



Historic Preservation Commission Minutes

1. Call to Order

Minutes:

CHAIR WHITE called the meeting to order at 12:11 p.m.

PRESENT: CHAIR WHITE and COMMISSIONERS BECK, SERFAS (excused until 12:15 p.m.), COSGROVE, LARIME, COLLINS and HOWE (ex-officio member)

EXCUSED: COMMISSIONERS STOLDAL, KLENK, LeVINE, HOTCHKISS and PALENCAR

ALSO PRESENT: ROBERT SUMMERFIELD, Planning Director, DIANE SIEBRANDT, Historic Preservation Officer, SETH FLOYD, 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 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 September 25, 2019

Motion made by Colleen M. Beck to Approve

Passed For: 5; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 1; Excused: 6

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

5. HPC-77526 - Discussion for possible action regarding the 2020 Historic Preservation Commission meeting schedule

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER HOWE reported that the calendar is for year 2020 and meetings will be held on the fourth Wednesday of every month.

Motion made by Sondra Cosgrove to Approve

Passed For: 5; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 1; Excused: 6

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

6. HPC-77703 - Discussion for possible action regarding topics and expected outcomes for the Historic Preservation Commission strategic planning session

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER HOWE reported that DIANE SIEBRANDT, Historic Preservation Officer, was present to assist. He reported that this topic is to discuss setting up a workshop dedicated to itemizing listed items from the future update list and to prioritize projects. The Historic Preservation Officer would facilitate the meeting and would like to hold this special meeting in a more relaxed setting, as long they remained in compliance with the Open Meeting Law. CHAIR WHITE asked if it would be appropriate to discuss dates at this meeting, and COMMISSIONER HOWE replied affirmatively.

ROBERT SUMMERFIELD, Director of Planning, stated that given the diversity of people on the Commission, it may be difficult to identify a date. Further, because it will be an open meeting, the Commission needs to ensure there are no conflicts with the City Clerk's Office, Planning Department and the City Attorney's Office to support the meeting. MR. SUMMERFIELD reminded the Commission that they had also mentioned previously inviting the facilitator from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), which is something else to consider when scheduling this meeting, but they will take any dates that they collectively think will work.

COMMISSIONER BECK asked if the Commission would be looking at dates for that meeting and discussing the possible agenda items or if that would be done at another meeting. MR. SUMMERFIELD stated that they were looking to hold this workshop in November, before the holiday season. COMMISSIONER HOWE confirmed that agenda items for the special meeting could be discussed at this meeting.

CHAIR WHITE suggested the dates of November 13th or 20th for the workshop. MR. SUMMERFIELD noted that November 20th is a City Council meeting, which would preclude the City offices needed to support the workshop, but the Planning Department would not have any conflicts with the 13th. GABRIELA PORTILLO-BRENNER, Deputy City Clerk, stated that the meeting would need to be noticed on November 5th due to the Veterans Day holiday, and she did not believe there would be any other conflicts in the City Clerk's Conference Room on the 13th other than another board meeting regularly scheduled for 4:30 p.m. on the same day.

MS. SIEBRANDT, COMMISSIONER HOWE and MR. SUMMERFIELD further discussed with CHAIR WHITE the best date and time for the workshop, and it was ultimately decided to schedule a luncheon workshop from approximately 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. in the City Clerk's Conference Room. SETH FLOYD, Deputy City Attorney, informed the Chair that a motion was not necessary, but they should outline the topics that will be covered at the workshop.

COMMISSIONER COSGROVE reported that she has seen news articles regarding the motels along East Fremont Street that Veterans Village is purchasing. She presented a picture of the Sky Ranch Motel and asked if the Commission would be receiving updates on the sales in case some of the motels have signs that they are interested in. MR. SUMMERFIELD asked whether or not she wanted this to be added as an item on the workshop agenda or just a follow-up report. COMMISSIONER COSGROVE answered that she would like both, because she would like to see this group do more when it comes to the intersection between transitional and affordable housing in historic preservation.

