of how her small staff manages the volume of work generated by the 22 departments in the City of Las Vegas.

Background - The Records Division must comply with the Las Vegas Municipal Code (LVMC), which is also supported by Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) and the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC). The City Clerk's Office is responsible for developing and implementing a records management program for the City, and this is done through guidelines for retaining public records. The City of Las Vegas is the only jurisdiction that manages an ARC, where the Division also retains historical, archival and vital records. She noted that they could not manage the workload without the cooperation of the department directors. In accordance with the LVMC, each department must maintain an inventory of all their records and establish policies and procedures to comply with the LVMC. Each department designates a records delegate to serve as liaison to collaborate daily with Records staff to ensure due diligence in managing City records.

Records Management Governance - The Division is bound by everything related to NRS, NAC and LVMC with regard to records management and is subject to inspection as a public entity. Anyone can submit a records

request to obtain copies of records. Ordinance 6683 was adopted in April of 2019 to adopt the State's Retention Schedules, which provides guidance on the timeframe records must be retained. Failure to comply, could pose liability to the City. CM920, a policy regarding Public Records Requests, was authored by the City Attorney's Office to provide information on how to respond to records requests. The ARC facility houses records that are 10-years-old or older and considered permanent, and they are classified as inactive or archived records. They have an electronic records policy to ensure compliance when the City needs assistance across the City with electronic records. The Division also has a policy on confidentiality and does not hold any credit card holder information. The Social Media policy was implemented because any information on the City's social media accounts are subject to public inspection as well. Resolution R-48-19 outlines fees that can be charged for copies; however, there are typically no fees because many records are provided electronically. Regardless, any fees charged are nominal.

Public Records Requests - The City uses the GovQA system for public records requests, and the current number of customers is about 11,000, with approximately 250 staff members monitoring all public records requests. The Division averages about 500 requests monthly.

Archive and Records Center - This facility is located on the northwest side of town and is 27,000 square feet with two vaults, one containing meeting records and the other vital records. She showed images of some of the items stored at the records facility.

Records Collections - A virtual tour was provided of the City's Records Collection at the ARC. There are approximately 25,000 boxes full of records. There are "coffins" to hold plans, which total about 26,000 and are tagged to help keep track of them. Some of the Mylar sheets stored at the facility date back to the early 1900s, and she is not sure how many they have because they are not in the Records Management System. The election room houses a significant amount of memorabilia, and she showed photos of many that came from former Mayor Oscar Goodman's office, even though some of the items were donated. Many of the artifacts the Division takes in are from the departments because they do not know what to do with them. The Photo Room contains about 93,000 photos, and there are boxes with about 23,000 negatives and slides that should be digitized because they contain City history and tell a story. She added that COMMISSIONER STOLDAL toured the facility, but she would like assistance in determining the dates and occasions depicted in some of the photos.

The minutes vault contains meeting minutes, and she noted that minutes dating back to 1984 are available on the City's online public portal. They also have in the vault about 500 microfilm and about 9,000 microfiche sitting on shelves, for which they have to keep outdated technology to make them available for viewing.

Challenges and Potential Solutions - MS. CABRERA said the Division has some challenges in trying to determine what qualifies as historical. She would really like assistance in determining a process to digitize, preserve and display the richness of the City. The systems being used to track and monitor records are getting overwhelmed, and the Division issued a bid request in August to accept proposals on a new Enterprise Document Records Management solution and a warehouse management solution.

She believes the HPC can assist her in determining what should be preserved and digitized to make the documentation available. COMMISSIONER STOLDAL discussed with MS. CABRERA that the oldest records date back to 1911 but nothing older. MS. CABRERA informed COMMISSIONER LeVINE that they have not been able to digitize the photos due to lack of funding and staff.

CHAIR WHITE said there are a few people who could participate in an ad hoc committee to help identify some of the documents and photos. MS. CABRERA appreciated her suggestion.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL asked MS. CABRERA if she submitted a grant application to the Commission for the Las Vegas Centennial, given that they have funded other collection projects. MS. CABRERA indicated that she would like more information on the process, which she has somewhat discussed with COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT.

