HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMITTEE AGENDA
REGULAR MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, 401 CALIFORNIA AVENUE
BOULDER CITY, NEVADA  89005

Wednesday, June 22, 2022 – 5:00 PM

The public may view the meeting live at the following link:
https://www.bcnv.org/191/City-Council-Meeting-Live-Stream-Video

ITEMS LISTED ON THE AGENDA MAY BE TAKEN OUT OF ORDER; TWO OR MORE AGENDA ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION MAY BE COMBINED; AND ANY ITEM ON THE AGENDA MAY BE REMOVED OR RELATED DISCUSSION MAY BE DELAYED AT ANY TIME.

CALL TO ORDER

CONFIRMATION OF POSTING AND ROLL CALL

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC COMMENT

PUBLIC COMMENT DURING THIS PORTION OF THE AGENDA MUST BE LIMITED TO MATTERS ON THE AGENDA FOR ACTION. EACH PERSON HAS UP TO FIVE MINUTES TO SPEAK ON A SPECIFIC AGENDA ITEM.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE IN THE MEETING WITHOUT BEING PHYSICALLY PRESENT BY ONE OF THE FOLLOWING METHODS:

- Written comments may be submitted via the Public Comment Form (https://www.bcnv.org/FormCenter/Contact-Forms-3/City-Council-Comment-Form-111)

- To comment during the meeting, members of the public may call (702) 589–9629 when the public comment period is opened.

AGENDA

1. For possible action: Approval of the minutes of the May 25, 2022 regular meeting

2. For possible action: Discussion with North Wind Resource Consulting, LLC on potential changes to the adopted exterior design guidelines for various properties in the Historic District

3. For possible action: Recommendation to the City Council regarding a draft policy for the placement of monuments on City property within the historic district
4. For possible action: Update on implementation of the Committee’s goals and priorities

5. For possible action: Discussion on public outreach to promote historic preservation matters

6. For possible action: Discussion/update on the status of properties in the Historic District or other potentially eligible properties

7. For possible action: Committee discussion regarding potential agenda items for upcoming Historic Preservation Committee meetings

8. Public Comment

   Each person has up to five minutes to speak at the discretion of the Chair. Comments made during the Public Comment period of the agenda may be on any subject. All remarks shall be addressed to the Historic Preservation Committee as a whole, not to any individual member of the Historic Preservation Committee, of the audience, or of the City Staff. No person, other than members of the Historic Preservation Committee and the person who has the floor, shall be permitted to enter into any discussion, either directly or through a member of the Historic Preservation Committee without the permission of the Chair or Presiding Officer. No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item.

Supporting material is on file and available for public inspection at the City Clerk’s Office, 401 California Avenue, Boulder City, Nevada 89005 and the Boulder City website at www.bcnv.org, as per NRS 241. To request supporting material, please contact the City Clerk Tami McKay at (702) 293-9208 or cityclerk@bcnv.org.

Notice to persons with disabilities: Members of the public who are disabled and require special assistance or accommodations at the meeting are requested to notify the City Clerk by telephoning (702) 293-9208 at least seventy-two hours in advance of the meeting.

This notice and agenda has been posted on or before 9 a.m. on the third working day before the meeting at the following locations:

Boulder City Hall, 401 California Avenue
www.bcnv.org
https://notice.nv.gov/
Item 1 - Minutes

SUBJECT:
For possible action: Approval of the minutes of the May 25, 2022 regular meeting

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>Backup Material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOULDER CITY
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Boulder City Historic Preservation Committee, County of Clark, State of Nevada, was called to order at 5:00 p.m., Wednesday, May 25, 2022, in the Council Chamber, City Hall, by Chairman Linda Graham in due compliance with law, the Charter, and the Agency’s Rules of Procedure.

CONFIRMATION OF POSTING AND ROLL CALL

Members present: Chairman Linda Graham, Members Blair Davenport, Glenn Feyen, Charlie Hauntz and Ray Turner (5)

Members absent: None (0)

Also present: Community Development Director Michael Mays, City Planner Susan Danielewicz, Historic Preservation Consultant Courtney Mooney

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Graham opened the meeting to public comment and announced the phone number to call.

No comments received in person or by phone.

1. For possible action: Approval of the minutes of the April 27, 2022 regular meeting

Motion: Approve the minutes as submitted.

Moved by: Member Feyen Seconded by: Member Davenport
AYE: Davenport, Feyen, Graham, Hauntz, Turner (5)
NAY: None (0)
Absent: None (0)
Motion approved.

2. For possible action: Discussion with North Wind Resource Consulting, LLC on potential changes to the adopted exterior design guidelines for various properties in the Historic District

A staff report had been submitted by Community Development Director Mays and included in the agenda packet.
Courtney Mooney, North Wind Resource Consulting, went through the PowerPoint presentation, summarizing that the approach discussed to date has been that:

- For contributing properties built within the period of significance (1931-1945) any proposed alterations will need to follow adopted design guidelines.
- For everything else (new construction, alterations to non-contributing properties, alterations to properties built outside the period of significance) a Design Within Context (DWC) approach will be used.

