

MINUTES
Regular Meeting
Historic Resources Commission
Thursday, September 8, 2016 ● 5:30 PM
Community Center Sierra Room
851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada

Commission Members

Chair – Mike Drews	Vice Chair – Robert Darney
Commissioner – Jed Block	Commissioner – Karyn de Dufour
Commissioner – Gregory Hayes	Commissioner – Donald Smit
Commissioner – Lou Ann Speulda	

Staff

Hope Sullivan, Planning Manager
Susan Dorr Pansky, Special Projects Planner
Daniel Yu, Deputy District Attorney
Tamar Warren, Deputy Clerk

NOTE: A recording of these proceedings, the commission’s agenda materials, and any written comments or documentation provided to the recording secretary during the meeting are public record. These materials are on file in the Clerk-Recorder’s Office, and available for review during regular business hours. An audio recording of this meeting is available on www.Carson.org/minutes.

A. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

(5:31:20) – Chairperson Drews called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m. Roll was called; a quorum was present.

Attendee Name	Status	Absent
Mike Drews	Present	
Robert Darney	Present	
Jed Block	Present	
Karyn de Dufour	Present	
Gregory Hayes	Present	
Donald Smit	Present	
Lou Ann Speulda	Present	

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS

(5:31:27) – Chairperson Drews entertained public comment; however, none was forthcoming.

C. ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JULY 14, 2016 and AUGUST 11, 2016 MEETINGS

(5:31:57) – Chairperson Drews introduced this item. Mr. Yu noted, for the record, that for good cause showing the July 14th minutes were not ready to be submitted for approval at the August 11th meeting. Chairperson Drews entertained a motion to approve the minutes. **Commissioner Hayes moved approval of the minutes. Commissioner de Dufour seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.**

D. MODIFICATION OF AGENDA

(5:32:49) – Chairperson Drews introduced this item, and entertained modifications to the agenda. Ms. Sullivan advised of no requested modifications.

E. DISCLOSURES

(5:33:49) – Chairperson Drews entertained disclosures. Commissioner Block advised that he would abstain from discussion and action on item F-1, and that he would leave the dais until conclusion of the item. Chairperson Drews advised of having met, together with Vice Chairperson Darney, with Architect Darrin Berger to discuss the details of item F-4. Chairperson Drews entertained additional disclosures; however, none were forthcoming.

F. PUBLIC HEARING MATTERS:

F-1. POSSIBLE ACTION ON HRC-16-096 TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FROM JOHN E. AND SUSIE BLOCK (OWNER: SPEAR AND PHILLIPS, LLC) TO CONSTRUCT A WOOD FENCE AROUND THE FRONT YARD; TO REMOVE A MUD ROOM ADDITION ON THE EAST SIDE; TO CONSTRUCT A BRIDGE-LIKE STRUCTURE TO CONNECT THE SECOND FLOOR LANDING TO THE GARAGE ATTIC; TO RE-ESTABLISH A PORCH THAT WAS ON THE SPEAR STREET SIDE; TO REMOVE THE PORCH ROOF ON THE SOUTHWEST SINGLE-STORY PORTION, ALL FOUR OF THE CASEMENT WINDOWS, THE FRONT DOOR, AND CONCRETE STOOP AND STAIRS, AND TO REPLACE WITH TWO DOUBLE-HUNG WINDOWS IN THE ORIGINAL LOCATION, TO ADD A TRANSOM WINDOW ABOVE THE DOOR ON THE PHILLIPS STREET SIDE, AND TO BUILD A THREE FOOT BY 30 FOOT RED BRICK WALL ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE PROPERTY, ON AN EXISTING FOOTING, ON PROPERTY ZONED SINGLE-FAMILY 6,000 (SF6), LOCATED AT 602 WEST SPEAR STREET, APN 003-243-04

(5:35:49) – Ms. Sullivan noted, for the record, that Commissioner Block had previously disclosed a conflict of interest, had recused himself from participating in this item, and was presently seated in the audience. Ms. Sullivan reviewed the agenda materials in conjunction with displayed slides. Ms. Sullivan noted staff's recommendation of approval, based on consistency with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and with the local guidelines.