COMMISSIONER HOTCHKISS asked MS. CABRERA to get an estimate by the next meeting on what it might cost to scan and digitize the photos to see if they can come up with some funding, because he did not believe it would be very expensive. MS. CABRERA said she had not obtained any estimates, but offered to reach out and obtain a cost proposal, noting that the cost for the plans was astronomical. COMMISSIONER LARIME suggested contacting the Nevada Preservation Foundation to get the contact information of the local reprographic company they used for their recent digitizing project. The company could possibly provide a more competitive quote.

COMMISSIONER BECK asked what records qualify as permanent archives, and MS. CABRERA answered that any records generated by the development services departments, especially Building and Safety, Public Works and Planning. Everything else has a retention schedule of 10 years or less.

COMMISSIONER COSGROVE appreciated the presentation, noting there is no history without good records keeping. She hopes they can help to digitize some of the photos as COMMISSIONER STOLDAL indicated.

CHAIR WHITE thanked MS. CABRERA for a wonderful presentation. MS. CABRERA said she looks forward to a mutual collaboration.

8. **20-0121-HPC1** - Discussion for possible action regarding a request by Laura Machado, Visual Arts Specialist with the Office of Cultural Affairs, for the involvement of the Historic Preservation Commission to develop a historical markers program

Minutes:

As a matter of background, COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT stated that this project was presented before the Commission for the Las Vegas Centennial in 2019, and they suggested that the Office of Cultural Affairs and the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) collaborate on the project.

LAURA MACHADO, Visual Arts Specialist with the Office of Cultural Affairs, electronically flipped through the PowerPoint slide presentation, a copy of which was submitted for the record. She explained that in 2017, the Public Works Department reached out to the Office of Cultural Affairs about including historic markers in different street improvement projects. A meeting convened, and they discussed incorporating markers along Las Vegas Boulevard for an ongoing improvement project. In 2019, they applied to the Centennial Commission for a grant, and the feedback received was that Cultural Affairs should work with the HPC to develop a program for the entire City.

MS. MACHADO said that the program could be developed in phases, and they could seek community participation and grants. They could identify community partners, and she noted that the Arts Commission allocated \$5,000 toward artistic design; therefore, she was seeking the involvement of the HPC to develop the program.

MS. MACHADO advised CHAIR WHITE that the process is at the beginning stage. She added that in 2017, they discussed bringing the markers into Las Vegas Boulevard so that each street between Steward Avenue and Charleston Boulevard would have a marker identifying the person the street was named after. Subsequently, Cultural Affairs decided to obtain input from the public to get ideas. She hopes they can eventually seek funding from the Centennial Commission. The Chair regarded this as a very worthy program and felt the timing is perfect. She wondered how they should proceed.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL commented that markers have limited space; therefore, it is important to include accurate information. In his experience with markers for the City of Las Vegas, he has observed that there is no consistency. He wondered if the Arts Commission was asked to come up with a specific design, and he wondered if this is what they should go with or if the marker should reflect the respective neighborhood. Moreover, he feels there is a better opportunity to place historic markers along neighborhoods off Las Vegas Boulevard.

COMMISSIONER PALACIOS shared that one of his groups won a competitive bid to create an art plan for the mass transit system project and connect it from downtown to the airport. The process took about six months. He certainly supports this endeavor, but he felt they need many questions answered and incorporated into a plan to make sure they proceed properly. He asked if a consultant would be contracted to put something together. MS. MACHADO said that although they can create a plan, she believes the direction from the Centennial Commission was to work with the HPC to develop a program.

CHAIR WHITE suggested putting a committee together, and COMMISSIONER LARIME agreed with that suggestion, adding that they could form a citizens advisory committee with some HPC members and some stakeholders to put together a plan.

CHAIR WHITE asked how many HPC members could be on such a committee. DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY JIM LEWIS explained the definition of a quorum under the Open Meeting Law, and he said they could work together on the special rules pertaining to a special subcommittee. He thought it would be better to meet with COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT and come up with some ideas on alternatives.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL noticed that the program development should include community participation; therefore, he suggested meeting in public and form a formal committee in order to deal with all the questions with public input. CHAIR WHITE asked if the City Clerk's Office would have to support the meetings, and MR. LEWIS said that the different options will have to be looked into and whether the format will require meeting the Open Meeting Law, including posting the agendas. He offered to gather information to provide at the next regular meeting of the HPC.

