

## **CARSON CITY HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION**

### **Minutes of the July 14, 2005 Meeting**

**Page 1**

A regular meeting of the Carson City Historic Resources Commission was scheduled for 5:30 p.m. on Thursday, July 14, 2005 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

**PRESENT:** Chairperson Michael Drews  
Richard Baker  
Robert Darney  
Rebecca Ossa  
Peter Smith  
Louann Speulda

**STAFF:** Walter Sullivan, Planning and Community Development Department Director  
Jennifer Pruitt, Senior Planner  
Kathe Green, Assistant Planner  
Kathleen King, Recording Secretary

**NOTE:** A tape recording of these proceedings is on file in the Clerk-Recorder's Office, and is available for review during regular business hours.

**A. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM (1-0007)** - Chairperson Drews called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Roll was called; a quorum was present. Vice Chairperson Lopiccolo was absent. Commissioner Ossa arrived at 5:35 p.m.

**B. ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES - June 9, 2005 and June 22, 2005 (1-0012)** - Commissioner Darney moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner Speulda seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

**C. MODIFICATION OF AGENDA (1-0023)** - Chairperson Drews advised of having been informed that item F-2 may need to be deferred until later in the meeting as the applicant was traveling from California. Ms. Pruitt advised that item F-5 should be deferred to a future meeting.

**D. PUBLIC COMMENTS (1-0038)** - None.

**E. DISCLOSURES (1-0043)** - Chairperson Drews advised of having met with Katy Vazquez to discuss her project. (1-0176) Chairperson Drews advised of having participated in a telephone conference call with Joyce Harrington regarding item F-1.

### **F. PUBLIC HEARING ACTION ITEMS:**

**F-1. HRC-04-082 ACTION REGARDING AN APPLICATION FROM JOYCE HARRINGTON REGARDING GUARDRAIL INSTALLATION, ON PROPERTY ZONED RESIDENTIAL OFFICE (RO), LOCATED AT 408 WEST ROBINSON STREET, APN 003-236-01 (1-0052)** - Ms. Pruitt narrated photographs of the proposed railing and the subject property. She provided background information on this item.

## CARSON CITY HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION

### Minutes of the July 14, 2005 Meeting

#### Page 2

(1-0090) Joyce Harrington provided background information on the proposed railing, and described proposed alterations to the design as depicted in drawings included in the agenda materials. She displayed and described sample colors of proposed powder coating.

Commissioner Baker advised that the designs included in the agenda materials have spaces which are larger than allowed by Code. Of the two options depicted in the drawings, he expressed a preference for the round ball top. Commissioner Smith agreed with Commissioner Baker's concern over the spacing, and discussion took place with regard to possible modifications. Ms. Harrington responded to questions regarding the origin and estimated age of the railing. Commissioner Darney agreed with an earlier comment that wrought iron would be more appropriate than wood, and that ball tops would be better than the existing hooks.

In response to a question, Ms. Pruitt advised that the handicap lift is proposed to be installed on the northern façade. Ms. Harrington acknowledged having a sufficient amount of the original railing for the entire front porch. Commissioner Ossa expressed the opinion that the proposed railing appears more art nouveau than art deco. She described the architectural style of the house with very refined classical lines, and the proposed railing as whimsical. She expressed the opinion that the proposed railing does not fit architecturally with the building. Chairperson Drews agreed, but suggested that the railing could have been added in the 1930s. Commissioner Darney agreed that the railing may be whimsical, but suggested adding pieces to "tone down the whimsical and keep the lines simple." He reiterated a preference for ball tops, and suggested adding pieces to the railing "in a simple fashion." Ms. Harrington advised she would consult with City Building Department staff regarding Code requirements for spacing.

Additional discussion took place with regard to spacing requirements and the method by which to modify the railing. Commissioner Ossa expressed a preference for removing the existing hooks. She inquired as to other alternative tops which would more appropriately mirror the dentil work on the building. Commissioner Darney suggested a beveled square top, and discussion took place with regard to the same. Chairperson Drews circulated a drawing to the other Commissioners, who concurred with the proposed modifications subject to Building Department approval.

