



## Historic Preservation Commission Minutes

### 1. Call to Order

Minutes:

CHAIR WHITE called the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m.

PRESENT: CHAIR WHITE and COMMISSIONERS KLENK, BECK, SERFAS (excused until 12:17 p.m.), COSGROVE, LARIME, PALENCAR, and SIEBRANDT (ex-officio member)

EXCUSED: COMMISSIONERS STOLDAL, LeVINE, HOTCHKISS and COLLINS

ALSO PRESENT: MICHAEL HOWE, Planning Section Manager, 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:

MIKE GANSON indicated he wanted to speak on several items, and CHAIR WHITE asked him to wait for each item as they come up.

### 4. For possible action to approve the Final Minutes by reference of the Regular Meeting of October 23, 2019

Motion made by Colleen M. Beck to Approve

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

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

### 5. HPC-77950 – Discussion for possible action regarding determining preservation priorities for the next 12 months

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT recalled the list of priorities worksheet that had been previously distributed and indicated she obtained everyone's ideas, determined if they are all on the same page and put together a priority list. She read from CHAIR WHITE'S list of priorities which included: a list of properties in danger of demolition, motor court survey, report on Fremont Street East, Las Vegas High School, meeting with the STEVENS brothers and discussion of historic elements that may be preserved, public policy as it applies to this Commission and affordable housing, status of all outstanding surveys, preservation consideration in each wards, training of commissioners, Berkley Square and Bonanza Village.

COMMISSIONER BECK did not understand the demolition list, and CHAIR WHITE clarified that she wanted to get a list of properties that are in danger of being demolished, or how to identify those properties.

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT read from COMMISSIONER LARIME'S list: perform a City-wide survey, develop better relationships with City departments, adaptive reuse ordinance, demolition ordinance, Huntridge Theater, update design guidelines, update the website, coordinate preservation with policy, establish grant programs for residential areas and involvement with the City's master plan process. She added that they have discussed some of these things in past workshops and know that the motor court surveys are a priority on everybody's list.

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT stated she can photocopy the worksheets and disseminate to everybody, then establish a way to prioritize all of the items. COMMISSIONER BECK asked if the decision impacts the schedule to receive grants, and COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT replied affirmatively, noting that will elaborate more on a later item.

COMMISSIONER SERFAS agreed with COMMISSIONER LARIME'S list. COMMISSIONER BECK felt there is a good list between CHAIR WHITE and COMMISSIONER LARIME.

6. **HPC-77951** – Discussion for possible action regarding increasing public awareness of the Historic Preservation Commission's role in the master plan, zoning code, and preservation management

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT explained that this matter was generated from the working group in November to address the concerns about bringing in guest speakers about what is done in the City and how that affects historic preservation. She added that they did not decide how they are going to engage speakers or how to reach out to them, and hoped this item could clarify that. CHAIR WHITE asked who works on the master plan, and MIKE HOWE, Planning Section Manager, clarified that it would be MARCO VELOTTA, Sr. Management Analyst, through him. CHAIR WHITE asked if there was anybody that the Commissioners wanted to invite, indicating her preference for some Councilmembers. COMMISSIONER BECK remembered they did that about two years ago, and it was a step in the right direction. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT asked how they did that, and DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY SETH FLOYD stated that PAUL BENGTSON (former City Senior Planner) reached out to the Ward liaisons, noting that with Wards 1 and 3 have new Councilmembers, they may be interested in speaking with this group. COMMISSIONER KLENK wondered if they could get a communications officer here to speak.

MR. FLOYD thought it would be helpful to have someone from Economic and Urban Development (EUD) because they have visual and commercial improvement programs and can provide useful information for this Commission. CHAIR WHITE thought that Ward 5 could use that soon.

COMMISSIONER SERFAS asked if the master plan has a steering committee chair to invite, and MR. HOWE replied that they have a Community Advisory Commission and they could also work with MR. VELOTTA.

