From: Firoze Katrak
To: Michael Behrendt; Karen Edwards
Subject: Suggestions for PB .....
Date: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 11:37:36 AM

Dear Members of the Planning Board and Michael,

A few suggestions for the proposed solar ordinance that you are currently reviewing.

1) Delete (i.e. not allow) "chemical" energy from solar energy definition and from solar energy system definition – keep only thermal and electrical. This is because most chemical energy systems are likely to have higher environmental risks from accidental leakage (such systems may be water based, but may also be based on the use of molten salts, or benzene, etc.).

2) The words "a system mounted on top of free standing car port over a parking lot" as used in definition of Free standing system -- are unclear. What does it mean and are we sure we know what this will allow?

3) Shared solar systems should not be permitted unless by special exception. Such systems are likely to have complex layouts that need to be reviewed and approved. Further, allowing one megawatt size as proposed seems excessive -- the allowable size should be site specific, with some sites justifying only much smaller sizes.

4) Enterprise solar systems should not be permitted any where in Durham. Such systems are likely to have complex layout and intensive use of land (clear cutting trees, etc.). Further, allowing any size as proposed is irrational -- Huge sized systems may be appropriate in "desert-like" settings (e.g. in Nevada), but clearly would be egregiously damaging to Durham's natural landscapes. Do we really want a "Onassis-refinery-like" solar monstrosity in Durham as allowed in current draft? I would suggest not.

5) Concentrating solar power systems, which often use sunlight reflecting mirrors, should not be allowed in any kind of solar system in any setting in Durham. This issue is unaddressed in the draft.

6) A positive aspect in the draft, is that residential Free Standing System will not be allowed in the front yards. In addition to that we should also require that any residential Free Standing System shall be as unobtrusive for neighbors and passers-by as possible. (e.g. where possible have the FSS backed up against trees).

7) The draft allows for residential FSS to be placed in most of our zones with no or minimal reviews beyond building permit. This ignores and puts low priority on any impacts on our natural landscapes. While the draft ordinance has some cursory references to our need to balance need for solar versus preserving Durham's rural character, in effect the proposal has no explicit practical way to limit impact on our rural settings. We should therefore either add requirements to meet some specific , thoughtful standards to limit impacts of residential FSS, or for the time being we should limit residential FSS to very few, may be only 1 or 2, zones.

Thank you.
regards
firoze

FEKatrak@aol.com