CHAIR WHITE said she would like to be able to move forward in an expeditious manner. MS. MACHADO said she would like the HPC to indicate if they would like to participate in the project, noting that having a smaller committee with some Arts Commission members, community stakeholders and artists would probably move things faster.

Motion made by Colleen M. Beck to Approve for the HPC to partner with the Office of Cultural Affairs to develop a historical markers program

Passed For: 11; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 1; Excused: 0

For-Claytee White, Robert Stoldal, Jack LeVine, Colleen M. Beck, Donald Hotchkiss, Richard Serfas, Sondra Cosgrove, Michelle Larime, Mia Palencar, Craig Palacios, Rhonda Long; Did Not Vote-Diane Siebrandt;

**9. HPC-78757** - Discussion for possible action regarding approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for a proposed Accessory Structure (Class I) in the rear yard of property located at 1240 South 7th Street - Ward 3 (Diaz)

Minutes:

This item was pulled out of order and heard subsequent to Item 4, and CHAIR WHITE said it would be Item 5. However, DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY JIM LEWIS explained that the item was being pulled forward but remained as Item 9.

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT said she hoped all the Commissioners had an opportunity to review the application and the associated information.

RUSSELL GARDNER, applicant, explained that he would like to turn the area into a casita for his 20-year-old daughter to live in while attending the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV). He answered for COMMISSIONER STOLDAL that he has lived on the property six years and was not aware the property was within a historic district when he purchased it. CHAIR WHITE commented that the structure is very tall, and MR. GARDNER said it is nine feet.

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT pointed out to MR. GARDNER that the concern is that pursuant to the John S. Park Design Guidelines, any part of the property visible from the public right-of-way has to comply with the historic context of the neighborhood, and the Commissioners need to know how the applicant intends to address that. MR. GARDNER explained that he included pictures of two improvement additions made to the home before he purchased it. They included a flat roof and wood panel siding toward the back half of the home, and he intends to keep the same color scheme and trim. He answered for CHAIR WHITE that the trim would be removed from the home next to his but not from his home.

COMMISSIONER LeVINE thought there is a 10-foot setback requirement for this property, and MR. GARDNER said there is a three-foot setback, as he discussed with Building and Safety staff. MICHAEL HOWE, Planning Section Manager, interjected that this matter originated from a Code Enforcement violation. The shipping container was installed without necessary permits. Although the applicant has since obtained a permit for sewer connections, the casita, which is considered an accessory structure, requires a Special Use Permit (SUP), along with a pending review. Obtaining the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) is the first step in the process.

CHAIR WHITE questioned what the applicant would need to do in order to come into compliance. MR. HOWE explained that the Commissioners needed to determine if the historic aesthetic requirements of the John S. Park Design Guidelines are being met. The remaining issues regarding building permits and setbacks would then be addressed through the Planning process.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL expressed confusion and questioned the code violation, and MR. HOWE said the owner was cited for having an unpermitted structure. MR. GARDNER stated that he was directed by City staff in October of 2019 to seek approval through the State of Nevada. MR. HOWE explained that State approval would pertain to the shipping container because it is mobile. Therefore, the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) had to verify its construction. However, that has nothing to do with having to obtain building permits to install the structure on the property. In this case, the City needs to address the issues created by setting up the

structure before pulling permits. Thus, the applicant needs to obtain the COA in order to pursue entitlements and then the permits.