COMMISSIONER KLENK expressed interest in gaining the support of City departments, and would like CITY MANAGER SCOTT ADAMS to come in and speak.

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT listed the people she wrote down which included: COUNCILMEMBERS CREAR, SEAMAN, DIAZ and KNUDSEN, DAVID RIGGLEMAN, Communications Director, someone from Economic and Urban Development, MR. VELOTTA and CITY MANAGER ADAMS. She informed the Commission that she will work from that list and see what she could get done. MR. HOWE advised that DAVE DOUGINS offered a tour to look at the Ferguson, noting that it would provide good insight on what it takes to make successful adaptive reuse. COMMISSIONER SERFAS requested an update on Project Enchilada from CITY ATTORNEY BRAD JERBIC.

CHAIR WHITE asked what the Commission thinks about the STEVENS brothers, who are renovating older properties downtown, and she would like to extend an invitation to them.

COMMISSIONER BECK asked if the EUD program covers projects for older buildings, and MR. FLOYD did not think it came through the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) because those buildings have not yet been identified. Once that is completed, it would trigger a process for the HPC's review. COMMISSIONER BECK thought that someone else in the City was talking to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and MR. FLOYD stated that those talks involved the Corridor of Hope project, which was designated on the local register. Due to the age of the building, they had to go through SHPO to document and preserve images on the site before moving forward with demolition. COMMISSIONER BECK stated that it is hard to be on the Commission

and find out that the City had activity with SHPO without this Commission being made aware. MR. FLOYD explained that part of that is because the project was outside of the Commission's scope. COMMISSIONER SERFAS stated that it is essential that they form a relationship with EUD and have some sort of coordination, similar to their existing relationship with the Planning Department.

CHAIR WHITE added CHAD WILLIAMS from the Southern Nevada Housing Authority to the list of desired speakers.

7. **HPC-77952** – Discussion for possible action regarding identifying and providing additional funding for survey(s) within the city

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT explained that this also resulted from the November workshop and the goal was to identify possible surveys and where to focus. She went back in the archives to identify completed surveys and listed the following: Archeological Resource Survey in 1978, downtown in 2002, Bitmore and the Mayfair neighborhoods in 2003, wedding chapels in 2005. Project Neon in 2008, McKnight's Senior Village and Southridge neighborhood in 2009 and the motor court survey is currently in progress. She questioned what the Commission would like to focus on, noting available budget funds of \$37,516 that can be used for surveys.

CHAIR WHITE stated she wants a survey of all of Ward 5.

COMMISSIONER PALENCAR asked for the results for the aforementioned surveys, to which COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT replied that she is working her way through to familiarize herself with them because they are very large.

MIKE HOWE, Planning Section Manager, believed that the John S. Park and Beverly Green surveys are missing, and also noted that a survey does not mean it is going to steer towards a direction. COMMISSIONER PALENCAR understood, but she does not see any results. COMMISSIONER COSGROVE stated it depends on the outcome they were trying to achieve and if it was actually achieved. MR. HOWE mentioned that John S. Park and Beverly Green became historic areas based on the surveys completed. CHAIR WHITE recalled that they attempted to survey historic districts in two other areas that did not go through; the Mayfair neighborhood and another area close to John S. Park, COMMISSIONER LARIME thought it was the Huntridge. CHAIR WHITE clarified that they have taken action, and suggested COMMISSIONER PALENCAR look back at the survey. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT stated they are available, and CHAIR WHITE said she would see more action than she imagined.

DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY SETH FLOYD explained that once they have a survey, they could use it to go to a specific neighborhood and speak with the residents about getting it registered. He added that this Commission can initiate an application for designation, and COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT could see if there are opportunities with what they currently have. COMMISSIONER COSGROVE stated that the outcome can be that they do not know what they do not know. MR. FLOYD agreed, adding that he thinks the idea is to get most of the City surveyed so they know what is out there and get things appropriately registered.