Ms. Mooney noted the review process will need to be in the code, but what is typical is that staff would review and approve minor remodels and that the Committee would review major remodels, new construction, demolition and anything else specified in the code. She said the graphics for the DWC approach will note the significant features that would be recommended, without requiring new construction that could create a false sense of history. She noted that for commercial or residential buildings built outside the period of significance, sometimes the buildings will be more unique and there may not be comparable examples elsewhere in the area, and in those cases the context would be the original building design rather than others on the street.

In response to Member Davenport, Director Mays noted that the historic preservation consultant would be considered staff for purposes of staff vs. committee review.

Member Davenport asked about how zoning would apply, such as where the zone would allow two stories but the historic homes are one story.

Ms. Mooney responded that there is typically a zoning overlay for the historic district, and the overlay zone would specify setbacks and stories.

In response to Member Davenport, Ms. Mooney said staff has not yet discussed other features such as streetscapes and lighting. She said the future guidelines and sketches for the DWC approach can include such details if desired.

Member Hauntz said he liked this approach but he had counted 22 home styles mentioned in the 2020 survey update of the historic district, and asked if there would be that many different guidelines, and if they will be grouped by street?

Ms. Mooney said they will group like styles together, so there will be fewer; in some cases there may only be one building in that style. She noted there can be more than one style of home on a street but the contextual aspects will be similar, such as setbacks. She said they will work on a better, interactive map for showing the historic style of each building.

Member Hauntz expressed concern about when changes are done to buildings, and whether it matters if the change was done during or outside the period of significance, as to whether this affects status as contributing or not.

Ms. Mooney said the contextual approach will address the types of changes but not necessarily when the changes were done, as that information is not always available.
Member Davenport understood the reasons for having specific guidelines for contributing buildings built within the period of significance; she asked whether the DWC approach will be sufficient for new infill construction. She said the key issue was that the new work should not adversely affect other properties, not about saving every window.

Member Feyen likened the DWC approach to a “drive by” effect, saying that new buildings should fit in and have the same feel as those around it.

Member Turner asked how the Committee would be involved regarding a historic overlay zone.

Director Mays said the first step was to coordinate the new code with updated guidelines to see if those address all the zoning issues, and if an overlay zone is needed it could be addressed later. He said the current request is to let Ms. Mooney know if this approach for the guidelines is what the Committee wants to proceed with; then she can begin work on specific guidelines. He summarized the current proposal as:

- For contributing properties built within the period of significance, the guidelines will focus on specific architectural features and the goal will be to ensure that alterations don’t change the contributing status of a property to non-contributing.
- For everything else a Design Within Context approach will be used (for non-contributing properties built within or outside the period of significance, and new construction). He also noted that the residential grant program can possibly help owners change a non-contributing property built within the period of significance to a contributing one.

In response to Chairman Graham, Director Mays said the specific guidelines will need to be developed and approved by the City Council.

Member Hauntz asked if only contributing properties will be reviewed by the Committee?

Director Mays responded no, the guidelines would specify what is major or minor remodel work. He said the ordinance will have a decision matrix that lists what items will require approval by the Committee, such as major remodels, new construction, demolition. He noted the guidelines will be more specific for contributing properties and more general if not. He said non-contributing properties would still come to the Committee if they don’t conform to the general guidelines using the DWC approach. He said the next step will be to present a specific example of new guidelines for the Committee’s review.

Members encouraged moving forward with the proposal and thanked Ms. Mooney for her work.

**3. For possible action: Update on implementation of the Committee’s goals and priorities**

A staff report had been submitted by Community Development Director Mays and included in the agenda packet.
Director Mays referred to the monthly report, noting that at last night’s meeting the City Council directed staff to move forward with the proposed amendment to the code for historic resources. He explained that staff will be scheduling the matter for hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council within the next few months, and that all owners in the historic district will be notified of the meetings. In response to Member Hauntz, he said he would discuss with the City Attorney how to address the decision matrix for which items needed review by the Committee vs. staff or the consultant, and that the City Council will make the final decision regarding this.

Member Davenport noted that there were covenants on the former Los Angeles Dept. of Water and Power building due to State funds being used that required SHPO approval. She wondered if there were covenants for the theater and Boulder Dam Hotel and said it would be helpful to see the covenants. Director Mays noted the LADWP building was owned by the City so he would provide a copy of those covenants to the Committee.

4. For possible action: Follow-up discussion regarding activities for Historic Preservation Day and Award for 2022

A staff report had been submitted by City Planner Danielewicz and included in the agenda packet.

Members agreed that the HP Day events on May 14th went well, and thanked staff and the participants for their efforts. Members said that all of the events were well attended except for at the railroad, and Member Hauntz wondered if having an event there earlier in the day will help in the future.

Member Turner noted that Nikki Collins had filmed the panel discussion and that the presentation by UNLV and Dr. Green had also been filmed. He asked if those could be posted on the city website and Director Mays responded that he would check on this.

Member Hauntz said he had spoken to Susan McIntyre, who wanted to express her thanks to the Committee for selecting her home as this year’s award winner.