In response to a question, Chairperson Drews advised that the stair railing designs would have to mimic the porch railing. **Commissioner Smith moved to approve HRC-04-082, a request from Joyce Harrington to allow wrought iron railing installations, as modified by the drawing prepared at this meeting and submitted into the record, for the front and side porches as applied for in the application, subject to the Building Code requirement with regard to spacing on the railings as applied to the front porch and the stairs, and otherwise as written in the form of the motion proposed by staff with the conditions of approval. Commissioner Speulda seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-1.**

**F-2. HRC-05-109 ACTION REGARDING AN APPLICATION FROM CLEARWIRE / VELOCITEL (PROPERTY OWNER: TRUST FOR METHODIST DEVELOPMENT) TO ALLOW THE ADDITION OF WIRELESS ANTENNAS TO AN EXISTING BUILDING, ON PROPERTY ZONED RESIDENTIAL OFFICE (RO), LOCATED AT 400 WEST KING STREET, APN 003-205-01 (1-1630) -** Ms. Pruitt explained that the proposal was to co-locate the antennas. She advised that, with the Commission's approval, the application would be submitted to the administrative permit review process. She referred to the staff report, and noted the mature trees surrounding the building.

## **CARSON CITY HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION**

### **Minutes of the July 14, 2005 Meeting**

**Page 3**

She requested the applicant to address whether or not the trees will hinder the proposed antenna placement. She narrated pertinent slides.

In order to provide the applicant an opportunity to project photo simulations, Chairperson Drews recessed the meeting at 7:08 p.m. He reconvened at 7:15 p.m.

Charnel McCall, of Clearwire / Velocitel, pointed out the proposed locations for the antennas. She advised that Clearwire flush mounts antennas and color matches them to the building. She further advised that as long as there are no trees directly touching the building, there will be no problem with interference. She acknowledged that the antennas will be installed flush with the roofline and will not stand above it. In response to a further question, she explained that each of the antennas are required to be set at a specific rad center in order to communicate with other antennas in the network. At this particular location, the rad center is such that the antennas are required to be installed slightly lower to be more in line with the edge of the building rather than with the penthouse.

Ms. McCall noted that the antennas are for wireless internet rather than cell phone use. In response to a question, she advised that an equipment shed, which houses electronics, will be installed on the ground. The Clearwire equipment cabinets are approximately 3'x2'x3', and sound emissions are roughly comparable to a household refrigerator. In response to a question, Ms. McCall provided dimensions of the antennas. She responded to additional questions regarding the antenna installation, and the equipment cabinet location. She advised that the cables will be run on the interior of the building. She acknowledged that a 12" color-matched dish will be installed on top of the penthouse. Ms. Pruitt acknowledged that the views from the Brewery Arts Center and the Methodist Church will be the most impacted. She advised of the understanding that the dish will not be visible because of the existing parapet.

Commissioner Ossa advised she would recuse herself from action on this item because of the Section 106 review through the State Historic Preservation Office. In response to a question, she explained Section 106 review requirements. Ms. McCall advised that all FCC licensing is already in place. Discussion followed.

Chairperson Drews called for public comment and, when none was forthcoming, entertained a motion. **Commissioner Smith moved to approve HRC-05-109, a request from Clearwire / Velocitel in the form of the motion presented by staff with the eight conditions of approval. Commissioner Speulda seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0-1, Commissioner Ossa abstaining.**