COMMISSIONER LARIME would like a City-wide survey and referenced a Referred Reuse and Revitalization in Jacksonville study. She would like a better understanding of where potential older areas are, identify hotspots and decide where they want to spend their resources. The Jacksonville survey also talked about adaptive reuse and looked at an affordable housing policy. She is picturing a broader survey that looks at older resources and how they can align those with future and older surveys. COMMISSIONER SERFAS thought that is well-suited and would be more comprehensive. CHAIR WHITE and COMMISSIONER COSGROVE were also in agreeance.

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT advised that a City-wide survey would be expensive, but they could ask for money from the Commission for the Las Vegas Centennial. CHAIR WHITE suggested they apply for State SHPO (Historic Preservation Office) monies as well.

MR. FLOYD suggested the Commission direct staff to come up with a scope for the City-wide survey and obtain a bid and other funding information. COMMISSIONER LARIME stated she would put COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT in contact with the people in Jacksonville and recalled the survey costing from \$90,000 to \$100,000. CHAIR WHITE was in full support of bidding out for the project. COMMISSIONER COSGROVE pointed out that using the data for other purposes would justify the price. CHAIR WHITE emphasized that she wants to avoid doing research that has already been done.

COMMISSIONER BECK asked that the 1970's buildings be included in this City-wide survey as well. She also pointed out that the original Tule Springs nomination was done by the state and then turned over to the City. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT assured the Commissioners that she will put together a proposal.

8. **HPC-77953** – Discussion for possible action regarding submitting grant proposals for the State Historic Preservation office (SHPO) Certified Local Governments (CLG) grants that support Historic Preservation initiatives

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT spoke of State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) grants for certified local governments. The first grant is a reimbursable 60/40 matching grant. She added that the state's priority is conducting surveys of cities. Although the grant is not guaranteed, it would be strongly considered. CHAIR WHITE stated it sounds like they want the City and COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT agreed.

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT listed other types of surveys and advised that an explanation for each of those is included in a link that was previously sent, but thinks it would make more sense to apply for grant. She reiterated that a City-wide survey will be very expensive and will take several years to complete; therefore, she suggested the Commissioners think about how they are going to divide it up. She used the examples of the cities of Palm Springs, West Hollywood and Austin, who divided their city-wide surveys by years. San Antonio did theirs by building-structure-type. These things need to be thought out to craft a reasonable proposal and be able to show how this is going to get completed.

COMMISSIONER COSGROVE asked if any of these cities have used their survey information for other purposes. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT stated that she found all of the information online and was not sure who else uses it. COMMISSIONER COSGROVE said it would be easier to do data-driven decision-making for policy experts with a completed City-wide survey. CHAIR WHITE did not think this will be a problem, emphasizing that SHPO and the City are ready for this project.

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT advised that associated with SHPO funding is also a travel grant available to visit the National Alliance and Preservation and Commissions Forum, which takes place in Tacoma, Washington, in July. It is recommended that the SHPO officer and the Commission Chair attend. In order to attend the conference, they will have to ask for the grant. CHAIR WHITE asked if they could put in a grant for more than two people, and COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT confirmed they could. She added that they do have a \$36,000 travel caps for all CLGs. CHAIR WHITE recommended putting in for the grant and finding out who would be interested in going. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT stated that the deadline is January 31, 2019, so she will need any comments or suggestions for the survey as soon as possible as submittal must be done via mail. COMMISSIONER BECK indicated that she learned a lot when she attended the forum in Des Moines, Iowa. CHAIR WHITE pointed out that it was paid through HPC funds.

CHAIR WHITE asked COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT to remind the Commissioners by e-mail what information she needs and by what date for both of these grants.

9. **HPC-77954** – Discussion for possible action to provide additional funding in an amount not to exceed \$3,206 for the Motor Court Survey

Minutes:

This item was heard subsequent to Item 5.

