

**DRAFT MINUTES**  
**Special Meeting**  
**Historic Resources Commission**  
**Thursday, December 11, 2014 ● 5:30 PM**  
**Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada**

**Commission Members**

<b>Chair – Jed Block</b>	<b>Vice Chair – Robert Darney</b>
<b>Commissioner – Elizabeth Dickey</b>	<b>Commissioner – Mike Drews</b>
<b>Commissioner – Gregory Hayes</b>	<b>Commissioner – Donald Smit</b>
<b>Commissioner – Lou Ann Speulda</b>	

**Staff**

Lee Plemel, Community Development Director  
Susan Dorr Pansky, Planning Manager  
Joseph Ward, Senior Deputy District Attorney  
Tamar Warren, Deputy Clerk/Recording Secretary

**NOTE:** A recording of these proceedings, the board’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.

Archived Historic Resources Commission (HRC) meeting recordings are available on [http://www.breweryarts.org/?page\\_id=2645](http://www.breweryarts.org/?page_id=2645).

**A. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM (5:32:55) – A quorum was present.**

Attendee Name	Status	Arrived
Jed Block	Present	
Robert Darney	Present	
Elizabeth Dickey	Present	
Mike Drews	Present	
Gregory Hayes	Present	
Donald Smit	Present	
Lou Ann Speulda	Present	

**B. PUBLIC COMMENTS – None.**

**C. ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**(5:34:50) – MOTION: I move to approve the minutes of the October 9, 2014 special meeting as presented.**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (7-0-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Darney
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Speulda
<b>AYES:</b>	Block, Darney, Dickey, Drews, Hayes, Smit, Speulda
<b>NAYS:</b>	None
<b>ABSTENTIONS</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None

**D. MODIFICATION OF AGENDA – None.****E. DISCLOSURES**

(5:35:14) – Commissioner Drews disclosed that “after the appeal to the Board of Supervisors” he had met and had phone conversations with Herman Bauer “regarding some visual screening and ways that he might be able to tone down parking”. He also noted that he had met with Philip Hersey on November 11, 2014, along with Chairperson Block and Commissioner Hayes, to discuss agenda item F1.

(5:36:11) – Chairperson Block also disclosed that he had a conversation with Mr. Bauer in “September or October”.

**F. PUBLIC HEARING MATTERS****F-1 HRC-14-153 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FROM PROPERTY OWNER PHILIP HERSEY TO CONSTRUCT A DETACHED GARAGE INCLUDING THE INSTALLATION OF ROOF-MOUNTED SOLAR SHINGLES ON PROPERTY ZONED SINGLE FAMILY 6,000 (SF6), LOCATED AT 700 W. TELEGRAPH STREET, APN 003-244-02.**

(5:37:07) – Ms. Dorr Pansky introduced the property and presented the agenda materials, incorporated into the record, accompanied by PowerPoint presentation.

(5:42:20) – Chairperson Block invited the applicants to the podium. Tina Davis Hersey and Philip Hersey introduced themselves and responded to the Commissioners’ questions regarding the materials to be used on the shingle roof, adding that they would be black in color. The Herseys also noted that they had read and agreed with the conditions of approval outlined in the staff report. In response to a question by Chairperson Block, Ms. Hersey noted that they were planning to use shiplap siding. Commissioner Speulda stated that having the solar panels on the roof was a “good idea” and Commissioner Hayes appreciated the use of real wood. Mr. Hersey thanked the Commission for their feedback and explained that it would be more beneficial to receive it prior to the start of a project. He also indicated that he planned to move a tree to accommodate the panels.

There were no public comments.

**(5:49:42) – MOTION: I move to approve HRC-14-153, a request from property owner Philip Hersey to construct a detached garage including the installation of roof-mounted solar shingles on property zoned Single Family 6,000 located at 700 W. Telegraph Street, APN 003-244-02 based on the findings and conditions of approval outlined in the staff report, the Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation, the Carson City Historic District Guidelines and consistent with Historic Resources Commission Policies.**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (7-0-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Drews
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Hayes
<b>AYES:</b>	Block, Darney, Dickey, Drews, Hayes, Smit, Speulda
<b>NAYS:</b>	None
<b>ABSTENTIONS</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None

**F-2 HRC-14-146 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FROM PROPERTY OWNER HERMAN BAUER TO AMEND A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION APPLICATION, HRC-10-102(A), TO ALLOW FOR MODIFICATION OF**