Member Davenport noted that only one citizen had nominated a property this year, so the Committee should discuss other ways to promote this in the future. Members agreed to start discussion in October for next year’s award and event.

5. For possible action: Discussion/update on the status of properties in the Historic District or other potentially eligible properties

A staff report had been submitted by City Planner Danielewicz and included in the agenda packet.

In response to Member Davenport, Director Mays said he would coordinate with Public Works and per direction of the City Council, the review of additional bistro lighting downtown will be on an upcoming agenda.
Member Davenport thanked the City for replacing the lights on the front of City Hall with a more appropriate historic style.

In response to Member Hauntz, Director Mays said staff will draft guidelines for statues in city parks and this will be on an upcoming agenda.

6. For possible action: Committee discussion regarding potential agenda items for upcoming Historic Preservation Committee meetings

A staff report had been submitted by City Planner Danielewicz and included in the agenda packet.

Director Mays said he would coordinate with Ms. Mooney to see if the guidelines can be on the next agenda. He also noted that there would be no July meeting due to further remodel of the City Council Chamber. In response to Member Davenport, he said an email was sent earlier today with the slides from the CAMP training on May 21st.

7. Public Comment

Chairman Graham opened the final public comment period and announced the phone number to call.

No comments received in person or by phone.

Chairman Graham adjourned the meeting at 6:25 p.m.

______________________________  ______________________________
Linda Graham, Chairman  Susan Danielewicz, City Planner
Item 2 - Design guidelines

SUBJECT:
For possible action: Discussion with North Wind Resource Consulting, LLC on potential changes to the adopted exterior design guidelines for various properties in the Historic District

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTACHMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2 Staff Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda Item No. 2
Historic Preservation Committee Meeting
June 22, 2022

Staff Report

TO: Historic Preservation Committee
FROM: Michael Mays, Community Development Director
DATE: June 22, 2022

SUBJECT: For possible action: Discussion with North Wind Resources Consulting, LLC on potential changes to the adopted exterior design guidelines for various properties in the Historic District

Background:
Several of the goals contained in the city’s 2021 Historic Preservation Plan focus on updating Chapter 27 of the City Code regarding Historic Resources. As the community evaluates proposed changes to Chapter 27, one of the issues identified is the need to update the existing design guidelines to ensure compliance with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards.

The current design guidelines for historic buildings were created by the Historic Preservation Committee between 2009 and 2011 based on information in the 1983 Nomination to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The guidelines do not apply to all homes in the historic district (certain categories and newer homes were left out), and guidelines were created for commercial but not institutional buildings. The design guidelines were reviewed by the Planning Commission and approved by the City Council.

As part of staff conversations with the Committee regarding priorities, the Committee agreed that updating the existing design guidelines in conjunction with potential Chapter 27 changes is a priority for the city’s Historic Preservation Consultant, North Wind Resources Consulting (“North Wind”).

The Committee provided guidance to Ms. Mooney with North Wind at the January 26, 2022, March 23, 2022 and May 25, 2022 meetings. With that feedback, Ms. Mooney has been working on this project and would like to provide updates to the Committee and seek further direction.
**Action Requested:**
That the Committee provide direction to North Wind on potential changes to the design guidelines.

**Attachment:**
1. North Wind Resources Presentation
Boulder City Historic District Design Guidelines for Non-Contributing Resources and New Infill

Presented by North Wind Resource Consulting, LLC to the City of Boulder City Historic Preservation Committee
June 22, 2022
Primary Architectural Styles within the BCHD (1931-1945)

- **Colonial Revival**
- **Minimal Traditional**
- **National Folk**
- **Spanish Revival**
- **Spanish Ranch**
Design Standards for Contributing (1931-1945)

NATIONAL FOLK STYLE

Contributing National Folk Style Properties within the Boulder City Historic District

- Acrone Street
- 304, 306, 318, 508, 514, 536, 541, 561, 569
- Ash Street
- 405
- Autumn Street
- 405, 434, 616, 619, 631
- Birch Street
- 465, 613
- Bellamy
- 469, 513, 515, 538, 619, 636, 641
- California Avenue
- 604, 515, 616, 636, 638, 627, 628, 632, 692, 641
- Colorado Street
- 719, 1555
- Autumn Street
- 606, 616, 623, 646, 647, 649, 650, 654
- Autumn Avenue
- 601, 617, 619, 620, 642, 646, 652
- Autumn Street
- 631, 635
- Autumn Street
- 643
- Paseo
- 155, 171
- Park Street
- 219, 254
- Rand Road Avenue
- 1565, 1566
- Oak Street
- 617

* bolded properties are recommended individually eligible for listing in the NHRP.