MIKE HOWE, Planning Section Manager, stated that the Motor Court Survey was based on specific locations, and COURTNEY MOONEY discovered that there were some opportunities with motor courts that had changed over time, and many buildings would show the transition and development of that model. To summarize, they are getting a doubling of the survey of the buildings that do not fit the narrow profile of a single-story motel, but contribute to the motor court hotel history along Las Vegas Boulevard and Fremont Street. He regarded it as a good expansion.

Subsequent to the motion and vote, BARBARA GANSON asked what the survey is and what it entails. MR. HOWE explained that they are implementing a new development code, and they want to keep motels in place to show how and why East Fremont Street developed in the way it did. The survey will define who designed it and when, which will give them more ammunition to defend keeping these properties. The challenge is that motels are an automotive-based building type and Fremont Street is becoming more walkable, so they want to have something in

place that recognizes the motels. CHAIR WHITE explained that the additional monies came from the discovery of other buildings that should have been included in the survey. MS. GANSON asked where she can view the updated survey, and MR. HOWE stated that a copy is available online and in person at the Development Services Center. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT added that the funding comes from the Commission for the Las Vegas Centennial from the sale of their commemorative license plates.

COMMISSIONER BECK pointed out that they are asking for an additional \$329 in funding per structure.

COMMISSIONER PALENCAR inquired about the motel across from the Stratosphere and how it was already demolished in order to build apartments. MR. HOWE clarified that it was not demolished, it was refurbished utilizing a different program and transformed for affordable housing. He explained that although it is good for adaptive reuse, but they also want people to understand that they do not need to demolish the structure.

COMMISSIONER SERFAS thanked MR. HOWE for bringing that point up and recalled speaking of an adaptive reuse ordinance and how it can help preserve structures.

COMMISSIONER PALENCAR asked if a density study was completed, and MR. HOWE stated that the UIP (Unified Improvement Planning) Program is administered by the Economic and Urban Development Department, and it does not meet thresholds of the parking because it was part of the old Downtown Centennial Plan and not subject to site review because it all pertained to tenant improvements.

DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY SETH FLOYD advised that they were getting off topic and inquiries could be directed to MR. HOWE.

Motion made by Michelle Larime to Approve

Passed For: 7; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 1; Excused: 4

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

10. **HPC-77955** – Discussion for possible action regarding the amended National Register of Historic Places nomination update for the Las Vegas High School, 315 South 7th Street (APN 139-34-710-038), C-V (Civic) Zoning, Ward 3 (Diaz)

Minutes:

This item was heard subsequent to Item 4.

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT provided a brief background of the item using a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was submitted for the record, and explained that the discussion would be surrounding the future of the school.

COURTNEY MOONEY, representative for Northwind Consulting, explained that the National Register of Historic Places listing for the academic and gymnasium buildings were completed in 1986. They were designed by GEORGE A. FARRISON'S son, and found eligible under criteria A, B and C. When she and COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT performed the site visit, they spent a lot of time looking at the campus and evaluating it as a potential historic district because the boundary only includes two buildings. An initial observation was that many of the buildings from the original campus are gone. In 1930, there was a workshop building and a study and music hall that were demolished in the early 1970's and 2000's. Many buildings were constructed in the 1970's with a mid-century vibe. Due to the many alterations, they wondered if instead of considering it a historic district, they could expand the period of significance to include the Fraiser Hall and Vocational buildings. However, those buildings, with the exception of Fraiser Hall, have also undergone alterations, so they are now considering only adding Frazier Hall if they still wanted to pursue the National Register update.

In discussions with SHPO (State Historic Preservation Office), an option would be working on a historic resource survey that identifies all buildings and their character-defining features, and makes criteria for eligibility. The Clark County School District (CCSD) would then possess a document that identifies the building(s) as historically significant, and use it to meet design criteria for new buildings or salvage the historic building rather than tearing it down.