**THE BUILDINGS AND SITE TO ACCOMMODATE ADDITIONAL DWELLING UNITS ON PROPERTY ZONED RESIDENTIAL OFFICE (RO), LOCATED AT 812 N. DIVISION STREET, APN 001-191-06.**

(5:51:12) – Ms. Dorr Pansky presented the agenda materials, incorporated into the record, accompanied by a PowerPoint presentation. She also referred to a letter by Stephen and Cynthia Brenneman on behalf of Mr. Bauer’s neighbors, incorporated into the record, believing that Staff had violated the municipal code by not obtaining approval by the HRC first, and allowing the Planning Commission to approve the Special Use Permit prior to HRC approval. She also clarified that “the start of a project would occur at the building permit stage”, adding that the District Attorney agreed with Staff that no violations of code had occurred in this case.

(5:55:27) – Ms. Dorr Pansky explained that “the density of the project” is strictly a Planning Commission decision, and that of the Board of Supervisors should it be appealed. She also read the duties of the HRC from the Carson City Municipal code for clarification. Ms. Dorr Pansky referred to the agenda materials for the Historic Design Review Guidelines. She then reviewed the conditions of approval outlined in the agenda report and showed examples of new construction in the area, similar in design to the proposed buildings.

(6:31:30) – Vice Chairperson Darney received confirmation that the handicap parking requirement was due to the multi-family nature of the buildings. He also expressed concern that the current proposal was “significantly different” than what was previously approved by the Commission, and encouraged not having “perfectly symmetrical” buildings.

(6:35:37) – Commissioner Smit clarified that the code required the lower portion of the buildings to be “handicap-adaptable” and not accessible, other than the required parking spaces. Commissioner Hayes wished to keep the fruit trees on the property.

(6:37:45) – Commissioner Smit requested clarification on the Commission’s role from the District Attorney’s office. Mr. Ward noted that the Commission held an advisory role to the Board of Supervisors, and read the HRC’s duties from the Carson City Municipal Code (CCMC) Chapter 18.06. Mr. Plemel also clarified that the elements under HRC review did not include zoning. Discussion ensued regarding the proposed density of the buildings.

(6:49:35) – Applicant Herman Bauer introduced himself and thanked Staff for their time with their assistance for the past four years. He also explained that the project architect, landscape designer, and real estate expert were present in the audience.

(6:50:38) – Al Salzano, architect, responded to several questions by Chairperson Block and Ms. Dorr Pansky noted that the Engineering Department had reviewed and approved the plans from an engineering standpoint. Commissioner Hayes and Vice Chairperson Darney were not pleased with the mirror-image buildings and identical rooflines. Discussion also ensued regarding parking garages and spaces. Mr. Salzano explained that each individual unit would have access to a garage, and the upstairs tenant would have to “go outside through the porch”. Commissioner Speulda suggested leaving the apple trees until that location is ready to be built. Discussion ensued regarding the poor care and pruning of the trees.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS** – Chairperson Block suggested keeping testimony at three minutes, and not to repeat what others had already said.

(7:02:06) – Peter Bader, a Carson City resident, was concerned about the “Special Use Permit” that benefited a single person and was opposed by many. He noted that he was opposed to multi-family dwellings. Chairperson Block reminded by Mr. Bader that this Commission could not change any zoning decisions.

(7:05:48) – Alexander Kirsch, neighboring property owner, noted that he was speaking “on behalf of the entire neighborhood” and stated that this item had been “pushed around” between commissions and the scope has changed over the years. He expressed concern that the current parking decisions could affect other dwellings as well and noted that the agreement reached two years ago was “deceitfully arranged” [changed]. Ms. Dorr Pansky explained that the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors had approved the 1.5 parking spaces per unit. Commissioner Smit noted that HRC was not the appropriate venue to discuss parking issues, and suggested the matter be addressed in the Planning Commission.

(7:17:45) – Brenda Dahlquist identified herself as living on the same block, and expressed concern over the “curb and gutter” sidewalks, inquiring how they would be transitioned into the sidewalks in front of their homes. She also questioned the use of a two-car garage by two apartments.

(7:20:43) – Steve Brenneman, owner of Bliss Mansion, expressed disappointment with the Planning Division calling them “a cheerleader for this project”. He believed that lack of storage would cause tenants to use their garages for storage and park their cars on the street. In response to a question by Commissioner Hayes, Mr. Brenneman stated his acceptance of the previously-approved duplexes.