To CHAIR WHITE, MR. HOWE reiterated that to obtain a COA, the applicant would need to demonstrate that the structure meets the aesthetic character, nature and context of the John S. Park Neighborhood Design Guidelines. MR. LEWIS added that this is the first step in the process for land-use entitlements to have the structure on the property. The Commission would need to decide if it is appropriate for this neighborhood. CHAIR WHITE verified that MR. GARDNER owns the property and resides there.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL commented that the structure was erected without pulling a building permit and without the applicant appearing before the Historic Preservation Commission to explain his intentions for making sure it meets the historic district guidelines. He asked MR. GARDNER what he is doing specifically to come into compliance with those guidelines. After MR. GARDNER answered that the reason he was before the HPC was to obtain direction on how to proceed, COMMISSIONER STOLDAL advised him that he needed to appear before the HPC with a plan for them to decide if the design is appropriate.

CHAIR WHITE asked if the structure would have to be removed. MR. HOWE explained that staff recommended denial in this matter because the container does not meet the character of the neighborhood. The applicant could agree to a condition to meet the standards by adding architectural finishes to the shipping container to make it a casita, which is allowed, as long as it meets the aesthetic characteristics of the primary dwelling. CHAIR WHITE asked MR. GARDNER if he could design the shipping container to adhere to the historical character of the area. MR. GARDNER replied that he wanted to find out from the HPC what they would like him to do or change, noting that the paint on the container matches his house and the trim is the same style as the back half of his home. The Chair verified with MR. GARDNER that regardless of the changes made, the structure still looks like a shipping container with windows and doors.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL questioned the process, which he thought entailed the applicant having to submit a plan to the Planning Department for staff's review and approval or recommendation of revisions.

COMMISSIONER SEIBRANDT explained that MR. GARDNER submitted a plan depicting the incorporation of wooden terraces and vines, which is what the HPC needs to consider and decide on its appropriateness. Should the HPC decide against the plan, COMMISSIONER STOLDAL asked if the applicant could submit a revised plan to staff, who could determine its conformance with the standards and not have to come back to the HPC for consideration.

CHAIR WHITE showed a picture in the backup depicting the vines, and discussed with MR. GARDNER that it would probably take approximately 1.5 years to accomplish the growth depicted. COMMISSIONER SEIBRANDT asked the HPC if they felt the image reflected is appropriate for the historic neighborhood. If not, MR. GARDNER would have to redesign his plan.

As a person who owns property in the John S. Park Neighborhood, COMMISSIONER PALACIOS said he looked at the neighborhood's guidelines when he moved into the area in 2000. In his view, the goal in dealing with historic properties is to maintain the face of existing structures and not require that additions exactly match those historic structures. He added that sheds or bungalows should look exactly like what they are. As a matter of example, he mentioned that he recently advised someone in the McNeil Neighborhood that any addition should not match the primary historic dwelling but rather look completely different so that people can make the distinction.

COMMISSIONER PALACIOS wondered if he was misinterpreting the goal of the John S. Park Design Guidelines. MR. LEWIS advised that as part of the COA process, the applicant submits a design they believe will work for their property to comply with the respective guidelines. However, the HPC is not required to give a yes or no answer. The HPC can provide recommendations on how to accomplish compliance. They have the option to: 1) deny the application because they feel the design does not meet the standards or 2) approve with the recommendation to come back before the HPC with some modifications. MR. LEWIS stated that in his experience with this board, the Commissioners do not generally shape a design and tell people exactly what they need to build. Therefore, the choices are to approve, approve with conditions, hold the application in abeyance with guidelines on what the HPC feels might qualify or deny. If denied, the applicant has the option to appeal that decision.

Moreover, MR. LEWIS stated that the process generally includes the applicant working in conjunction with staff before appearing before the HPC. However, the applicant typically works with an architect to help him understand the neighborhood requirements and draft a design to submit for consideration.

COMMISSIONER BECK understood COMMISSIONER PALACIOS' point, because people commonly want non-historic structural features in historic neighborhoods, such as she has seen in Chicago, Illinois. However, COMMISSIONER BECK pointed out that this involves the street view, and the picture shows a shipping container next to a house. Without making a recommendation, she wondered if there is any way to shield a non-fitting structure from a street viewpoint. MR. GARDNER stated that the view from the street consists of an eight-foot by nine-foot square area, with a lot of it mostly covered by the fence and vines. In his opinion, a big portion of the structure is screened from the street viewpoint.