Chairperson Drews invited Susan Block to the meeting table. (5:41:01) Mrs. Block narrated a PowerPoint presentation which was displayed in the meeting room. In response to a question, Mrs. Block and Mr. Block discussed the proposed fencing material. Mrs. Block acknowledged that full-scale drawings are available. Chairperson Drews advised that the full-scale drawings will be "critical when we sign off on this, if in fact we do, because we need something better than a little 3"x5" blow up to show what we're agreeing to here." Commissioner de Dufour acknowledged this as her concern.

With regard to fencing, Chairperson Darney requested the applicants to "clarify if we're going to have corner posts with caps or if it's just going to kinda just turn the corner ..." In response to a question, Mr. Block advised that the three-foot high brick wall will be straight at both ends, without a pillar.

Mrs. Block acknowledged that the breezeway will connect to the garage at the point of the existing dormer. In response to a question, Ms. Sullivan noted the condition of approval that construction commence within 12 months of the date of any action by the commission. Mrs. Block acknowledged that the siding will match the house. Chairperson Drews advised of the common practice to delineate old siding from new, especially if using similar materials. He suggested a "trim board or something against the house ... [to] break that line."

Commissioner Smit commended the project, but expressed concern that the presentation included images that "aren't connected to the drawings. The drawings don't have the call-outs. It makes it confusing." He expressed the opinion that "a little bit more time could have been spent rather than us sitting here getting clarification ... When we put together a package ... you really need to be very clear with what your objective is and be able to communicate that effectively in the design package rather than standing there at the podium."

Chairperson Drews entertained additional questions or comments of the commissioners and, when none were forthcoming, entertained public comment. When no public comment was forthcoming, Chairperson Drews

entertained a motion. Discussion took place with regard to the appropriate action. In response to a question regarding the two stair cases, Commissioner Speulda expressed the opinion that “it’s its own unit ... and it’s not on the porch anymore. So the porch will be its original size. So you’re putting back the original feature of the house. The other porch is an attachment; it’s not the original building. So, ... it’s separate and it works better for the house than it is right now.” Chairperson Drews suggested that the addition is “historic in its own right ... so it does comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards because you don’t necessarily look at the single time period. You can look at the life history of the house. If there are additions that have occurred after the original construction and they can be considered part of the historic evolution of that house, then restoring ... that small part to that time period does meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.”

Discussion followed and, in response to a question, Mr. Block advised that the “earliest picture ... is 1957 ... We know that the remodel happened ... in 1954. The front porch, everything was rotted out. ... And between 1954 and the 1957 picture, they added aluminum siding and did more terrific things. ... That is the earliest picture. I’ve been to the Historical Society, the UNR Special Collections, the State Museum. I went to Keith Winchester, who’s dad was the last one to own it. I talked to Bobby Winchester. Nobody seems to have pictures. ... that’s the only photo I have.”

In reference to displayed photographs, Vice Chairperson Darney inquired as to the Blocks’ willingness to “turn the steps out toward the garage 90 degrees, instead of going straight out to the street.” Mr. Block advised, “there’s not enough room. ... There’ll be two sets of steps in front but there’s only going to be one stairwell. ... If you turn them 90 degrees, then that’s all the way to the edge of the driveway and walking through that area, between the two structures, becomes a little bit more difficult.” Discussion followed.

In response to earlier comments, Mr. Block apologized for the presentation format. “I was going at it from ‘a picture’s worth a thousand words.’ We can come up with drawings and, by no means, all of this isn’t going to happen over the next two weeks or three months. It’s a work in progress and we still have to go in front of the Building Department for the permits ... So, whatever additional requirements, I’ll get John to draw them up.”

Chairperson Drews entertained additional questions of the commissioners and of the public. When no additional questions were forthcoming, Chairperson Drews entertained a motion. **Vice Chairperson Darney moved to approve HRC-16-066, a request from John E. and Susie Block (property owner: Spear and Phillips, LLC) to construct a wood fence around front yard; to remove a mud room addition on the east side; to construct a bridge-like structure to connect the second floor landing to the garage attic; to re-establish a porch that was on the Spear Street side; to remove the porch roof on the southwest single-story portion, all four of the casement windows, the front door, and concrete stoop and stairs, and to replace with two double-hung windows in the original location; to add a transom window above the front door on the Phillips Street side; and to build a three-foot by 30-foot red brick wall on the west side of the property on an existing footing, on the property zoned single-family 6,000 (SF6), located at 602 West Spear Street, APN 003-243-04, based on the findings and the conditions of approval contained in the staff report, the Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation, Carson City Historic District Guidelines, and consistent with Historic Resources Commission Policies; in addition that the three-foot brick fence on the west property line, determine delineation of architectural details; that a profile of the actual pickets for the picket fence, and their spacing, be provided to the commission, in addition to any corner posts with caps that may be planned; that trim work and other fascial delineations to separate the historic aspect of the original house from the entry to the apartment be done on the front porch; and delineation on the exterior elevations to match the details discussed at this meeting.** In response to a request for clarification, Vice Chairperson Darney requested to see detail drawings “or an accurate photograph that’s a scale large enough to be able to see the details of any architectural significance” for the brick and picket fences. In response to a question, Vice Chairperson Darney expressed a preference for “an actual, detailed dimension drawing of the actual pickets you’re going to purchase or have made.” Chairperson Drews called for a second on the motion. **Commissioner Speulda seconded the motion.** Chairperson Drews entertained additional discussion on the motion and, when none was forthcoming, called for a vote.