(7:24:52) – Bazel Slaughter, a Historic District resident, believed the project was “out of scale” for the district and urged the Commission to “do what’s right”.

(7:26:41) – Mr. Bader compared the Historic District requirements to the ones of a gated golf course community. He believed this issue “should not have ever come up”. He believed the Commission has “two standards” regarding this item. Chairperson Block encouraged the residents to get involved in the community, adding that he was torn between property rights and the Historic District requirements.

(7:31:03) – Mr. Kirsch stated that should this item “go into [the] favor of the appellant”, it will be appealed because it is “essential to the Historic District”.

(7:34:10) – Commissioner Smit reminded everyone that their task is to approve architecture, massing, landscaping, and materials and wished to “get back on track”.

(7:34:26) – Dr. Thomas Gibbons introduced himself and stated that he had lived in Carson City for 40 years. He expressed his appreciation to “what my neighbors have said about my projects”. He thanked the attendees and the Commission for volunteering their time, and noted his concern in getting along with and obtaining support from his neighbors, which he believed was not the case with this project.

(7:38:42) – Vice Chairperson Darney asked why the design had changed from duplexes and four-plexes. Mr. Bauer stated that the reason was for marketing purposes and that there was a demand for one-bedroom units. He cited examples of the elderly tenants who were downsizing to smaller units. Commissioner Hayes questioned why Mr. Bauer had not come to the HRC first, prior to going to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Bauer explained that they believed the appearance of the building had not changed, therefore, they sought approval from the Planning Commission, adding that the four-plexes would allow fewer people to live in the units. Ms. Dorr Pansky clarified that the reason most requests come to the HRC first because it has no fee associated with it, unlike the special use permit which would require a fee of around \$2,000. Commissioner Drews noted that he disagreed with the density but agreed it was a Planning Commission decision. Commissioner Smit acknowledged the emotion present on both sides and was sympathetic to it; however, he noted that he could not factor that into the decision making process. He expressed his dislike to the density and explained that it had been reduced a little, and the smaller units would result in fewer children, adding that the “mirroring” did not bother him as there was “good articulation”. Commissioner Smit stated that he had seen several references to Art Hanifin’s project, and had observed many similarities to it in this project, noting that “they had done a good job with landscaping” as well, and that he could not object to the project, per the task the Commission was assigned.

regarding approvals and denials. Chairperson Block was pleased that the stucco was gone and that pavers had replaced the concrete.

**(7:49:14) – MOTION: I move to approve HRC-14-146, a request from property owner Herman Bauer to amend the previously approved Historic Resources Commission Application, HRC-10-102 and HRC-10-102(A), to allow for modification of the buildings and site to accommodate additional dwelling units on property zoned Residential Office, located at 812 N. Division Street, APN 001-191-06, based on the findings and conditions of approval outlined in the staff report, the Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation, the Carson City Historic District Guidelines and consistent with Historic Resources Commission Policies.**

(7:50:30) – Commissioner Hayes suggested several additional items such as windows and the status of fruit trees be included in the motion; however, Commissioner Smit wished for his motion to stand as is.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>Denied (3-4-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Smit
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Darney
<b>AYES:</b>	Drews, Smit, Speulda
<b>NAYS:</b>	Block, Darney, Dickey, Hayes
<b>ABSTENTIONS</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None

(7:52:45) – Commissioner Hayes reiterated his point that not adhering to the previously approved duplexes had resulted in the initial appeal and the current results.

(7:54:18) – Mr. Ward read an excerpt from the CCMC and explained that Chairperson Block's entertainment of another motion was correct.

**(7:53:34) – MOTION: I move to approve HRC-14-146, a request from property owner Herman Bauer to amend the previously approved Historic Resources Commission Application, HRC-10-102 and HRC-10-102(A), to allow for modification of the buildings and site to accommodate additional dwelling units on property zoned Residential Office, located at 812 N. Division Street, [APN 001-191-06], based on the findings and conditions of approval outlined in the staff report, the Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation, the Carson City Historic District Guidelines and consistent with Historic Resources Commission Policies, with the additional conditions of approval: the roofline on one of the two units be modified so that they are not mirror images of each other, the windows are either wood clad aluminum or wood, and the living trees on the lot be maintained until second phase is built.**

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

(7:58:32) – Susan Lewis, a next-door neighbor, requested that the Commission revert to “what was agreed upon two years ago”.