COMMISSIONER LARIME agreed with COMMISSIONER COSGROVE and added that it is good to talk about how to better align the Commission's efforts with City priorities such as economic development, affordable housing, homelessness and master planning. She would also like to discuss better pathways to working with different departments and elected officials that are working on these projects in order to have their voices heard and prioritize projects. In the past, the Commission has dedicated funding towards specific historic designations, but if they had a better understanding of resources and possibly fund studies, it could help them understand preservation priorities and how they could work through them. COMMISSIONER LARIME also noted that it is important for the newer Commissioners to have an understanding of what the Commission has done over the last 20-25 years. She suggested a comprehensive list to know what has already been looked at. COMMISSIONER COLLINS agreed that it is important to set the priorities of the Commission and having an understanding of what their roles are.

COMMISSIONER BECK emphasized that she would like discussion on how to inform the public that they exist. She has come across some people who are interested in the Historic Preservation Commission but they have no idea what it is about.

COMMISSIONER SERFAS concurred with his colleagues and noted that when moving forward with the adaptive re-use ordinance, they should consider meeting with the new Councilmembers to get acquainted and learn about each other and maybe form partnerships and alliances.

MR. FLOYD explained that they should get an overview of what the Commission does and what it can do. He also noted that SHPO could provide an overview of what resources are available and what it means to be a Certified Local Government (CLG). Most importantly, an overview of the budget and how much money they have and what it can be spent on would be good start for prioritizing the projects for next year. He clarified that there will be separate agenda items to keep the Commission on task.

COMMISSIONER SERFAS asked if staff has anything that they may have over looked. MR. SUMMERFIELD stated that he has heard that they want to have a discussion, but they have never presented the City's strategies regarding the given topics. He asked if they would like anyone from the Office of Community Services to come in and make a presentation or if this is something that they feel versed enough on, based on what they have read in the media and can have a robust discussion in the workshop without any additional input. If they are looking at a three-hour meeting, he wants them to have time to wrap their hands around some things, but there may be some table setting activities to be done in the beginning. However, it may be helpful to have other members of the City's stakeholder community present. CHAIR WHITE thought it would be of great value considering there are two new people, and that way they can learn how to align with Community Services. COMMISSIONER SERFAS was in agreeance and noted that it is good to hear where the City is at when proposing new ideas.

CHAIR WHITE asked if the Commissioners had overlooked any topics they should be concentrating on, and COMMISSIONER HOWE replied that they have a solid agenda, and it will be staff's job to avoid overlaps because there are common themes that align with the Downtown Master Plan and the City Master Plan, so they will try to keep it fairly condensed. He also recommended having Community Services and Economic and Urban Development representatives present to see how the Commission can take advantage of the historic tax credits and other tools.

MR. SUMMERFIELD commented that given COMMISSIONER BECK'S request to raise awareness of the Commission's existence and their desire to look at how to use the website to promote the Commission, he suggested inviting the Director of the Office of Communications. He added that in the Planning Department, they get three free promotional activities each year for things that the department wants promoted. One is Historic Preservation month in May, and he put it forward to make sure that they have some sort of campaign and social media component, so someone from Communications could speak about how to get the message out on what the Historic Preservation Commission is doing and on how they can seek different avenues to get the message out. MR. SUMMERFIELD noted that he will not be present at the workshop meeting.

Motion made by Richard Serfas to Approve a Strategic Planning Session for 11/13/2019 from 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m., with an agenda to incorporate topics discussed during this meeting

Passed For: 6; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 1; Excused: 5

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

7. HPC-77704 - Discussion for possible action regarding guidelines for solar panels within historic properties and districts

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER HOWE reported that the John S. Park Neighborhood Association hosted a meeting, and he turned to DIANE SIEBRANDT, Historic Preservation Officer, to give a recap. MS. SIEBRANDT reported that the consensus was that the Association does want to amend their guidelines to incorporate the City's guidelines on Title 19.10.150 as far as how to alleviate damaging historic houses with the installation of solar panels or water tanks.

COMMISSIONER LARIME stated that she specifically asked for other ideas for amending the guidelines outside of solar panels, such as fencing and carports. She asked if they could amend the guidelines under this matter or if would be better to have broader discussion. COMMISSIONER HOWE suggested future discussion because it would have to be done through a text amendment, which would have to go through the established process, including the Planning Commission and City Council for approval. SETH FLOYD, Deputy City Attorney, stated that this matter was only to discuss solar panels, so if the direction is to move forward with the amendment, COMMISSIONER HOWE would bring back a draft of that amendment. If they would like to broaden the guidelines, they would have to bring that back in the future, which could delay the solar panel discussion.