RESULT:	APPROVED (6-0-1)
MOVER:	Vice Chairperson Rob Darney
SECONDER:	Commissioner Lou Ann Speulda
AYES:	Drews, Darney, de Dufour, Hayes, Smit, Speulda
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS	Block
ABSENT:	None

Chairperson Drews thanked Mr. and Mrs. Block for their presentation and participation. Chairperson Drews commended the project. Commissioner Block returned to the dais.

F-2. POSSIBLE ACTION ON HRC-16-098 TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FROM BLACK PINE CONSTRUCTION (PROPERTY OWNER: KLP LLC) FOR EXTERIOR RENOVATION OF AN EXISTING BUILDING AND LANDSCAPING, ON PROPERTY ZONED RESIDENTIAL OFFICE, LOCATED AT 1000 NORTH DIVISION STREET, APN 001-181-01

(6:05:41) – Chairperson Drews introduced this item, and Ms. Sullivan reviewed the agenda materials in conjunction with displayed slides. Ms. Sullivan noted staff’s recommendation of approval based on consistency with development standards for historic buildings and new construction “because it’s ... not either one of those.” She explained the requirement for the project to be submitted to the commission “because it’s in the district.” She introduced Applicant Rob McFadden.

Chairperson Drews entertained questions of the commissioners. Ms. Sullivan acknowledged the requirement for the project to be submitted to the commission because of its location within the historic district. She suggested “the one thing you would be on the look-out for is if it tried to morph into something that would confuse the public into thinking it was an historic building. And I don’t think that’s what you have before you.” Discussion followed.

In response to a question, Mr. McFadden advised that “everything that’s above the eaves, we’re going to stucco or replace with ... metal, powdered coated to match the colors that we submitted. ... we’re going to replace not rehab the rotted wood.”

Chairperson Drews entertained additional questions or comments of the commissioners and, when none were forthcoming, public comment. When no public comment was forthcoming, Mr. McFadden offered to display color samples. He stated, “We want to fit in. ... we don’t want to do anything that stands out. And same thing with the roof shingles. We’re probably going with the brown color ...”

Chairperson Drews entertained a motion. **Commissioner Smit moved to approve HRC-16-098, a request from Black Pine Construction (property owner: KLP LLC) to renovate an existing building and install landscaping, on property zoned residential office, located at 1000 North Division Street, APN 001-181-01, based on the findings and conditions of approval contained in the staff report, the Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation, Carson City Historic District Guidelines, and consistent with Historic Resources Commission policies. Vice Chairperson Darney seconded the motion.** Chairperson Drews entertained discussion on the motion and, when none was forthcoming, called for a vote.

RESULT:	APPROVED (7-0)
MOVER:	Commissioner Don Smit
SECONDER:	Vice Chairperson Rob Darney
AYES:	Drews, Darney, Block, de Dufour, Hayes, Smit, Speulda
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS	None
ABSENT:	None

F-3. POSSIBLE ACTION ON HRC-16-095 TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FROM ALPINE SIGNS (PROPERTY OWNER: KLP LLC) TO REMOVE EXISTING SIGN AND REPLACE WITH NEW, DOUBLE-FACED WOOD SIGN WITH MASONRY BASE, ON PROPERTY ZONED RESIDENTIAL OFFICE, LOCATED AT 1000 NORTH DIVISION STREET, APN 001-181-01

(6:14:48) – Chairperson Drews introduced this item, and Ms. Sullivan reviewed the agenda materials in conjunction with displayed slides. Ms. Sullivan noted a correction to the staff report in that the proposed sign will be 27.5 square feet. She noted staff’s recommendation of approval, and introduced Kathy Dietz, of Alpine Signs.