The National Folk style was most common for residential construction in the United States from about 1890 to 1910. This style was typically used for mass-produced houses that were relatively simple to construct, and evolved after the expansion of the railroad, which made the transportation of lighter wood across the U.S. easier and less expensive. In Boulder City, the National Folk style was initially popular for the construction of temporary employee housing built by both the Los Angeles and San Bernardino, which the Los Angeles Times of Southern California (1927) also utilized the National Folk style in the construction of single-family cottages to meet the increased employment needs brought about by the war effort. In Boulder City, National Folk style houses typically consist of wood-frame structures built with light-batten or braced-frame framing and sheathed in wood siding. Historically, houses constructed in this style by the Los Angeles were located on consecutive lots on Autumn A, B, C, etc., and Colorado and Avenue St. National Folk style housing constructed by the Los Angeles was concentrated in the area bounded by Wyoming Street on the north, New Mexico Street on the south, Avenue C on the west, and 15th Street on the east; while housing constructed by the Los Angeles was located adjacent to existing LAHA housing along 15th Street from Railroad Avenue to Nevada Highway.

STANDARDS FOR CONTRIBUTING PROPERTIES

- Market style
- Front gables
- Asymmetrical facade
- 3-sided gable roof
- Exposed rafters at gable ends
- Decorative wood siding on porch
- Double hung wood-frame sash windows
- Single story
- Horizontal wood siding on porch
- Front entry

STREETSCAPE STANDARDS FOR RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES

- Maintain
- Parkway
- Setback
- Additions
- Separate garages
- Maintain alley ROW
Boulder City Historic District Style and Context Area Maps
Contextual Design Guidelines for Non-contributing (1931-1945)

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards: New Construction within the Boundaries of Historic Properties (edited)

- Related new construction – including [accessory] buildings, driveways, parking lots, landscape improvements and other new features – must not alter the historic character of a property or the district.

- The location of additions/new construction should be considered carefully in order to follow the setbacks of neighboring historic buildings and to avoid blocking their primary elevations. New construction should be placed away from or at the side or rear of buildings and must avoid obscuring, damaging, or destroying remaining character-defining features of the building and district.

- Protecting the historic setting and context of the district, including the degree of open space and building density, must always be considered when planning new construction on a property within the district.

- The massing, size, scale, and architectural features of new construction (additions) must be compatible with those of the historic building. When visible from the street, additions must be subordinate to the historic building. New construction should also be distinct from the old and must not attempt to replicate historic features found within the district to avoid creating a false sense of historic development. Maximizing the advantage of existing site conditions, such as [landscaped] areas or drops in grade, that limit visibility is highly recommended.
Contextual Design Guidelines for Non-contributing (1946-1972)

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards: New Construction within the Boundaries of Historic Properties (edited)

- Related new construction – including accessory buildings, driveways, parking lots, landscape improvements and other new features – must not alter the historic character of the district.

- The location of additions/new construction should be considered carefully in order to follow the setbacks of neighboring contributing historic buildings and to avoid blocking their primary elevations. New construction should be placed away from or at the side or rear of buildings and must avoid obscuring, damaging, or destroying character-defining features of neighboring contributing historic buildings and the district.

- The massing, size, and scale of new additions and/or alterations must be compatible with those of neighboring contributing historic buildings and the district. When visible and in close proximity to historic contributing buildings, the additions/alterations must be subordinate to these buildings. Additions/alterations should be distinct from the old and must not attempt to replicate historic buildings and features found within the district to avoid creating a false sense of historic development.

- The limitations on the size, scale, and design of additions/new construction may be less critical the farther it is located from contributing historic buildings.

- Maximizing the advantage of existing site conditions, such as landscaped areas or drops in grade, that limit visibility is highly recommended.
Contextual Design Guidelines for New Construction/Infill

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards: New Construction within the Boundaries of Historic Properties

• Related new construction— including buildings, driveways, parking lots, landscape improvements and other new features— must not alter the historic character of the district.

• The location of new construction should be considered carefully in order to follow the setbacks of historic buildings and to avoid blocking their primary elevations. New construction should be placed away from or at the side or rear of contributing historic buildings and must avoid obscuring, damaging, or destroying character-defining features of these buildings or the site.

• Protecting the historic setting and context of the district, including the degree of open space and building density, must always be considered when planning new construction. This entails identifying the formal or informal arrangements of neighboring buildings, lot size, setbacks, building heights, streetscapes, etc.

• In properties with multiple historic buildings, the historic relationship between buildings must also be protected. Contributing buildings must not be isolated from one another by the insertion of new construction.
Secretary of the Interior’s Standards: New Construction within the Boundaries of Historic Properties

- As with new additions, the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of new construction must be compatible with those of the historic district. When visible and in close proximity to contributing historic buildings, the new construction must be subordinate to these buildings. New construction should also be distinct from the old and must not attempt to replicate historic buildings elsewhere within the district to avoid creating a false sense of historic development.

- The limitations on the size, scale, and design of new construction may be less critical the farther it is located from contributing historic buildings.

- As with additions, maximizing the advantage of existing site conditions, such as landscaped areas or drops in grade, that limit visibility is highly recommended.