To COMMISSIONER BECK, COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT explained that the John S. Park Design Guidelines stipulate that anything visible from the sidewalk or street must conform, but she was not certain that shielding the view would qualify. She asked MR. HOWE if he knew if that was possible; however, MR. HOWE could not provide an answer. He mentioned that in consideration of the general design guidelines, which indicate that new construction materials should match existing structures, the simple solution would be to include material finishes for the container that match the main structure. Those materials would be stucco, wainscoting and paneling. He conceded this is in conflict with COMMISSIONER PALACIOS' point. He added it is the Secretary of Interior's standards that indicated that new construction should not cause confusion with historic construction.

COMMISSIONER LeVINE emphasized that he would prefer not to see the container from the street at all. He would support it being completely shielded with materials. He made the motion to approve as submitted as long as the shipping container is completely hidden from the street viewpoint. MR. LEWIS clarified that the motion is not to approve based upon staff's conditions, rather to approve, as long as the casita does not look like a shipping container from the sidewalk. As a matter of information, MR. LEWIS stated that this is not a final approval; it is the first step in the process to receive land-use entitlements and building permits.

Based on the application and documentation submitted, CHAIR WHITE asked if the motion should be for denial of the application. MR. LEWIS advised that the membership had the discretion to approve or deny this matter. COMMISSIONER STOLDAL said he could not support the motion, because he felt the John S. Park Design Guidelines are an important component and the motion should be in context with this historic neighborhood. COMMISSIONER LeVINE amended his motion to require that the structure not resemble a shipping container and that the design be in the context of the main structure and the historic neighborhood. COMMISSIONER BECK felt that would leave too much vagueness and suggested requiring further review of a redesign by the HPC. MR. GARDNER said requiring further review would delay his project, and he added that he really could not do anything to the structure to make it look different. MR. LEWIS interjected that there was a motion on the floor.

COMMISSIONER LARIME asked what was meant by the added part regarding historic context, because she does not believe that the siding of the container is outside of the historic context of the neighborhood. COMMISSIONER STOLDAL said he felt the original motion was too vague because it only asked that the structure not resemble a shipping container. That is why he felt that it should require staying within the context of the John S. Park Design Guidelines and narrowing it down.

After reading the guidelines, MR. GARDNER felt his structure fits the architectural style, with a flat roof and wide windows. It also conforms to the siding of the nearest home, with wood panel siding and wood painted trim. He opined that it does fit the historic appropriateness of the nearest home. He said that adding more paneling would make it look worse.

MR. GARDNER discussed with COMMISSIONER LeVINE that he is only dealing with a small area from the street viewpoint, and he intends to grow the vines sufficiently to cover that portion of the structure. COMMISSIONER STOLDAL interjected that this applicant did not follow the process for pulling building permits, which would have allowed the neighbors to express their opinions. COMMISSIONER LeVINE said the neighbors could have their say at the public hearing before the Planning Commission.

COMMISSIONER HOTCHKISS ascertained that MR. GARDNER installed the shipping container and that he did not know his house is in a historic neighborhood.

MR. GARDNER reiterated that when he conferred with staff at the Building and Safety Department, he received advice to go through the State of Nevada for the shipping container. After he adhered, he installed the container only to find that he did not receive all the information and that the entire process is convoluted.

CHAIR WHITE asked if MR. GARDNER received permission from the State to go ahead with the installation. MR. HOWE summarized that MR. GARDNER installed the container without entitlements, and he has been working to address issues resulting from a Code Enforcement violation. An SUP is required for the accessory structure, and there will be some other issues associated with the public hearing process. Between general guidelines and

specific John S. Park Design Guidelines, there is a requirement for the materials to match the color of the primary structure. If the applicant could agree to conditions on that, the applicant could continue, with the understanding that the Planning Commission and City Council would have to consider and approve the application.

CHAIR WHITE asked if the motion on the floor accomplishes that, and MR. HOWE replied that staff recommended denial, unless the recommended conditions are met. MR. LEWIS answered no; however, he regarded it as an active, valid motion the Commission should act on, unless the motion maker wanted to change it or withdraw it.