The National Register options also include expanding the boundary to include Fraiser Hall if the period of significance was extended to 1950. If they include the Sunset Hall building, it may be difficult because that

building was built as an administrative building for CCSD and not Las Vegas High School. The Vocational building has had two additions, so it does not have architectural integrity, but they could look for individual eligibility, review the Vocational and administrative buildings for eligibility under the existing Multiple Property Documentation form, or review for a discontinuous district. SHPO stated that would be a stretch, but they would make the case if they were determined eligible. One benefit is that the Historic Resource Survey is a planning document, and it would help CCSD guide future development. The National Register expansion could also possibly allow additional funding options for Frazier Hall, the Vocational building and Sunset Hall. She reiterated that a district is no longer an option, and it would depend on what CCSD believes to be best and what this Commission would like to get out of it.

CHAIR WHITE asked what CCSD believes to be best, and JOSH HAGER, Las Vegas Academy of the Arts Assistant Principal, came forward and explained that they would support anything that would help them in obtaining more funding to upgrade the campus to meet 21st century educational needs. CHAIR WHITE asked if the discontinuous concept would be most feasible to them, and MS. MOONEY replied that it would be the most difficult option administratively because it is a hard designation to get and the buildings would have to maintain a very strong integrity. It may be easier to get them in under the existing context for Schools in Nevada if it were to meet the criteria. However, she wondered if CCSD was planning to reconstruct more compatible additions, and MR. HAGER stated that they had a master plan drafted to preserve the historic buildings, but redesigned the interior. It included removing the two additions to the Vocational building; therefore, it returns to its original architectural design. CHAIR WHITE asked if Frazier Hall qualifies, to which MS. MOONEY replied that it does, unless they find something in their research that would disqualify it.

COMMISSIONER BECK knew that one of the additions to the Vocational Building was the Black Box Theater, but inquired about the other addition. MR. HAGER stated that it would be the dance studio. COMMISSIONER BECK asked if the original theater was removed, and MR. HAGER stated that it still exists and they are looking to update the facade from the late 1940's or 1950's. COMMISSIONER BECK wondered if the buildings from the 1970's were included in this discussion, and MS. MOONEY replied that they are not architecturally compatible with the original buildings and do not meet the theme. COMMISSIONER BECK clarified that their design would not qualify, and MS. MOONEY stated not as a continuous district. COMMISSIONER BECK asked if they could be independently eligible, and MS. MOONEY did not know if it would qualify as being architecturally significant on its own.

MS. MOONEY further explained that there are two different styles on the campus and some of the buildings do not fit. COMMISSIONER BECK understood, but opined that it shows the continued use of the buildings through time. She wondered if the history survey looks at eligibility or just the history of property. MS. MOONEY commented that it is documentation of all the buildings and structures on the property, including open spaces. It also provides detailed descriptions of their character-defining features and criteria for eligibility. If CCSD wanted to move forward with individual eligibility nominations, they would know right away by looking at the document if it meets criteria. The document is very detailed, so it can be used for future architectural decisions.

COMMISSIONER BECK asked if the survey would look at the entire campus and outline where things were such as the football field, and how the campus has changed through time. MS. MOONEY indicated that it would include a detailed content for the site, which shows what things used to look like. She added that SHPO stated that it is possible that there could be a National Register nomination for the 1970's buildings, but it is not possible to have one for both because they do not have the same context. COMMISSIONER BECK asked if Black Box Theater was done in the early 2000's, and MS. MOONEY clarified that it was done in 1950.

COMMISSIONER LARIME asked what the timeline is for renovating the campus, and if there would be time to perform the survey and then follow up with nominations. MR. HAGER explained that there is no schedule for the renovation at this time because the proposed funding is greater than for any high school. They do have some issues that are pressing in terms of the facility not being very useful and possibly becoming unsafe. Funding the renovation sooner would be appreciated, but he does not want to lose the history of the buildings or the site itself. Regardless of how they move forward, the Las Vegas High School needs to encompass the history of what it was. He has no pressing need for getting things done quickly, except for the safety issues that may arise in a shorter period of time.