In response to a question, Ms. Sullivan reiterated that the sign is wooden and, therefore, the materials are appropriate. She advised there is no lighting proposed. Chairperson Drews entertained questions of the applicant and, when none were forthcoming, entertained public comment. When no public comment was forthcoming, Chairperson Drews entertained a motion. **Commissioner Smit moved to approve HRC-16-095, a request from Alpine Signs (property owner: KLP LLC) for a new sign, on property zoned residential office, located at 1000 North Division Street, APN 001-181-01, based on the findings and conditions of approval contained in the staff report, the Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation, Carson City Historic District Guidelines, and consistent with Historic Resources Commission policies. Commissioner Hayes seconded the motion.** Chairperson Drews entertained discussion on the motion and, when none was forthcoming, called for a vote.

RESULT:	APPROVED (7-0)
MOVER:	Commissioner Don Smit
SECONDER:	Commissioner Gregory Hayes
AYES:	Drews, Darney, Block, de Dufour, Hayes, Smit, Speulda
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS	None
ABSENT:	None

F-4. POSSIBLE ACTION ON HRC-16-097 TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FROM KEN PEARSON (PROPERTY OWNER: FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH) TO ALLOW THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SIDEWALK AND ROOF STRUCTURE, AND TO ADD A NEW 700-SQUARE-FOOT COVERED WALKWAY, ON PROPERTY ZONED RESIDENTIAL OFFICE, LOCATED AT 115 NORTH DIVISION STREET, APN 003-214-07

(6:17:14) – Chairperson Drews introduced this item, and Ms. Sullivan reviewed the agenda materials in conjunction with displayed slides.

Chairperson Drews invited Architect Darrin Berger to the meeting table. (6:19:30) Mr. Berger narrated displayed slides in presentation of the project details. He thanked Chairperson Drews and Vice Chairperson Darney for meeting with him. Mr. Berger responded to questions of clarification relative to the project details.

Chairperson Drews entertained additional commissioner questions or comments and, when none were forthcoming, entertained public comment. When no public comment was forthcoming, Chairperson Drews entertained a motion. **Commissioner Hayes moved to approve HRC-16-097, a request from Kenneth Pearson (property owner: First Presbyterian Church), to allow the demolition of an existing concrete sidewalk and small roof structure, and construction of a new 700-square-foot covered walkway in the Residential Office zoning district, located at 115 North Division Street, APN 003-214-07, based on the findings and conditions of approval contained in the staff report, the Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation, Carson City Historic District Guidelines, and consistent with Historic Resources Commission policies. Commissioner de Dufour seconded the motion.** Chairperson Drews entertained discussion on the motion and, when none was forthcoming, called for a vote.

RESULT:	APPROVED (7-0)
MOVER:	Commissioner Gregory Hayes
SECONDER:	Commissioner Karyn de Dufour
AYES:	Drews, Darney, Block, de Dufour, Hayes, Smit, Speulda
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS	None
ABSENT:	None

Chairperson Drews thanked Mr. Berger for working with the commission, and commended the project.

F-5. POSSIBLE ACTION ON HRC-16-009 TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FROM JOE AND RUTH HART (PROPERTY OWNERS: JOE AND RUTH HART), TO INSTALL A FENCE IN THE FRONT OF THE HOME, REPLACE THE FRONT PATIO AND DRIVEWAYS WITH PAVERS, AND PERFORM LANDSCAPING, ON PROPERTY ZONED SINGLE-FAMILY 6,000 (SF6), LOCATED AT 502 WEST ROBINSON STREET, APN 003-233-04

(6:28:09) – Chairperson Drews introduced this item, and Ms. Sullivan reviewed the agenda materials in conjunction with displayed slides. Ms. Sullivan pointed out the applicant’s intent to obscure the proposed fencing with landscaping. She noted that the proposed fencing is not consistent with the applicable guidelines, and suggested utilizing “something like a wooden picket fence in lieu of the plastic lattice fence.” She advised of the finding that the proposed landscaping and flatwork is substantially consistent with what is currently in place, with no anticipated impact to the historic district.