- Historic landscapes and significant viewsheds must be preserved. Also, significant archeological resources should be taken into account when evaluating the placement of new construction, and, as appropriate, mitigation measures should be implemented if the archeological resources will be disturbed.
Design Review Process as Presented at CAMP

- Applicant submits completed Certificate of Appropriateness Application
- Staff reviews for completeness and may schedule a preapplication conference with the applicant
- Staff reviews routine maintenance, minor work
- Committee reviews large rehabilitation projects, new construction/infill, demolition, and anything else as specified in the ordinance
Item 3 - Monument policy

SUBJECT:
For possible action: Recommendation to the City Council regarding a draft policy for the placement of monuments on City property within the historic district

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:
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<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
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<td>Item 3 Staff Report</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
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<td>Attachment 1</td>
<td>Backup Material</td>
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<tr>
<td>blank page</td>
<td>Backup Material</td>
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</table>
Staff Report

TO: Historic Preservation Committee
FROM: Michael Mays, Community Development Director
DATE: June 22, 2022
SUBJECT: For possible action: Recommendation to the City Council regarding a draft policy for the placement of monuments on City property within the Historic District

Background:
At the April 26, 2022 City Council meeting, the Council directed staff to develop formal city guidelines that would regulate the placement of monuments on city owned property. Before bringing the guidelines back to the City Council for consideration, they further requested that the Parks and Recreation Commission and the Historic Preservation Committee review and provide guidance.

Draft Guidelines Summary:
The Monument Guidelines provide definitions for monuments of city-wide significance and monuments of less than city-wide significance. It provides application review procedures for each and criteria for consideration. A copy of the draft guidelines prepared by staff is provided as Attachment 1.

Action Requested:
That the Committee provide guidance to the City Council regarding the draft Public Monument Guidelines.

Attachment:
1. Draft Public Monument Guidelines
City of Boulder City
Public Monument
Administrative Directive

1. **Purpose:** The purpose of the Public Monument Policy is to establish a process for the placement of Monuments sponsored by individuals and/or groups on City property which is subject to the administrative jurisdiction of the City Manager, whether they are private parties, non-profit organizations or others. For the purpose of this policy, the term “Monument” refers to but is not limited to monuments, memorial plaques, works of art and other fixtures intended to commemorate individuals, groups, events, or concepts.

2. **Policy:** It is the policy of the City of Boulder City to allow for the placement of Monuments sponsored by individuals and/or groups provided that Monuments and their proposed locations are determined to be appropriate, compatible with existing uses, do not adversely impact the use of public spaces, and do not create liability or monetary demands on the City.

3. **Process:** The process for the consideration of the Monument request shall be based on the level of significance associated with the proposed Monument, as determined by the City Manager and further outlined below.

4. **City Code:** All Monuments will be reviewed for compliance with City Code, upon application by applicant in a form approved by the City. If the City Code applies, any approval process set forth in the Code shall be followed instead of the process set forth in this policy, to the extent of any conflict.

5. **Cost:** All costs associated with the permitting, establishment, installation and ongoing maintenance of any Monument subject to this policy shall be paid by the applicant(s). Final approval of any Monument will not be given until all associated costs have been paid in advance or secured in a form and manner approved by the City.

6. **Monuments of less than City-wide significance:** Monuments of less than City-wide significance, as determined by the City Manager, are defined as minor in scope, impact and placement. They include rocks, minor landscape features, and identification or signage which does not create liability or safety issues, and which are unlikely to have any ongoing maintenance costs. These Monuments shall be considered in the following manner:

   A. **Application:** An application that details the proposed Monument shall be submitted to the City Manager. The application shall include information regarding the association, if any, between the subject matter and the City of Boulder City. And, to the extent possible, include other pertinent
information such as size, materials, cost-estimates and suggested locations for placement.

B. **Evaluation:** City staff shall evaluate the application as it relates to the proposed location, compatibility with the surroundings, potential impact on other uses, potential liability, safety and maintenance issues, and shall employ the following criteria:

1. **Appropriateness:** Consideration of the long-term impact of the Monument. Subjects should be of sufficient stature to weather the vagaries of time and changing attitudes. Has the subject proposed for recognition made a contribution to the community.

2. **Compatibility:** How well the Monument integrates with the surrounding environment. Any proposal must be consistent with the Boulder City Municipal Code and any other appropriate policy documents.

3. **Impact on Existing Use:** Proposals that would negatively impact existing uses of public property may be denied on this basis.

4. **Aesthetics:** Aesthetic merit is a primary determinant in the acceptance of Monuments. Proposed Monuments must show a high level of quality. Works of inferior workmanship will not be approved.

5. **Maintenance:** Monuments that are likely to have ongoing maintenance costs will not be approved.

6. **Safety:** Monuments must be safe to passersby, curious spectators (especially children) and the environment as a whole. Sharp projecting elements, loose parts, and other potential hazards which create liability or safety issues will not be approved.

7. **Ownership:** The application shall indicate that the Applicant transfers ownership of the Monument to the City of Boulder City upon the written acceptance of installation by the City.
8. Construction, installation and site preparation of every Monument must be undertaken pursuant to plans and any required permits, all approved by the City of Boulder City.