MIKE GANSON expressed that he was concerned about the issues relating to the health of the building. MR. HAGER stated that the concrete at the northwest corner of the gym is crumbled at the base, and that would be something that needs immediate attention.

COMMISSIONER KLENK asked if MR. HAGER has spoken with CCSD administration to figure out what they will and will not support. MR. HAGER stated that he has not personally, but knows that administration has found the cost to be unreasonable. However, they have tried to come up with new proposals that would still meet all of their needs, but they have not received any proposals to date. COMMISSIONER KLENK wondered if higher ranks would support this before they start considering various alternatives. MS. MOONEY stated that she has not had any discussions with CCSD on that level.

RICK SMITH, co-founder of the Las Vegas Academy Advisory Board, explained that his daughter graduated from the Las Vegas Academy, and this means a lot to him. He is a commercial real estate developer, and asked what they are doing with CCSD, as that is an essential component of this decision. It would be difficult to make a strong argument that some of the buildings have architectural integrity that someone would want to put on the National Registry. He added that he sat down with CCSD and other architects and put together a master plan that includes updating the buildings of significance. They want to preserve those but they have to fix the plumbing. What needs to be done there is of significance at the original cost of around \$250 million, which did not include all repairs. He added that the Las Vegas Academy is very unique and they are always in the top with their fine art programs. This decision also needs to consider people, education and the significance of this Academy to the community. He will be working with CCSD to bring the budget down so they may begin a phased development rather than all at once.

MR. GANSON asked if the project site has been identified as an opportunity zone as part of PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP'S new tax plan. MIKE HOWE, Planning Section Manager, stated that it is within the area that would qualify, but he was not sure how a public school would utilize an opportunity zone. He would prefer to get back to the agenda item where they need to decide if they want to do a site survey or amending the National Register, which may bring a risk of not amending the direction they would prefer, but it brings in more money to CCSD for preservation. MS. MOONEY stated that because it is already on the National Register, there are already opportunities for funding. Adding this would just bring more opportunities for other buildings such as Frazier and Sunset Halls.

COMMISSIONER BECK recalled discussions with the school in the 1990's and voicing her concerns then about things like plumbing and concrete buildings being neglected even though they were on the National Register.

MR. HOWE clarified that CCSD is not the City of Las Vegas, and they are putting together a survey report for CCSD to utilize, but they do not have any means of emphasizing or steering in any direction. He reiterated that option one would be to amend the National Register for more additional buildings with the challenge that it may not go in the direction that they thought. The second option is to expand the full site survey to identify everything on campus as they go into redevelopment.

MR. SMITH questioned the advantage of expanding the survey, and MS. MOONEY clarified that it is not an expansion, it is an initial historic resource survey. She described it as a catalog of all the buildings, structures and open spaces that would provide some context for all of those things in great detail. It would also define the significance of the historic buildings that CCSD may want to look at when redevelopment occurs and defines the criteria for designation or eligibility. CHAIR WHITE asked for the cost, and MS. MOONEY had not looked at fees, but noted that all up front work was all done. She wanted to see what came from this meeting before providing any figures.

COMMISSIONER LARIME noted that she prefers the Historic Resources Survey because it can be used for future nominations, but would support both.

Subsequent to the motion and vote, COMMISSIONER BECK thanked everyone for their hard work and looks forward to future involvement. MR. SMITH asked the Commission to continue emphasizing the importance of preserving this campus. CHAIR WHITE thanked him for his involvement and appreciation.

Motion made by Michelle Larime to Approve a Historic Resource Survey

NOTE: The video does not reflect accurately in that COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT did not vote.