(6:33:57) In response to a question, Joe Hart advised that the proposed fencing is four-feet in height. In response to a further question, he described the proposed location of the fence in conjunction with displayed slides. “The hedge would come out and then be replaced with some shrubbery that would go in front of [the fence].” He acknowledged that the fence would not be immediately adjacent to the sidewalk. “It’s set back 17 to 20 feet from the curb and it’s a screening fence actually. It doesn’t close anything in. It runs along the street for ... 25 feet and then there’s a 6 ... or 8-foot section that runs perpendicular to that; just to screen the driveway next door and the street from the patio.” Using a displayed slide, Ms. Sullivan pointed out the building, the patio, the driveway, and the street. Ms. Sullivan responded to questions of clarification in conjunction with the agenda materials.

Vice Chairperson Darney requested to “see this delineated on a plan so that we have no questions about length and height and, probably, ... detail on construction of the fence.” Vice Chairperson Darney expressed no opposition to the criss-cross pattern of the proposed fence, but expressed opposition to vinyl materials. Mr. Hart advised that “all the fences on the property are wooden with a lattice insert.” Discussion followed.

In response to a further question, Ms. Sullivan read into the record Carson City Historic District Guidelines Section 5.24.2. She expressed the opinion that “a fence would be okay but make it a fence that’s consistent with the Guidelines.” She recommended a “wood and picket which is clearly consistent with the Guidelines as opposed to the proposed and it’s a wood trim with plastic lattice inserts.” In response to a further question, Ms. Sullivan advised that if the fence is not opaque, “then it can be four-feet tall pursuant to the fencing regulations and ... condition number two says the fencing in the front of the patio must be picket or post and rail. ... condition number one is the proposed fencing must utilize wood as the material. So essentially, [conditions] one and two, ... let’s follow the Guidelines. ... he can put landscaping there to help obscure it. Discussion followed.

In response to a question, Special Projects Planner Susan Dorr Pansky advised that “in general cases, when you’re looking at the Zoning Code in relation to the homeowners association, if the homeowners association is less restrictive than the Zoning Code, then the Zoning Code is what stands. And that would be the case when you’re looking at the wood. ... tying it to wood is more restrictive than allowing additional materials, including vinyl.

So if there's a conflict there, which there clearly is, the Zoning Code would apply as opposed to the homeowners association." Mr. Yu confirmed the accuracy of Ms. Pansky's statement.

With regard to the vinyl lattice, Commissioner Smit suggested "a continuity issue ... because Art [Hannafin] designed this as a block and ... they've been there a long time and that design is throughout that entire block. So, we're the ones that are ruining the continuity by requiring this picket fence where there's not a picket fence on the entire site. It's all this lattice work. ... It's going to sit back 17 feet and, from what I understand listening to Mr. Hart, he's going to landscape in front of this as well. So, I'm assuming these bushes are going to grow. So, if you were to hold the fence that matches everything else on the site to four-feet high and we look at a plant, and we can define a plant that's going to reach a height of 36" to 42" over a period of time, I don't see a problem with this." Commissioner Hayes pointed out the importance of moving "away from vinyl towards the wood." Mr. Hart suggested "a wooden fence with wooden lattice insert painted white because the plastic is grain. If you stand at the street and look in, you can't tell that it's plastic. But I would be willing to fight the HOA and do a wooden insert. It's in the front of my house. It may not be part of the HOA responsibility. It would be my responsibility. I'd have to maintain that."

Chairperson Drews expressed no opposition to the lattice, "especially in terms of the continuity for that development. It's the vinyl that, when Art [Hannafin] designed that, if we were going through what we're going through now, he wouldn't have used vinyl either. So, if you're willing to use wood lattice the same exposure, paint it white, and make it look ... like the vinyl, I think that works." Vice Chairperson Darney expressed the opinion that when Mr. Hannafin originally built these five houses, there was probably wood lattice in the fence. "... they probably came apart after a while and they replaced them with fiberglass ... The wood is what I'd recommend also." Ms. Sullivan advised that the original plans "did have a detail of the lattice work but they didn't call out a material. ... the lattice definitely was part of the original design."

In reference to Section 5.24.2 of the Historic District Guidelines, Chairperson Drews expressed the opinion that a four-foot open lattice would not obstruct views of the structure. Commissioner Block advised of having conducted research on fencing, "and ... the last thing that's recommended on these old wood fences is paint. What was recommended was an opaque, white stain ... [because] it lasts better and doesn't peel like paint does." Discussion followed.