C. Approval: The City Manager approves or denies monuments of less than City-wide significance.

7. Monuments of City-wide significance: Monuments of City-wide significance as determined by the City Manager, are Monuments which are significant in scope, impact or placement, which are likely to have ongoing maintenance costs or any liability issues, and include memorials, statues, works of art, whether they be free standing or affixed to buildings or other features, commemorating individuals, groups, events or concepts. In addition to the considerations above, these Monuments shall be considered in the following manner:

A. Application: An application that details the proposed Monument shall be submitted to the City Manager. The application shall include information regarding the association, if any, between the subject matter and the City of Boulder City, detailed information such as suggested locations for placement, schematic designs, height, width, total footprint, lighting, landscape, signage, inscriptions, and any other details deemed necessary by the City Manager to assist the City Council in making a fully informed decision.

B. Project Review Committee: After review and consideration, the City Manager will submit the application to the internal administrative Project Review Committee for review and comments. The applicant and/or their representatives will be invited to the Project Review Committee meeting to provide additional information and answer questions.

C. Board and/or Commission Review: The City Manager will determine which Boards and/or Commissions if any, he/she will submit the application for review and recommendation prior to review by City Council.

D. City Council Review: The City Manager shall submit the application, with the recommendations of the Project Review Committee, if applicable pertinent Board’s and/or Commission’s review(s), along with a summary report to the City Council for consideration. In considering the proposed Monument the City Council may consider the following as well as any other criteria it deems appropriate:

1. Appropriateness: Consideration of the long-term impact of the Monument. Subjects should be of sufficient stature to weather the vagaries of time and changing attitude. Has the person, group or event being memorialized made a significant enough contribution to merit a Monument of the scale, cost and visibility of the
proposed Monument? Has the subject proposed for recognition made a contribution to the community? The City, generally, does not permit the installation of Monuments to living persons, and, generally, a minimum of five years from the occurrence of or conclusion of any specific event and its memorialization is required.

2. Compatibility: How well the Monument integrates with the surrounding environment. Multiple monuments for similar or related groups should be avoided. Any proposal must be consistent with the City of Boulder City Municipal Code and any other appropriate policy documents.

3. Impact on Park Use: Proposals that would negatively impact existing park functions may be denied on this basis. The proposed site in the park for the Monument is related to the underlying purpose of the Monument or the site in the park has been designated in a master plan or other approval of the City Council as a particularly appropriate site for a proposed Monument.

4. Aesthetics: Aesthetic merit is a primary determinant in the acceptance of Monuments. Proposed Monuments must show a high level of quality. Works of inferior workmanship will not be approved.

5. Maintenance and insurance: The application shall indicate the manner in which the Applicant will pay in advance, bond or guarantee projected maintenance costs, general liability insurance and property insurance, in a form and amounts approved by the City. Maintenance costs will be projected and required by the City according to the expected life of the Monument and taking into consideration elements of a Monument which are reasonably likely to create extraordinary maintenance costs, including but not limited to water elements.

6. Safety: Monuments must be safe to passersby, curious spectators (especially children) and the environment as a whole. Sharp projecting elements, loose parts, and other potential hazards will result in disapproval of a proposed Monument.

7. Ownership. The application shall indicate that the Applicant transfers ownership of the Monument to the City of Boulder City upon the written acceptance of installation by the City.

8. Construction, installation and site preparation of every Monument must be undertaken pursuant to plans and permits approved by the
E. **City Council Final Approval**: The City Council may decide, in its sole discretion, to accept or reject a proposal for a Monument, to determine the appropriate location for a proposed Monument or take whatever action(s) it deems appropriate. The City Council may impose conditions of approval on any approved Monument in addition to any specified in this policy as are reasonably necessary to protect the public health and safety and including but not limited to a requirement that the applicant be required to pay all installation costs associated with the fabrication, placement and maintenance of the Monument.

F. **Waiver of Intellectual Property Rights**: Applicant and artist creating Monuments shall sign an agreement acknowledging and agreeing that applicant and artist shall expressly waive applicant’s and artist’s rights and shall also sign a general release in a form acceptable to the City Attorney.
Item 4 - Goals and priorities

SUBJECT:
For possible action: Update on implementation of the Committee’s goals and priorities

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 4 Staff Report</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 1</td>
<td>Backup Material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Report

TO: Historic Preservation Committee
FROM: Michael Mays, Community Development Director
DATE: June 22, 2022
SUBJECT: Update on implementation of the Committee’s goals and priorities

Background:
In order to provide the Committee an opportunity to evaluate City progress on the implementation of the Committee’s historic preservation goals and priorities, staff provides monthly a matrix showing recent updates. Updated items are noted in bold.

The Committee’s goals are based on the goals contained in the Boulder City Historic Preservation Plan approved by the City Council on August 24, 2021. At the October 27, 2021 Historic Preservation Committee Meeting the Committee agreed to follow the same goals.