Passed For: 7; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 1; Excused: 4

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

11. **HPC-77956** – Discussion for possible action regarding providing funding to conduct an in-depth study of Historic Preservation Commission actions over the past 20 years

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT stated that this came from November's workshop and goes back to the priority list that was handed out, a copy of which was not submitted as backup. Previously funded programs were discussed along with other potential opportunities. She will need to know if this is still the direction the Commission wants to go in, or branch out to something different, while staying within the bylaws and guidelines that they have to adhere to.

CHAIR WHITE asked the Commission if they need to discuss anything that has not been made a priority, and COMMISSIONER BECK thought that they needed to form a list prior to making a decision.

12. **HPC-77957** – Discussion for possible action regarding amendments to the Historic Preservation Commission By-laws

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT explained that the last amendment was made in 2013. There is a lot of outdated information such as Section J regarding membership, which shows that SHPO (State Historic Preservation Office) was part of this Commission. She recalled a letter that was sent from SHPO explaining that they would no longer be attending. COMMISSIONER BECK thought that was when PAUL BENGTON was here, but she never saw the letter. The other issue was regarding attendance and who will be able to attend and making notifications if a Commissioner is unable to attend. They also discussed the term "unexcused" being used, and how all of these changes are going to be worded and more reflective to where this Commission is going.

DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY SETH FLOYD did not think that the Commission needs to change the verbiage regarding attendance, rather they need to enforce it. He added that in his two years representing this Commission, SHPO has never been present as a member and suggested amending the language.

COMMISSIONER LARIME noticed in the Bylaws that Commissioners are to notify the Secretary if they cannot attend, but she was not sure who that would be. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT stated they should notify her.

COMMISSIONER COSGROVE asked if they could authorize the attorney to review the Bylaws for compliance, and MR. FLOYD said he could do that, and he added that the Secretary is the Historic Preservation Officer, or COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT, who will then relay the information to the Chair. MR. FLOYD confirmed he will go through the Bylaws, and they will vote on the changes in January.

13. **HPC-77958** – Report by the Department of Planning regarding Director's updates Minutes:

MIKE HOWE, Planning Section Manager, stated he was filling in for ROBERT SUMMERFIELD, Director of Planning.

Using a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was submitted for the record, COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT reported that the first update is the Blue Angel plaque, and in addition to eventually being restored, they were able to extend the grant. A plaque will be accompanying the statue and the sign, and she showed a slide with the language that they came up with. She explained that the plaque will be similar to the one for former MAYOR OSCAR GOODMAN outside of City Hall. She would like everyone's input, so she will e-mail the language then hold a further discussion. DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY SETH FLOYD reminded everyone to only respond to COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT.

COMMISSIONER PALENCAR asked how she found out that HOWARD HUGHES was there, and COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT replied that she found the information from an oral history archive. She reminded everyone that this was just a draft that could be modified. CHAIR WHITE noted that HOWARD HUGHES was very illusive and moved all around the city.

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT reported that the old Victory Hotel located at 307 S. Main Street caught on fire on December 9, 2019. After speaking to the fire officials and Code Enforcement Officers, 75 percent of the roof is gone and the walls are in danger of collapsing. The Code Enforcement Division recommends demolition because it is a serious safety issue, but it is ultimately up to the owner. She found a survey completed in 2013 and

depicting a refurbish price of over \$1 million. The cost-to-fix-it total would be much more, so she believes the building will be demolished.

COMMISSIONER LARIME asked if there is anything left in the building worth documenting before the demolition, and COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT stated that she already asked and officials recommended that nobody go in because it is very dangerous. MR. HOWE added that there is no foundation and this sits on redwood piles. CHAIR WHITE appreciated the report.