Commissioner Hayes expressed appreciation for Mr. Hart's willingness to utilize wood lattice, and the hope that the homeowners association will reconsider vinyl materials. Chairperson Drews entertained additional commissioner questions or comments and public comments. When no additional questions or comments were forthcoming, Chairperson Drews entertained a motion, noting a necessary revision to condition of approval 2. **Commissioner Smit moved to approve HRC-16-099, a request from property owners Joe and Ruth Hart, to install a lattice fence, four-feet high, with a drawing to be submitted to staff indicating the post type and the details of attachment of the lattice for administrative approval; to install pavers on the driveway and on the front patio; and to install new landscaping, on property zoned single-family 6,000, located at 502 West Robinson Street, APN 003-233-04, based on the Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation, Carson City Historic District Guidelines, and Historic Resources Commission Policies. Vice Chairperson Darney seconded the motion.** In response to a question, **Commissioner Smit amended his motion to include the conditions of approval with the exception of condition of approval 2. Vice Chairperson Darney continued his second.** Chairperson Drews called for a vote on the pending motion.

RESULT:	APPROVED (7-0)
MOVER:	Commissioner Don Smit
SECONDER:	Vice Chairperson Rob Darney
AYES:	Drews, Darney, Block, de Dufour, Hayes, Smit, Speulda
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS	None
ABSENT:	None

F-6. POSSIBLE ACTION ON SUP-16-094 TO CONSIDER THE INDIRECT VISUAL IMPACTS ON THE HISTORIC DISTRICT OF A VERIZON TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLE PROPOSED TO BE LOCATED ON SOUTH FALL STREET, BETWEEN EAST EIGHTH AND EAST NINTH STREETS, ON PROPERTY ZONED DOWNTOWN MIXED USE, APN 004-053-02

(6:52:40) – Chairperson Drews introduced this item, and Ms. Sullivan reviewed the agenda materials in conjunction with displayed slides. In response to a question, Mr. Yu advised Commissioner de Dufour that if she was not materially affected by participating in this item, there was no need to recuse herself.

Chairperson Drews pointed out that the title page of the assessment indicates “Clark County.” He advised of “issues with their identification efforts of historic properties in that area. They’ve relied on NVCRIS ... and they talk about eligible properties in NVCRIS. There are two historic properties within a block of that structure and within the viewshed. Those are not brought up. They need to be addressed. The Children’s Home is ... across the vacant lot. There are historic portions of that that aren’t addressed. They should also look ... at the parcel records and look for other properties that are more than 50 years old that may be adjacent to that. That’s something that’s definitely missing. Their tower is 84-feet tall. From driving the neighborhood and scaling trees, those trees are 50-feet tall. The Capitol is two stories. The Mint is two stories. The Post Office is two stories. They’re all above the tree canopy. This is going to be 30-feet above the tree canopy and visible to any structure that is taller than two stories or not viewed from ground level. ... in the document, they talk about historic maps and say they could only find the 1966 map. There’s a 1962 GLO plat. There’s an 1891 Carson City 30-minute plat. There are two 1907 and 1923 Sanborn maps that actually show the Sierra Wooden Lumber Company yard ... on that property ... It ran right down Stewart Street. Those need to be addressed. And with those, I think they need to evaluate the archaeological resources that the tower footings may impact as well. ... for the record, those are my concerns and my comments and I agree with [Ms. Sullivan] that it’s not adequate. We can’t address the visual effects because they haven’t really given us the information we need to address those.”

In response to a question, Ms. Sullivan advised that the applicant has submitted a special use permit application. “... and that includes an analysis on coverage and capacity which are the two things they’re trying to achieve.” Ms. Sullivan offered to review the analysis “to see if they’re achieving additional coverage where there’s no need for more coverage ...” She responded to additional questions of clarification, and discussion followed.

Consensus of the commission was that no formal action was necessary. Chairperson Drews entertained public comment. Michelle Ellis, of Complete Wireless Consulting on behalf of Verizon Wireless, discussed various design options, and the reason for the proposed height. With regard to the historic properties, she offered to produce additional photo simulations, and requested the commissioners’ input on the proposed tower design. In response to a question, Ms. Ellis advised of having considered several State buildings. “The problem is that the State would not agree to longer than a two-year lease. Verizon needs a 25-year lease term, minimum.” Ms. Ellis explained that a primary purpose of the proposed facility is “to provide inbuilding coverage to the buildings across the street. And so, the closer to those, the better.”