**F-3. HRC-05-072 ACTION REGARDING AN APPLICATION FROM KATY VAZQUEZ TO ALLOW A ROOM ADDITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF A TWO-CAR GARAGE, ON PROPERTY ZONED RESIDENTIAL OFFICE (RO), LOCATED AT 1013 NORTH NEVADA STREET, APN 001-183-01 (1-0650)** - Ms. Pruitt provided background information on this item and noted, for the record, the written comments from an adjacent neighbor expressing concern over the proposed setback. She advised of having informed the applicant of the 20-foot setback requirement pursuant to the Carson City Municipal Code ("CCMC"). She suggested the project may have to be modified if the required variance is not approved. Ms. Pruitt further noted that the subject site is less than 6,000 square feet, and that the applicant is proposing a 3,900 square-foot, single family residence. In planning terms, she advised that the proposed addition will cause the site to be overbuilt. With regard to a variance, the applicant will

## **CARSON CITY HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION**

### **Minutes of the July 14, 2005 Meeting**

**Page 4**

be required to show a hardship and demonstrate the appropriate findings. Ms. Pruitt expressed the hope that the Commission would be able to review the application and make a decision regarding the proposed architecture and style. She advised the applicant will need to address the condition of approval pertaining to the setback.

Chairperson Drews suggested that the written comments of the adjacent property owner would be more appropriately addressed to the Planning Commission. Ms. Pruitt agreed, but advised of the adjacent property owner's familiarity with the Commission's role and of his desire to ensure his comments were entered into the record. In response to a question, Ms. Pruitt advised that the applicant would have to decide to modify her plan and resubmit it to the Commission if the variance is not approved.

(1-0715) Steven David, representing the applicant, advised of having modified the previous plan pursuant to the recommendations the Commissioners provided at the May 12, 2005 meeting. With regard to the setback, he expressed the opinion the proposed addition "would not be out of the ordinary for a home in this area. There are many homes in this area that have no setback, including the adjacent property owner that registered this ... objection." Mr. David advised of a structure on the adjacent property that is "actually encroaching on [the applicant's] property." In response to a question, Ms. Pruitt advised the proposed setback is 9'2".

Ms. Pruitt agreed there are properties, specifically in the historic district, which don't meet current Code requirements for setback. There are also some structures which are over property lines. Ms. Pruitt explained that the current CCMC requires 20 feet. Mr. David acknowledged that the subject lot is small, and explained that the applicant reduced the size of the structure by eliminating a proposed bedroom. He expressed a willingness to meet with the adjacent property owner. Commissioner Smith advised of having read the adjacent property owner's written comments, and noted no formal objection to the proposed plans. Mr. David suggested it would be reasonable to allow a 9'2" setback since the adjacent property owner "has an actual structure that's encroaching on [the applicant's] property."

Chairperson Drews reviewed revisions to the proposed design as depicted in the agenda materials. He expressed the opinion that the applicant had effectively scaled down the design as requested by the Commission. Mr. David speculated that the kitchen addition was constructed in the last 30-50 years. Commissioner Speulda commended the applicant on reducing the scale and massing of the proposed addition.

Mr. David responded to questions regarding the roof line. In response to a comment, Chairperson Drews referred to the proposed carriage-style garage door included in the agenda materials. Commissioner Darney suggested repeating the west elevation shutter detail on the windows over the garage doors. Mr. David agreed, and expressed a preference for operable shutters. Commissioner Darney expressed appreciation for the scaled-down version of the proposed addition. Mr. David acknowledged the entire roof will be redone in conjunction with the project. Commissioner Darney expressed a preference for square windows in the carriage-style garage doors. Mr. David discussed the intention to install a 3'-wide sidewalk around the whole house, and Ms. Pruitt suggested contacting the Engineering Division first.

In response to a comment regarding the elevation drawings and the roof line, Mr. David advised of the need to redraw the elevations "because they don't accurately show what's going to be there." Commissioner Smith explained the importance of the Commission understanding exactly what is being submitted for

## **CARSON CITY HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION**

### **Minutes of the July 14, 2005 Meeting**

#### **Page 5**

approval. In response to a comment regarding the roof line, Mr. David advised of the intent to “lower the plate line to allow those rafters to plane down.” Chairperson Drews suggested a 10 and 12 pitch for the dormers. In response to a question, Mr. David reiterated the need to “clean up … [the] drawings.” In response to a comment, he expressed a preference to match the trim on the proposed addition with the existing. He responded to questions regarding the floor plan. Commissioner Ossa suggested dropping the roof line a bit to provide a visual differentiation between the historic structure and the proposed addition. Commissioner Darney agreed, and suggested using the same pitch but dropping the roof line a couple feet to differentiate between the two. Discussion to clarify the suggestions followed.