COMMISSIONER BECK was reluctant to be satisfied with simply adding vines, because they could dry out or be removed later. She opined that the Commissioners should consider a more permanent solution. COMMISSIONER LeVINE said he would have no problem with driving by and seeing vine extending nine feet as coverage, or a nine-foot-wooden structure covered in vines to shield the container.

After the motion failed, COMMISSIONER PALACIOS said he would really like the applicant to submit a set of drawings to the HPC for consideration. He felt uncomfortable with telling him that he could move forward as long as the structure does not look like what it is, a shipping container. After CHAIR WHITE asked the Commissioner if his statement was in the form of a motion, MR. LEWIS advised that the options remaining would be for the Commissioners to deny the application, requiring the applicant to start over, or hold the application in abeyance and require the applicant to come back with new drawings. COMMISSIONER LeVINE opted for an abeyance with drawings that include shielding measures other than vines, and COMMISSIONER PALACIOS supported that. MR. LEWIS advised that the next regular meeting of the HPC would be September 23, 2020.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL asked MR. GARDNER if 30 days would be sufficient, and MR. GARDNER replied affirmatively. COMMISSIONER BECK asked when would be the absolute deadline to get everything submitted in time for the next regular meeting, and COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT went over the agenda deadlines and asked that the applicant have everything submitted within four days from this meeting in order to have everything prepared and submitted for the agenda. MR. GARDNER stated he would have no problem submitting his revised drawing, as he believed his only other option would be to install a screen at least one foot from the property line to allow access to the container. MR. LEWIS pointed out that holding this matter in abeyance would be allowing the applicant to work with staff on presenting alternate plans for review by the Commissioners at the next meeting, and they will either approve with conditions or deny. COMMISSIONER STOLDAL pointed out that staff could still not like the new drawings, and COMMISSIONER BECK expressed her preference for a 60-day abeyance to allow sufficient time, especially since the drawings are coming back to the HPC for consideration.

After the vote on the second motion, COMMISSIONER STOLDAL verified with MR. GARDNER his understanding that he is to work with staff.

Motion made by Jack LeVine to Hold in Abeyance to 10/28/2020 with the applicant to work with staff on a revised plan

NOTE: COMMISSIONER PALACIOS disclosed that he owns the property at 1700 8<sup>th</sup> Place although he does not reside there.

NOTE: A previous motion by COMMISSIONER LeVINE to Approve contingent upon the structure not resembling a shipping container and meeting the guidelines of the neighborhood plan and historic designation failed with COMMISSIONERS STOLDAL, BECK, HOTCHKISS, SERFAS, PALACIOS and LONG voting No.

Passed For: 10; Against: 1; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 1; Excused: 0

For-Claytee White, Robert Stoldal, Jack LeVine, Colleen M. Beck, Donald Hotchkiss, Richard Serfas, Sondra Cosgrove, Mia Palencar, Craig Palacios, Rhonda Long; Against-Michelle Larime; Did Not Vote-Diane Siebrandt;

- 10. 20-0122-HPC1** - Discussion for possible action regarding the approval of up to \$20,000 in Historic Preservation Commission funding to distribute a Request for Proposals to hire a consultant to prepare a Nomination Report for the National Register of Historic Places for the following buildings on the Las Vegas High School Campus, located at 315 South 7th Street: (1) The 1953 Las Vegas High School Auditorium; (2) The 1951 Vocational and Industrial Arts Building; and (3) The 1947 Public School Administration Building - Ward 3 (Diaz)

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT explained that the Commissioners requested at a previous meeting that a survey be conducted on the three subject buildings, with a report to be prepared for possible nomination to the National

Register at a cost of up to \$20,000. Given the amount, a formal bid is not required, and they can contact consulting companies with experience in the work required.

COMMISSIONER LARIME said she could not support the item, because the information she reviewed indicated that the Vocational Arts Building and the Public School Administration Building are at best contributing and will not meet the eligibility requirements for national register nomination. For this reason, she was hesitant to spend more money on pursuing this. She would prefer to pursue a district nomination for submittal to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL commented that they have a detailed district plan that was prepared by North Wind Consultants, even though it was not requested when they put out a request for proposals in 2019. The plan was considered by this Commission and sent to SHPO, which came back with a response saying no to the district. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT confirmed this and added that they only supported listing Frazier Hall, the Academic Building and the Gymnasium. COMMISSIONER STOLDAL said SHPO did not feel a district would fit. He said the only way to move forward would be to identify which buildings may qualify and write a nomination for those that qualify, not to write a nomination for all three.