(7:59:35) – Commissioner Drews received clarification that a disapproval of the current project does not deny Mr. Bower the higher density project. Ms. Dorr Pansky also clarified that Mr. Bauer could go back to the duplex design anytime.

(8:01:01) – Commissioner Hayes reiterated his request to approve the duplex versus the current design.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>Denied (3-4-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Darney
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Drews
<b>AYES:</b>	Drews, Smit, Speulda
<b>NAYS:</b>	Block, Darney, Dickey, Hayes
<b>ABSTENTIONS</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None

(8:02:17) – Commissioner Drews noted that this was the time to “start exploring an historic district overlay” to avoid “two separate government entities from deciding things on their own”. He gave the example of not being able to discuss density and parking issues. Commissioner Smit agreed. Discussion ensued regarding the limitations of the HRC to decide on the density of the project. Mr. Ward explained that the project would be denied if it does not get an approved.

**(8:07:37) – MOTION: “I move to deny [HRC-14-146] a request from property owner Herman Bauer to amend the previously approved Historic Resources Commission Application, HRC-10-102 and HRC-10-102(A), to allow for modification of the buildings and site to accommodate additional dwelling units on property zoned Residential Office, located at 812 N. Division Street, APN 001-191-06, based on the fact that the project does not support the purpose of Chapter 18.06.015 with regard to density and historic uses within the historic district.”**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (6-1-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Drews
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Hayes
<b>AYES:</b>	Block, Darney, Dickey, Drews, Hayes, Speulda
<b>NAYS:</b>	Smit
<b>ABSTENTIONS</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None

Ms. Dorr Pansky clarified that the applicant (or anyone else) has the option to appeal this decision to the Board of Supervisors, adding that if it is chosen to be appealed, it would be heard by the Board of Supervisors and if not, the motion to deny stands. She also stressed that this denial “does not deny the eight units”, and that Mr. Bauer “can go back to his original duplex, or he can choose to propose a new product type to accommodate the eight units”.

Chairperson Block encouraged everyone to get involved; however, he suggested showing respect and decorum when addressing the topic.

## **G. STAFF REPORTS**

### **PLANNING DIVISION STAFF REPORT TO THE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION.**

(8:11:35) – Ms. Dorr Pansky explained that the 2015 Historic Preservation Fund Grant application had been submitted last Friday for \$75,000.00 with a \$50,000.00 match, for the Nevada State Prison Historic Structures

Reports, adding that the award would be announced in spring 2015. She also noted that she had requested financing for part of the match from the Nevada State Prison Preservation Society.

(8:12:23) – Ms. Dorr Pansky stated that the 2014 grant nomination had been submitted in October, 2014, and that the nomination was being finalized by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). She also noted that the current consultant had chosen “not to move forward on the balance of the contract”; therefore, a new consultant would be sought, and the scope would be modified.

(8:13:28) – Ms. Dorr Pansky notified Chairperson Block that his term would expire in February 2015, and that Commissioners Speulda and Hayes had terms expiring in January 2015, adding that reappointment forms were available under the Volunteer Opportunities tab on the City’s website, for submittal to the City Manager’s Office. Chairperson Block thanked the Commissioners and Staff for all their hard work. Commissioner Speulda thanked Ms. Dorr Pansky for an “excellent job” on both staff reports.

**COMMISSIONER REPORTS/COMMENTS** – None.

#### **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

(8:15:30) – Ms. Dorr Pansky announced that a modification would be discussed in January regarding a Public Works project, and Chair and Vice Chair nominations would be heard. She also reminded the Commission that the Annual Report, and the nominations for the Historic Preservation Awards would be discussed as well.

#### **H. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

(8:18:22) – Mark Palmer gave examples of how the rules and guidelines had changed since he had built his structure on 611 N. Nevada Street pertaining to parking and standards. He also noted that this project had been through 14 public hearings and recommended clarifying each board and commission’s roles. He also thanked Staff and the Commission for volunteering their time.

(8:22:30) – Mr. Kirsch noted that he was never opposed to a development; however, he objected to the magnitude of the project.

**I. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT (8:25:25) – Commissioner Drews moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hayes. The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.**

The Minutes of the December 11, 2014 Carson City Historic Resources Commission special meeting are so approved this 8<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2015.

---

JED BLOCK, Chair