With regard to the north elevation, Chairperson Drews suggested repeating the existing windows for the kitchen and over the garage. Commissioner Ossa referred to Commissioner Darney’s earlier suggestion to repeat the shutter detail. Mr. David reiterated his agreement. He suggested the trim should match the fascia boards, and expressed a preference to “keep everything consistent” with the historic structure. He responded to additional questions regarding the floor plan.

Chairperson Drews expressed concern over the number of additions to the proposed plans, and inquired as to the applicant’s time frame. Mr. David proposed that the Commission make changes by redlining a set of drawings, and that he would redraw and resubmit the plans. He advised he would visit with the neighbor and members of the Planning Commission in the meantime.

Ms. Pruitt advised that the adjacent property owner’s contact information was included in the agenda materials. She encouraged the applicant to contact him, and to meet with a member of the Planning and Community Development Department staff to discuss the variance. She advised that the variance process is not simple, and offered staff’s assistance with the variance application which would then be submitted to the Planning Commission for review.

Discussion took place with regard to the bump out and its associated gable on the west elevation. Mr. David reiterated the suggestion that the Commission indicate modifications by redlining a set of drawings. In response to a comment, Ms. Pruitt reiterated that a variance application would be required to be submitted to the Planning Commission for review. Mr. David expressed a preference to not meet with the Planning Commission “on an official basis.” He stated that if this project “is not going to happen, then I don’t want to waste your time.” Commissioner Darney explained the Commission and staff were not trying to make things difficult for the applicant. He noted the inadequacies in the drawings, and explained the Commissioners were required to review the details in order to take action. He expressed the opinion that the suggestions offered were “fairly minor,” and advised that the variance application was not under the Commission’s purview.

Chairperson Drews expressed the opinion that the Commission was in favor of the proposed revisions submitted at this meeting. He explained “it’s a long process, we want to get it right, and that just takes some time;” that marking up the plans and ironing out the details will serve everyone quite well. Chairperson Drews suggested the variance application process will most likely be more contentious. He expressed a willingness to provide redlined drawings. Ms. Pruitt requested the Commission to provide the redlined drawings to staff, and advised that the minutes would be consulted in order to ensure the stated suggestions were included. She emphasized that it was not the City’s intent for an applicant to keep resubmitting plans. She offered to assist the applicant in providing a copy of the plans. In response to a comment, Ms. Pruitt reviewed the time table associated with the next meeting. She reiterated the

## CARSON CITY HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION

### Minutes of the July 14, 2005 Meeting

#### Page 6

importance of the applicant meeting with Planning and Community Development Department staff to discuss the variance application. She advised of having informed the applicant, at the May 12, 2005 Commission meeting, of the need to meet with Planning and Community Development Department staff, but that the applicant had never followed through with scheduling a meeting. She further advised of having contacted the applicant with regard to the variance, and of the need to meet with staff. There was no reason to postpone presentation of the application to this Commission, but Ms. Pruitt advised "the variance has always been a serious issue."

At Commissioner Ossa's suggestion, the Commissioners reviewed the proposed modifications and marked the plans, as follows: Indicate on the plans the window sizes. With regard to the east elevation, change the pitch of the dormer and drop it back. With regard to the west elevation, the french doors look fine. Try to match the window sizes with the existing windows; change the dormers to 10 and 12 or 12 and 12; cut back the gable end eaves to match the overhang of the existing building; unless the bump out exceeds the eave, it's not necessary to put a gable on the roof line at that point. With regard to the south elevation, show the drop between existing roof line and the extension, and bring the dormer back so that it's not overhanging the eave. Mr. David acknowledged that the existing windows on the south elevation would remain. In response to a question regarding the three-over-threes on the addition, Commissioner Darney indicated no problem because it is located in the corner of the property. With regard to the north elevation, match windows; drop the roof line; for the kitchen, rather than have eight panes, use two sets to match; repeat shutters; the same over the garage; and trim back the dormer and eaves. Chairperson Drews requested the applicant to call out trim to match existing.