Attachment:

1. Historic Preservation Committee Goals
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>UPDATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Update qualifications for designation listed in section 11-27-3-A of Title 11, Chapter 27 of the City Code</td>
<td>06.30.21 - 12.31.22</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Ordinance Ad Hoc Committee created a draft ordinance and held two workshops with public in June 2021. SHPO provided feedback. Ad Hoc Committee met on 02.15.22 and 03.15.22 and has provided a recommendation to the City Council on a modified SHPO draft ordinance. <strong>City Council on May 24 directed staff to proceed with the text amendment. Planning Commission to consider proposed text amendment in August.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Update the procedure for landmark or historic district recommendations in section 11-27-3-B of Title 11, Chapter 27 of the City Code</td>
<td>06.30.21 - 12.31.22</td>
<td>See 1.1 for update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Implement a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) for alterations and new construction affecting individually designated resources or historic districts.</td>
<td>06.30.21 - 12.31.22</td>
<td>See 1.1 for update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Implement a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) for demolition of individually designated resources and for contributing properties in a historic district.</td>
<td>06.30.21 - 12.31.22</td>
<td>See 1.1 for update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Develop an appeal process for property owners of historic resources who are subject to a demolition or building CoA.</td>
<td>06.30.21 - 12.31.22</td>
<td>See 1.1 for update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Update the executive tasks and powers of the HPC listed in section 11-27-2-B of Title 11, Chapter 27 of the City Code.</td>
<td>06.30.21 - 12.31.22</td>
<td>See 1.1 for update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Develop a minor home repair program for residential properties that will support maintenance and integrity of historic districts and existing housing stock.</td>
<td>01.01.22 - 12.31.26</td>
<td>City Council approved $100,000 for FY22. Committee considered draft guidelines on 10.27.21, 11.30.21 and 01.26.22. City Council approved guidelines on 02.22.22. Staff is promoting the program. Had contact with ten property owners so far.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMITTEE GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Goal Description</th>
<th>Start Date - End Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Update the committee membership to include commissioners with a professional background.</td>
<td>01.01.22 - 12.31.23</td>
<td>At the May 24, 2022 City Council Meeting, Council included as part of its recommendation the inclusion of two ex-official members to be added to new Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Apply CLG funds towards preservation workshops and conferences for commissioners.</td>
<td>01.01.22 - 12.31.26</td>
<td>SHPO approved a $3,000 CLG grant for Boulder City to conduct CAMP in Spring 2022. CAMP scheduled for May 21, 2022. Exploring CLG grant opportunities for Committee training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Conduct a city-wide reconnaissance level survey (RLS) of the City's historic resources.</td>
<td>01.01.22 - 12.31.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Complete a city-wide historic context statement.</td>
<td>01.01.22 - 12.31.25</td>
<td>City Council approved five-year contract with North Wind on 11.09.21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Establish a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for a historic preservation planning consultant.</td>
<td>01.01.22 - 12.31.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Develop a historic preservation easement program overseen by the HPC.</td>
<td>01.01.23 - 12.31.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Establish a process and criteria for the nomination of historic districts lead by a neighborhood, citizen initiative, or other grassroots campaign.</td>
<td>01.01.23 - 12.31.24</td>
<td>See 1.1 for update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Develop a Historic Resources Survey Plan</td>
<td>01.01.23 - 12.31.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Develop land use policies and financial incentives to encourage adaptive reuse of vacant historic buildings.</td>
<td>01.01.23 - 12.31.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Use CLG, federal and philanthropic funds to hire a consultant/nonprofit heritage tourism firm to develop a tailored Heritage Tourism Assessment for Boulder City.</td>
<td>01.01.23 - 12.31.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PRIORITY:
- **HIGH:**
- **MEDIUM:**
- **LOW:**
Item 5 - Public outreach

SUBJECT:
For possible action: Discussion on public outreach to promote historic preservation matters

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 5 report</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Report

TO: Historic Preservation Committee

FROM: Susan Danielewicz, City Planner
Community Development Department

DATE: June 14, 2022

SUBJECT: Discussion on public outreach to promote historic preservation matters

This item was last discussed at the January meeting, at which time members agreed to focus on activities for Historic Preservation Day and bring this item back in June.

From the January 26, 2022 staff report:

At the September 22, 2021 HPC meeting, Chairman Graham said that she had met with Member Turner about preparing videos for City-owned buildings. The proposal was that he would find historic photos of seven buildings, noting who had built the structures, how they are used now, and with stories from locals about them. She listed the buildings as the L.A. water and power building, water filtration plant, Bullock Field hangar, City Hall, police department, parks and recreation building, and water tank. Member Turner would post requests for information on Facebook. She said the goal would be to have the information available on the City website, and the project could be complete by January. Chairman Graham reported that she had been working on an article about the Browder Building (550-554 Nevada Way).

Per the scope of the Committee’s duties per the current City Code, any articles or videos should focus on historic buildings or properties rather than general history.
Item 6 - Status of Properties

SUBJECT:
For possible action: Discussion/update on the status of properties in the Historic District or other potentially eligible properties

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 6 report</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current permit list</td>
<td>Backup Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registry with map</td>
<td>Backup Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blank page</td>
<td>Backup Material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Historic Preservation Committee

FROM: Susan Danielewicz, City Planner
Community Development Department

DATE: June 16, 2022

SUBJECT: Discussion/update on the status of properties in the Historic District and/or other potentially eligible properties

This matter is a standing item on agendas, for the purpose of discussion on properties in the Historic District, or other potentially eligible properties outside the district. According to City Clerk Tami McKay, “general discussion” is not permitted under this agenda item, as all items for discussion must be listed specifically on an agenda. However, discussion specifically related to historic (or potentially historic) properties within or outside the Historic District is permitted under this agenda item, even if the property is not listed on the attached summary. **NOTE: If properties are not listed on the attached summary, the Committee may only have brief discussion on those matters (announcements, updates, questions). If lengthy discussion is desired the item will need to be placed on a future agenda.**

Included with this item is an update on any new or proposed construction within the Historic District. Staff will check permits and with other departments on a monthly basis to update Committee members on construction activities. This is intended for informational purposes only, as most matters will not require formal review by the Committee. Members should also keep in mind that not all citizens inquire as to whether or not a permit is needed before they begin their work, and that the Federal government is not required to obtain permits from the city.