In response to a comment, Chairperson Drews advised that Section 106 requires the Commission to consider adverse effect and the method by which to mitigate that. He expressed the opinion that the Planning Commission should understand the treatments that would be more compatible with the historic resources. “In terms of the Section 106 review that we’ve been asked to conduct, the next step is determining a project effect on the cultural resources and then coming up with a way to mitigate it. The way you mitigate it is with that stealth design.” Chairperson Drews suggested that the water tank design would be the most compatible with the historic theme of the old rail yard and the Sierra Wooden Lumber Company. Commissioner Block suggested that the fencing should also be consistent with the historic theme. Chairperson Drews thanked Ms. Ellis, and offered to provide his comments to Ms. Sullivan.

F-7. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION ON HRC-15-070 TO CONSIDER TRAINING PRIORITIES FUNDED BY THE 2016 HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND GRANT PROJECT RELATED TO FUNDING RECEIVED FOR A COMMISSION ASSISTANCE MENTORING PROGRAM THROUGH THE NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF PRESERVATION COMMISSIONS

Chairperson Drews introduced this item. Ms. Pansky reviewed the agenda materials, and responded to questions of clarification. Discussion took place to determine the priorities. Chairperson Drews entertained additional commissioner questions or comments and, when none were forthcoming, entertained public comment. When no public comment was forthcoming, Chairperson Drews entertained a motion. Following additional discussion, **Commissioner Speulda moved to select the following topics for the Commission Assistance and Mentoring Program to be hosted in 2017 by the Carson City Historic Resources Commission as a part of its 2016 Historic Preservation Fund grant: Standards and Guidelines; Preservation Planning for Local Commissions; Preservation Incentives and Benefits; Building Public Support; Design Review Exercise Workshop; and Window Restoration Workshop. Vice Chairperson Darney seconded the motion.** Chairperson Drews entertained discussion on the motion, and Ms. Pansky responded to questions regarding proposed dates. Chairperson Drews called for a vote on the pending motion.

RESULT:	APPROVED (6 – 0 – 1)
MOVER:	Commissioner Lou Ann Speulda
SECONDER:	Vice Chairperson Rob Darney
AYES:	Drews, Darney, Block, Hayes, Smit, Speulda
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTION:	Commissioner Karyn de Dufour
ABSENT:	None

F-8. DISCUSSION ONLY REGARDING HRC-16-068 TO CLARIFY THE 2005 DESIGN GUIDELINES TO IDENTIFY DISCOURAGED MATERIALS CARRIED OVER FROM THE JULY 14, 2016 MEETING

Chairperson Drews introduced this item, and Ms. Sullivan reviewed the agenda materials. Commissioner Hayes expressed the opinion that vinyl windows should be included in the list. Commissioner Smit suggested clarifying “metal” windows, and discussion ensued. Vice Chairperson Darney suggested also including modified density fiberboard (“MDF”) siding and trims. Following a brief discussion, Chairperson Drews suggested focusing on fencing and requested staff to continue this item to the next commission meeting.

F-9. DISCUSSION ONLY REGARDING HRC-16-061, POTENTIAL 2017 HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND GRANT PROJECTS

Chairperson Drews introduced this item, and Ms. Sullivan reviewed the agenda materials. Commissioner de Dufour advised that the grant applications will likely not be available until November. Chairperson Drews discussed the successful partnerships with other agencies. Following discussion, consensus was to pursue the Carson City Blue Line Maintenance, Historic Building Markers, and Historic District Street Sign Toppers. Commissioner de Dufour cautioned that the wording of the project would make it ineligible for funding. Chairperson Drews requested staff to reagentize this item for the next commission meeting.

G. STAFF REPORTS

PLANNING DIVISION STAFF REPORT TO THE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION

Ms. Sullivan advised that there was no written report. Discussion took place regarding the importance of complete applications with supporting materials.

COMMISSIONER REPORTS/COMMENTS

Commissioner Block reported that the Free Notes Harmony Park for the Brewery Arts Center was ordered yesterday.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Chairperson Drews entertained suggestions for future agenda items, and consensus was that the matter had been previously covered.

H. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chairperson Drews entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

I. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made, seconded, and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

The Minutes of the September 8, 2016 Carson City Historic Resources Commission meeting are so approved this _____ day of November, 2016.

MIKE DREWS, Chair