JOSHUA McNALLY, Real Estate Developer in the John S. Park neighborhood, commented that he is looking for some sustainable solutions and this would affect their designs. DAYVID FIGLER, President of the John S. Park Neighborhood Association, stated that any exterior change that impacts the aesthetic is of interest to the neighborhood. The consensus for the most part was that they like the option to install solar panels, but it should be done thoughtfully with guidelines that the neighbors can give input on before they are finalized. With regard to other items, he does not know that anybody feels that the current rules are so restrictive that they cannot go through the process as is and if there was an opportunity for the neighbors to give input, it would be on fences, carports and solar panels. Some comments at a neighborhood meeting were regarding general concerns, and they do not want to lose historic trees and other mature landscaping if that is what is necessary to accommodate solar panels and other little nuances.

MR. FIGLER pointed out that COMMISSIONER PALENCAR lives in the neighborhood, and she has been trying to relay information and serves as a good conduit for when things are coming up. The Councilwoman for the area had suggested they discuss it, which they did at a neighborhood meeting where 36 residents were in attendance.

They appreciate being part of the process and would like to maintain the rigors of the historic designation, but they also understand that the world is changing and there does need to be other options, but it all needs to fit together and hopefully the new Historic Preservation Officer will enforce the restrictions.

COMMISSIONER LARIME commented that Title 19.10.150 suffices for the kind of guidelines needed, and they probably just need John S. Park's guidelines to state that the neighborhood approves the direction of the Title 19 guidelines. How she read it was that they basically align with what the neighborhood wants, which is that every effort should be made to try to keep the panels off the street-facing façade, but if they cannot, at least try to be sensitive to how they are applied to that street-facing façade. COMMISSIONER HOWE stated that staff would take direction and make corrections, which would be shared with COMMISSIONER LARIME and MR. FIGLER to see where staff is going with those edits. If they all feel they are on track, the edits could then be finalized. He noted, however, that staff was still trying to determine if the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) has final authority on the adoption of the final guidelines, or if it would be considered a necessary amendment to Title 19 to be made through the process.

MR. SUMMERFIELD stated that the design guidelines are adopted as part of the rezoning process, because a historic designation is technically a rezoning and applies a different level of scrutiny, which requires Council action to formalize that rezoning applying the historic designation to a district, such as the John S. Park neighborhood. As such, he does not believe that when the John S. Park neighborhood was built, there was a lot of detail in terms of how to edit those provisions. Consequently, that is what staff needs to review extensively, short of a new zoning action to re-designate the district with the updated guideline. Typically, special area plans include documents to allow the ability to amend the zoning action. However, he did not believe that was the case with historic districts; therefore, staff is trying to figure out exactly how to update the guidelines without doing a new zoning action to reestablish the district under revised guidelines. They should be able to come to a consensus on what they want to change while his staff works with the City Attorney's office to figure out the technical aspect of how to accomplish the change. CHAIR WHITE wanted to make sure that updates are shared with the HPC and the John S. Park Neighborhood Association, and MR. SUMMERFIELD assured her that there will be updates.

MR. FIGLER added that there is some interest in the neighborhood to expand the overlay so that might be something to consider as they go through the process with Planning. Additionally, they have a very antiquated neighborhood plan, and as things change, many of those provisions are not applicable anymore. It might be a good idea to discuss where the historic designation fits in with the idea of revitalizing the neighborhood plan to accomplish the HPC's ability to make amendments or to expand the designation restrictions throughout a larger segment of the neighborhood. He also mentioned that he is not sure how that affects the nearby neighborhoods such as South Ridge, Beverly Glen and West Huntridge, which all are abutting to the John S. Park neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER LARIME commented that Title 19 talks about how all of the options for the placement of solar panels should be explored in conjunction with the HPO, noting that it would be more helpful to have more information on where solar panels should be placed for better efficiency before making decisions. She fears saying no to solar panels unless they are placed on the front-facing side may force homeowners to not use solar at all. MR. FLOYD stated that per state law, they cannot prohibit solar panels all together, but they can implement a reasonable restriction on them per NRS 278. He agreed that they rely on the applicant or their representative to tell them about system efficiency when some alternatives could have been discussed ahead of time, but they did not have an HPO to enforce the restrictions. CHAIR WHITE suggested that when the Commissioners receive the agenda, they should view the property in question rather than relying on the diagrams. COMMISSIONER BECK added that the applications need to also include photos; CHAIR WHITE insisted that they still need to see the property in addition to the photos.