For this list, the attached summary is just for new permit requests since the last monthly report, for properties in the Historic District. In most cases no detail will be provided; permits are available for review in the Community Development Department.

**Attachments:**
HD permit summary
Historic registry addresses with map
Summary of new building permits for properties within the Historic District
May 18 thru June 15, 2022

Key notes for tables below (as to why review by the Committee may not have been needed):
1. Guidelines not yet adopted at the time of the permit.
2. Guidelines do not apply to the subject address.
3. Guidelines do not apply to this type of construction.
4. Guidelines do not apply to this type of construction at this address.
5. Guidelines do not apply to construction that is not readily visible to a public street.
6. As per the adopted guidelines, for most of the Avenue homes (and some homes on Arizona and Park Streets), noncompliance with the adopted guidelines does not result in a permit delay. Permit delays only occur for 1) adding a second story, or 2) changing the roof type/pitch for an enclosed addition visible to the street.
7. Accessory Buildings: As per the adopted guidelines, for certain accessory buildings, noncompliance with the adopted guidelines does not require review by the HPC (structures 120 s.f. in size or less; buildings if not closer to the property line than the house; carports depending on setbacks/lot; gazebos). Also, the adopted guidelines apply to new construction and additions but not remodels.
8. Proposed work complies with the adopted guidelines and/or parameters of the Council resolution of approval (e.g. items which do not require a permit do not require HPC review, guidelines apply only to facades readily visible to street, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Address/Permit</th>
<th>Guidelines adopted?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1409 Denver Street extension – retaining walls</td>
<td>No, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial Address/Permit</th>
<th>Guidelines adopted?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Permits</th>
<th>Guidelines adopted?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historic Registry Addresses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address Range</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>DESCRIPTIVE RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>408 – 1620</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>408 TO WEST END</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 – 526</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619 – 667</td>
<td>Avenue A</td>
<td>600 BLOCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402 – 763</td>
<td>Avenue B</td>
<td>400, 500, 600 &amp; 700 BLOCKS, EXCLUDING 708 &amp; 712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 – 668</td>
<td>Avenue C</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603 – 668</td>
<td>Avenue D</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603 – 668</td>
<td>Avenue F</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 – 555</td>
<td>Avenue G</td>
<td>500 BLOCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avenue H</td>
<td>(500 block, but no buildings there have an address on Avenue H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421 – 537</td>
<td>Avenue I</td>
<td>400 &amp; 500 BLOCKS, EXCLUDING 401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 – 505</td>
<td>Avenue K</td>
<td>500 THRU 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 &amp; 504</td>
<td>Avenue L</td>
<td>500 &amp; 504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 – 540</td>
<td>Birch</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 – 702</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>ALL, EXCLUDING 701 &amp; 751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503 – 560</td>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101 – 1404</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>EAST END TO 1404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 – 557</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>500 PLUS ALL ODD # ADDRESSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Range</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1256 – 1411</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>ALL EXCEPT 1412 &amp; 1415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 – 1312</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>EVEN #’S ONLY IN THIS BLOCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453 – 587</td>
<td>Hotel Plaza</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>Lodge</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>1310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304 – 708</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>304 THRU 708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1109 – 1608</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1109 THRU 1608, EXCLUDING 1407 &amp; 1409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701 – 712</td>
<td>Park Place</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 – 1200A</td>
<td>Park Street</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 – 1505</td>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td>300 THRU 1505, EXCLUDING 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307 – 529</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>300, 400 &amp; 500 BLOCKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 – 1400</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>NORTH SIDE: ALL PROPERTIES BETWEEN NEVADA &amp; UTAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SOUTH SIDE: FROM 909 WYOMING WEST TO NEVADA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Item 7 - Next agenda

SUBJECT:
For possible action: Committee discussion regarding potential agenda items for upcoming Historic Preservation Committee meetings

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

ATTACHMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 7 report</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Report

TO: Historic Preservation Committee

FROM: Susan Danielewicz, City Planner
Community Development Department

DATE: June 14, 2022

SUBJECT: Committee discussion regarding potential agenda items for upcoming Historic Preservation Committee meetings

This is a regular monthly agenda item to provide the Committee an opportunity to discuss agenda items for future meetings. This will help the Committee with planning efforts and will also give staff an opportunity to conduct necessary research and/or explain what resources are needed to successfully present the item for Committee consideration.
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