Ms. Pruitt advised she would take the marked up drawings and provide a copy to the applicant. In response to a question, she explained that this Commission has no purview over the variance application. This Commission's approval of the plans would be forwarded to the Planning Commission. Chairperson Drews requested the applicant to visit the Planning and Community Development Department to pick up the redlined drawings. He thanked the applicant and Mr. David for their patience.

Chairperson Drews called for public comment and, when none was forthcoming, entertained a motion. **Commissioner Darney moved to continue this item. Commissioner Baker seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.**

**F-4. ACTION REGARDING HISTORIC DISTRICT GUIDELINES, DIVISION 5, OF THE CARSON CITY DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (1-1932)** - Ms. Pruitt advised that Planning and Community Development staff had been working on getting the guidelines into the proper format for submission to the Planning Commission at their July 27<sup>th</sup> meeting. If the Planning Commission approves the amendments to the guidelines, they will be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors. Ms. Pruitt invited the Commissioners to attend the Planning Commission meeting and/or provide written comments in support of the proposed amendments. She requested submission of written comments as soon as possible.

Mr. Sullivan suggested a joint meeting between this Commission and the Board of Supervisors at the time the proposed amendments are submitted for review. Discussion followed, and Chairperson Drews suggested considering a date and then polling the Commissioners. In response to a question, Ms. Pruitt discussed the importance of the Commissioners' attendance at the July 27<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting

## **CARSON CITY HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION**

### **Minutes of the July 14, 2005 Meeting**

**Page 7**

to provide comments and answer questions, if necessary. Chairperson Drews committed to attending. Mr. Sullivan advised that a specific time could be established for the Planning Commission item. Chairperson Drews called for public comment; however, none was provided.

#### **F-5. HRC-05-020 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPLICANT(S) FOR THE POSITIONS OF BUILDING / DESIGN PROFESSIONAL AND ACTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPOINTMENT OF APPLICANTS - Deferred.**

**F-6. DISCUSSION REGARDING MASTER PLAN GOALS AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES (1-2055)** - Ms. Pruitt advised that this item will continue to be reagendized until all the Commissioners' comments are submitted. She provided background information on this item, and requested the Commissioners to submit comments. She advised that Mr. Plemel has been working on the master plan update for some time now. His intent is to ensure the Commissioners have sufficient time to provide comments before the master plan recommendations are forwarded to the Board of Supervisors. Ms. Pruitt advised that Mr. Plemel will present an update at a future Commission meeting. Chairperson Drews requested the Commissioners to review the information included in the agenda materials, and provide comments to Ms. Pruitt or Mr. Plemel.

**G. FUTURE COMMISSION ITEMS (1-2109)** - Chairperson Drews reviewed the tentative agenda for the August meeting. He advised of having discussed with Mr. Sullivan the possibility of scheduling design review sessions with applicants. A brief discussion followed.

#### **H. INTERNAL COMMUNICATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

**H-1. COMMENTS AND STATUS REPORTS FROM STAFF (1-2225)** - Mr. Sullivan distributed, to the Commissioners and staff, an article entitled *Aircraft As Cultural Resources*.

**H-2. COMMENTS AND STATUS REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS (1-2257)** - Chairperson Drews thanked Planning and Community Development staff for their work on the guidelines.

**I. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT (1-2267)** - Commissioner Baker moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:41 p.m. Commissioner Speulda seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

The Minutes of the July 14, 2005 meeting of the Carson City Historic Resources Commission are so approved this 11<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2005.

---

MICHAEL DREWS, Chair