After COMMISSIONER BECK asked if three of the buildings could be added to the National Register, COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT reiterated that it would be listed as Las Vegas High School Academic Building, Gymnasium and Frazier Hall, because they did not believe the campus would qualify as a district. The Commissioner said this is contrary to her experience, because she was always required to make a district anytime she was dealing with three buildings. Things may have changed, but she found it very odd.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL asked if the document from SHPO could be made available to the entire membership. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT pointed out that the agenda item is whether to approve the statement of work.

COMMISSIONER PALENCAR opined that they were just spending more money to get the same answers, and she could not support the item. COMMISSIONER STOLDAL said they would not get the same answers as the comments in the report included the buildings be listed individually and not as part of a district. COMMISSIONER PALENCAR said the buildings were listed individually, and COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT clarified that the report submitted only included Frazier Hall, which is why the new scope of work was drafted, to find out if the subject three buildings are eligible for nomination to the register.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL stated his motion for approval. COMMISSIONER BECK thought the evaluation would be conducted first to determine eligibility, and then proceed with the national register nomination. In the interest of time, COMMISSIONER STOLDAL said his motion includes determining eligibility and writing the nomination on any buildings the consultant find eligible to bring back for consideration.

COMMISSIONER LARIME asked what would happen if the buildings are ineligible. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT replied that the consultant they contract with would have to submit a report either way. If they are eligible, they would draft a nomination as well. CHAIR WHITE said there was some confusion as to whether some of the buildings were surveyed. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT explained that there was a feasibility report stating that the buildings could be eligible, but an in-depth study is necessary in order to make a determination.

COMMISSIONER BECK said she would prefer to see the SHPO report to gain a better understanding of the expectation before voting. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT said she could provide it via a hyperlink. COMMISSIONER STOLDAL interjected that the document in essence says the campus is not eligible as a district and that only Frazier Hall is eligible for listing. He said there is not a lot of details in the report. COMMISSIONER BECK said she might achieve a better understanding to SHPO's approach.

COMMISSIONER LARIME supported obtaining more information, and she would like this reflected in the motion. Because when the national register survey was prepared previously and they questioned the explanation for ineligibility of the buildings, they were told that it was because they did not fit. She does not want to run into the same problem in this effort. COMMISSIONER STOLDAL said the report will say which buildings are eligible and why. If any buildings are deemed ineligible, an explanation will be provided, and a nomination will automatically be drafted for any eligible buildings.

COMMISSIONER BECK felt they are leaving out SHPO at a critical point. Because it seems if a building is eligible, SHPO has to agree before a nomination is written. COMMISSIONER STOLDAL explained the process and said that SHPO is somewhere in the middle of the process, not at the beginning. COMMISSIONER BECK

disagreed and said that a report would be written explaining eligibility or not, SHPO would agree or disagree and then the nominations would be written for qualifying buildings.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL restated his motion for approval.

Motion made by Robert Stoldal to Approve up to \$20,000 in Historic Preservation Commission funding for a Request for Proposals to hire a consultant to prepare a Report for the National Register of Historic Places to deem if (1) The 1953 Las Vegas High School Auditorium; (2) The 1951 Vocational and Industrial Arts Building; and (3) The 1947 Public School Administration Building at the Las Vegas High School Campus are eligible, with the report to include determination as to why or why not the aforementioned buildings are or are not eligible and if one or more of the buildings are eligible, that nominations be drafted

Passed For: 11; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 1; Excused: 0

For-Claytee White, Robert Stoldal, Jack LeVine, Colleen M. Beck, Donald Hotchkiss, Richard Serfas, Sondra Cosgrove, Michelle Larime, Mia Palencar, Craig Palacios, Rhonda Long; Did Not Vote-Diane Siebrandt;

**11. 20-0123-HPC1** - Report by the Department of Planning regarding Director's updates

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT said ROBERT SUMMERFIELD, Planning Director, could not attend, but she did not believe MR. SUMMERFIELD had any updates to provide. He would have, however, welcomed the new members, but CHAIR WHITE did that under Public Comment.