14. **HPC-77959** – Report by the Department of Planning regarding Project Update list

Minutes:

MIKE HOWE, Planning Section Manager, reported that the \$150,000 grant for the hay barn restoration was received, and the anticipated completion is May 2020. COMMISSIONER BECK asked if they could see the plan of how it would look when completed, and MR. HOWE stated the material is available and they can send it out. DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY SETH FLOYD added that it can be found online in the backup materials for the November 23, 2019 meeting. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT stated she would send everyone a PDF version. COMMISSIONER BECK asked if SHPO (State Historic Preservation Office) was supportive, and MR. HOWE affirmed they were.

COMMISSIONER BECK asked for the status of the Huntridge Theater. CHAIR WHITE stated that JAY DAPPER is in negotiations with the City and his people are looking at it. MR. FLOYD believed it is in the middle of their diligence period and making sure it is structurally sound and able to preserve parts of the theater and the sign. CHAIR WHITE referenced an article that had information about the deal in it. COMMISSIONER BECK asked if they are still in court deciding on previous issues with the previous owner, and MR. FLOYD stated he was not sure but he did hear CITY ATTORNEY BRAD JERBIC say that they are working on the issues. The owner would like to be released from the requirement to pay back the funds. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT added that SHPO went through and they are in the process of preparing a report. MR. FLOYD stated that MEMBER STOLDAL attended the last court hearing because the state was looking to enforce those obligations. He offered to find out and provide updates at the next meeting. COMMISSIONER BECK clarified that this was about the previous owner getting funds and nothing ever happened. MR. FLOYD believed he received \$750,000 to repair the roof, which was repaired but with sticky points. MR. HOWE understood that Friends of the Huntridge operated the theater, lost money and then turned over the property at a reduced price. There grant included stipulations to maintain the property and having it open to the public. MR. FLOYD remembered that it was the Centennial grant, which they never received.

15. **HPC-77960** – Report by the Department of Planning regarding historic and archaeological resources in local media

Minutes:

CHAIR WHITE found the Huntridge article to be very interesting.

COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT mentioned that she and CHAIR WHITE did an interview with Nevada Public Radio, and they talked about this Commission and her new position. The Commissioner offered to provide the link for the interview. COMMISSIONER COSGROVE stated that the interviewer did not know what Helldorado was. CHAIR WHITE stated she wants more opportunities like that to talk about historic preservation. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT stated that the interviewer was very excited that they talked about it, and thinks he would be more receptive to do a series on historic preservation issues in Las Vegas. CHAIR WHITE said the radio has lost a lot lately, and they are looking for more things topics to feature. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT stated she would reach out to Nevada Public Radio again if anyone was interested in going on air.

CHAIR WHITE expressed that she was grateful for this wonderful year and for everything COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT and MR. HOWE have done for the Commission. COMMISSIONER SIEBRANDT thanked everybody and announced that they City was losing SYDNEY NOYCE, Planner II, to the San Diego Airport, where he would be doing master planning. CHAIR WHITE was proud and the Commissioners wished him well.

16. **HPC-77961 – 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 asked for an agenda item on preservation requirements that were included in the agreement for the Huntridge Theater and how those will be governed and how this Commission might have a role in reviewing that and helping to oversee that process. CHAIR WHITE asked if CITY ATTORNEY BRAD JERBIC could come in and talk about the Huntridge Theater and the Fremont Street addition at the same time. MIKE HOWE, Planning Section Manager, thought they should have a separate agenda item for the Huntridge Theater. DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY SETH FLOYD offered to check if CITY ATTORNEY JERBIC will be available. Otherwise, he will get as much information as possible for the meeting.

COMMISSIONER BECK wondered about a list of places that were on the city, state and national registers, and MR. HOWE replied that there is an interactive map on the website. COMMISSIONER BECK would like things that are on the state and national registers to be added to the city register. MR. FLOYD stated the explanation makes sense, and added that only the property owner can seek national and state registrations, but the City can initiate an application for the city register and be more proactive since it hired a Historic Preservation Officer.

- 17. 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.

**18. Adjournment**

Minutes:

The meeting was adjourned at 2:12 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:

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