MR. McNALLY stated that he has been in the John S. Park neighborhood for about five years and has great appreciation for the historic architecture, which is less than 10 percent of the houses. He wondered, however, how building from the ground up would fit into the HPC's narrative and work within that to create something that while trying to use the most advanced and sustainable materials, people wonder when their structures were constructed. They could use technology to make a home look like it was built in the 40's or 60's, so he would like to participate as much as possible in whatever narrative they prepare. He added that he is building 11 houses on approximately two acres near the school, and they are dealing with 11 large trees. He challenged the Commissioners to look at all the surrounding houses and be able to tell which time period they were built in.

CHAIR WHITE stated that all the information is available on the report they filed when application was made to add the neighborhood to the national registry of historic places, including a list of qualifying properties. COMMISSIONER HOWE interjected that there would not be any criteria to review for that site because it involves undeveloped land, noting that the guidelines only apply to structures that have been identified. MR. SUMMERFIELD interjected that since the property is within a historic designation district, it will require an additional historic review component as part of the permitting process, although not as stringent. MR. FIGLER stated that it splits them in half, but the entire house is included. MR. SUMMERFIELD stated that there is a difference in the quantitative review between something that is contributing in the district and something that is not contributing, but it is all within the district; therefore, it has a historic designation and will require some level of review. CHAIR WHITE confirmed with MR. SUMMERFIELD that the structure will look like existing development in the John S. Park neighborhood. COMMISSIONER LARIME remarked that best practice is to

allow new construction to look new and to keep historic structures recognizable as historic, so there is no need to be hung up on making a home look like it is from the 40's. She believes it is appropriate to have a mix construction from various decades to be able to showcase new technologies. MR. McNALLY appreciated the comment and explained that the reason for constructing an older-looking home is that they are trying to disrupt the construction industry. If they do this correctly, by the time Historic Preservation Month comes around, they will have plans or a model that will look like something else in the area and they can say what the differing operating costs are. He would like to do something that is era-specific.

CHAIR WHITE put it in staff's hands and asked that the Commissioners be kept apprised of any changes. MR. FIGLER expressed his appreciation to the HPC for everything they do.

8. HPC-77705 - Report by the Department of Planning regarding Director's updates

Minutes:

ROBERT SUMMERFIELD, Planning Director, reported this was COMMISSIONER HOWE'S last meeting as Historic Preservation Commissioner and as his designee to the Historic Preservation Commission. He will be designating MS. SIEBRANDT to start at the special meeting. COMMISSIONER HOWE is not abandoning the Historic Preservation Commission and will serve in a supervisory capacity over work that the Historic Preservation Officer does and the actions of this body and will occasionally attend in his stead as well. For the first time, the Commission will have full-time Historic Preservation Officer. She has been working at Floyd Lamb Park and the adaptive re-use project to work as an events center and the Commission will probably get a report on that in December. After taking lead up time, he thinks that project is starting to have legs and is moving quickly. There is dedicated revenue that can go to other restoration projects and a Ward 6 office representative will be present to talk about hopes and dreams for that area. There is a robust agenda for the special workshop departments to provide an hour of table setting conversation and to use the rest of the time to prioritize. He will not be able to attend that workshop, but he assured the Commissioners he was leaving them in great hands.

9. HPC-77706 - Report by the Department of Planning regarding Project Update List

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER HOWE clarified that it is Item 9, not Item 6 as read. He reported that he has been working closely with North Wind Consulting on the motor court survey. The scope of work was to determine motels that supply some sort of motor court design. During the survey process, North Wind made them aware that there are many small hotels and motels that do not fit the motor court building type, and they did not want to expand the contract to include those properties because they are trying to capture the spirit of the motor court that had a significant role in the history of Las Vegas and was a typical lodging feature. To be clear, there was invitation to expand the scope, but only the motor courts will be included in the scope and they will keep tabs on the other buildings. CHAIR WHITE asked if some of those buildings are over 50 years old, and COMMISSIONER HOWE replied that some are, and there is a concern that part of the motor court survey that was given equal weight was the signage, so they will have to discuss with North Wind which properties they are talking about. If there is interest, they may have those properties identified and may look at doing a second contract. CHAIR WHITE expressed that she was in favor of having those properties identified. COMMISSIONER HOWE clarified that in order to include them as part of the survey, they would have to expand the contract. As a favor to potential work, they ask that the Commission let Planning know what they can include without going into too much detail. COMMISSIONER BECK asked what the description of a motor court motel is, and COMMISSIONER HOWE informed her that it suffices as a single-story courtyard, auto-accessed motor hotel lodge. They are focused on the single-story courtyard motels.