**12. 20-0125-HPC1** - Report by the Department of Planning regarding Project Update List

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT provided status updates on the list of projects:

Las Vegas National Register - The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) came back with changes and North Wind made those and resubmitted to SHPO. The main changes included formatting and sentence structure. The main concern was that SHPO did not feel it is a district and that it should be listed as Las Vegas High School Academic Building, Gymnasium and Frazier Hall. COMMISSIONER STOLDAL verified that the amended document was sent to SHPO, and he felt that it should have come back before the Commission, because he felt there were substantial changes. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT stated her understanding of the process, which was to submit the changes back to SHPO. She offered to contact SHPO and ask them to hold off. COMMISSIONER STOLDAL asked if the changes included setting up a district and they came back saying that only Frazier Hall can be nominated, and COMMISSIONER replied affirmatively, that it is only a nomination for Frazier Hall.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL said he would not like to delay the process, but he wondered how the other Commissioners felt about it. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT sought clarification and asked if he wanted North Wind to make it a district. COMMISSIONER STOLDAL thought that SHPO said the campus does not fit the criteria for a district, so he wondered if the document no longer included a request for a district but rather just a nomination for Frazier Hall. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT replied affirmatively.

COMMISSIONER LARIME said she would like to see the comments, but she did not want to delay the process. COMMISSIONER STOLDAL said many of the comments surprised him. He would not say how he was able to view the comments, and then noted that he simply requested a copy.

Motor Court Survey - COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT is trying to send shape files to SHPO with assistance from North Wind and the City's GIS team.

SHPO Grants - Two grants were awarded by SHPO, one to pay for forum attendance, for which she will provide a report at the meeting in September. The other grant was for an inventory survey, for which a Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued.

Floyd Lamb Park Hay Barn - The Certificate of Appropriateness was approved in February. SHPO approved everything on this project, and it is moving forward.

Home + History 2020 - The event will be held the week of September 11-13, 2020. Most of the tours will be made available online. A few in-person tours will be offered with restrictions, in keeping with COVID-19 protocols.

13. **20-0126-HPC1** - Report by the Department of Planning regarding historic and archaeological resources in local media

Minutes:

CHAIR WHITE appreciated the information and said COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT has been very active. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT said she has received a lot of input from the Commissioners. She pointed out that she, CHAIR WHITE and COMMISSIONER STOLDAL participated in a podcast with a person from Milwaukee on Las Vegas history and why people should visit when it is safe to do so. The Chair suggested everyone look at the Blue Angel information online.

14. **20-0127-HPC1** - 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:

CHAIR WHITE asked the Commissioners if they had any requests.

COMMISSIONER BECK was very pleased with the Blue Angel project. However, she would have liked an update report item on it with a few pictures and wondered if it would be possible. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT indicated that she provided an update at the meeting in June and would be happy to send a copy of the PowerPoint photos. COMMISSIONER BECK withdrew her request, and COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT asked that the Commissioners let her know if she needs to expand on the information she provides.

15. **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:

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT thanked JEFF BASSO, Sr. Production Technical, for pulling and showing PowerPoint slides of the Blue Angel project from a previous meeting.

See item 14 for related discussion.

16. **Adjournment**

Minutes:

The meeting was adjourned at 1:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

---

Gabriela Portillo-Brenner, Deputy City Clerk

---

Diane Siebrandt, Historic Preservation Officer

THIS MEETING WAS PROPERLY NOTICED AND POSTED AT THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS  
IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE STATE OF NEVADA EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT  
DECLARATION OF EMERGENCY DIRECTIVE 006  
The City of Las Vegas website – [www.lasvegasnevada.gov](http://www.lasvegasnevada.gov)  
and  
The Nevada Public Notice Website – [notice.nv.gov](http://notice.nv.gov)