COMMISSIONER LARIME discussed with COMMISSIONER HOWE that the contract total came in at around \$22,000, so the Commission could use the additional funding if needed. COMMISSIONER LARIME added that she would be in favor of using any additional money to expand the scope and include more hotel/motel typologies; otherwise, at least identify them as recommended by CHAIR WHITE. CHAIR WHITE wondered how much it would cost to expand the contract the at this point, and COMMISSIONER HOWE did not know, but he will continue to have that conversation on how to go about the next steps. MR. FLOYD stated that they could ask for the cost of the expansion and then bring it back as a future agenda item for consideration and decision.

COMMISSIONER HOWE noted that the consultant for the Las Vegas High School National Register Nomination is on track to give a presentation at December's HPC meeting.

COMMISSIONER HOWE reported that the Moulin Rouge project regarding the relocation of the columns is somewhat interrelated to the Blue Angel, which he wants to prioritize and get that work started. He shared the news that they are going with the original restoration of the Blue Angel sign as designed Betty Willis with the belt

but minus the halo. This will then help move forward towards relocation and the storage of the glass mosaic columns on Moulin Rouge.

Continuing with this report, COMMISSIONER HOWE stated that the architect for the Floyd Lamb Hay Barn is keeping the role of a three-way liaison. They are modifying the existing hay barn to provide additional doorways so that it can be used as an events center. These changes are necessary to meet safety and code requirements, and then they will be having a discussion with representatives from the State Historic Preservation office (SHPO) to have an understanding that they are treating these buildings with the upmost respect and care. The potential of this project can lead to the self-funding process that will help contribute to the renovation of the adjacent structures.

COMMISSIONER BECK asked if it would be appropriate for her to attend the site visit. COMMISSIONER HOWE stated that it would be beneficial to have a member of the HPC present, especially with her knowledge. He will make sure to include invites, and it would really help if she could keep the suggestions and comments in line and not overwhelm SHPO so they can keep the process moving along.

COMMISSIONER HOWE noted that the remaining items on the subject list of updates could be left for the upcoming workshop. One of the key items was the HPC website, and MS. SIEBRANDT has started a good fresh take on that. He will reserve the rest for the workshop in order to have a more in-depth discussion.

10. HPC-77707 - Report by the Department of Planning regarding historic and archaeological resources in local media

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER LARIME referenced an article from the Nevada State Museum and talked about a sports exhibit which includes elements of the Las Vegas Golden Knights and that pointed out that history does not always have to be past and it is sometimes being made. She really liked that because Las Vegas is still so young and there is some misunderstandings of what history is and that is something they could talk about at the workshop.

11. HPC-77708 - **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 stated that this is not just for the workshop but also for regular Historic Preservation Commission meetings. She stated they would like to include the motor court survey and discuss funds and how many motels are not under definition.

COMMISSIONER LARIME asked for a status report on Marble Manor, noting she heard it may be redeveloped, and she would like some documentation on the process before it is demolished. COMMISSIONER BECK asked for the location; COMMISSIONERS LARIME and HOWE clarified that it is located north of the Moulin Rouge.

COMMISSIONER COLLINS asked what is being proposed to replace Marble Manor, and COMMISSIONER HOWE stated that he heard through the Office of Community services that there is a Southern Nevada Housing Authority proposal with a concept to retain the number of units at Marble Manor and complete redevelopment, and potentially mixed-use and mixed-income housing. They are essentially trying to bring in a complete neighborhood and market-rate rental housing along with other uses for employment.

12. **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.

13. **Adjournment**

Minutes:

The meeting was adjourned at 1:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Gabriela Portillo-Brenner, 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