PREFACE

The City of Rapid City was awarded the status of a Certified Local Government under the Department of the Interior National Park Service in June of 1986. The Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission functions as the local body committed to the execution of the State and Federal CLG programs.

The 2011 Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Annual Report submitted herein fulfills the annual report requirements for the CLG program.

Staff support for the Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission is provided by the Rapid City Community Planning and Development Services Department, 300 Sixth Street, Rapid City, South Dakota 57701, (605) 394-4120.

MISSION STATEMENT

The City of Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission was established by Ordinance 1502 in March of 1975. By ordinance, the Commission is assigned several different purposes or functions. These functions can be summarized as preserving historic buildings and archeological sites through public education, policy development, advocacy and governmental participation. More specifically, the Commission is to conduct surveys of local historic properties, promote and conduct educational and interpretive programs on historic properties within the City, and recommend ordinances and provide information that will promote the preservation and restoration of historic properties and districts.
FUNDING

The City of Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission receives program funding from the City of Rapid City, the National Park Service through the South Dakota State Historic Preservation Office, and private donations.

City funding is typically in the form of staff support. The City of Rapid City provides support through staff assistance. In 2011 staff assistance was provided to the Commission through two main positions: Planner II and Administrative Assistant. In 2011, 641.5 hours of staff time were dedicated to Historic Preservation Commission support by the Community Planning and Development Services Department. This equates to an estimated $23,250.43 in staff support.

In 2011, 358.5 hours of Commission time was dedicated to Historic Preservation Commission support by the Commission members and includes hours directed to the Black Hills Home Show. This equates to an estimated $4,121.66 in Commission support.

Program support was received from the National Park Service through the South Dakota Historical Preservation Center. The 2011/2012 Federal grant support in the amount of $16,000.00 was directed to the following projects:

- $275.00  Membership
- $1,500.00 Postage, Notices, Printing, Program Administration
- $2,225.00 Workshop/Education Materials
- $12,000.00 Design Guidelines

No private donations were received by the Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission during 2011.
COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP

By ordinance the Commission is composed of ten (10) members, each serving a three-year term. The membership of the Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission as of the end of 2011, their roles on the Commission and professional interests are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Professional Interest</th>
<th>Term of Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pat Roseland</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>December 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Kessloff</td>
<td>Medical - Finance</td>
<td>December 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Sogge</td>
<td>Restoration Contractor</td>
<td>December 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Grable</td>
<td>Finance-W.Blvd Business Owner</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Krull</td>
<td>Design/Construction Management</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara Pier</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Matson</td>
<td>West Blvd Property Owner</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Eric James</td>
<td>Academic - Education</td>
<td>December 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane Baumgartner</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>December 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Knox</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>December 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOALS OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

In 2011, the Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission reviewed and reaffirmed the goals and objectives established for 2010. To support and secure the continuing advancement of historic preservation in the City of Rapid City the Commission formulated the following goals for 2011 and beyond.

- Pursue grant funds for the purpose of re-surveying boundaries of the West Boulevard Historic District and the Downtown Historic District.

- Pursue grant funds to survey the areas adjacent to the West Boulevard Historic District which may contain eligible structures.

- Develop a comprehensive listing of qualified funding sources to include application filing deadlines and qualifying criteria for each funding source to be utilized by the Commission in meeting the growing demands for their assistance and direction with nomination and restoration projects.

- Develop more effective methods of public education.

- Develop media contacts.

- Identify buildings of historic importance and promote their restoration.

- Continue to expand the existing library of historic preservation materials.

- Pursue the creation of a façade protection ordinance.

- Support amendments to the City of Rapid City Sign Ordinance to enhance historic signage in the Downtown Commercial Historic District.

- Pursue the development of Design Guidelines for the West Boulevard Historic District.

- Execute thorough 11.1 Reviews of remodeling and demolition projects within the historic districts or their environs.

- Develop Incentive Program for Restoration
2011 OBJECTIVES

Many of the 2011 goals are ongoing and will continue to be pursued in 2012 and future years. Therefore, the twelve goals listed earlier remain the principal goals of the Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission. To satisfy these goals, the following objectives were established for 2011.

• Continue with Phase IV of the photographic archives project whereby reproductions of historical photographs and negatives housed in public and private collections are created both via hard-copy and electronically.

• Pursue State CLG and Survey grant funds to fund preservation activities

• Conduct a preservation exhibit at the Black Hills Home Show and/or other events

• Monitor progress on the SHPO model historic preservation ordinance for possible future application to Rapid City

• Update Tax and Economic Incentive Brochures

• Continue with the Design Guidelines for the West Boulevard Historic District
2011 PROJECTS

The following list represents the major projects undertaken by the Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission during 2011.

YEAR 2011 HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

In February, the Historic Preservation Commission met with a newly formed non-profit group called Historic Rapid City. Historic Rapid City was created to seek grants and tax deductible contributions for historic preservation and to provide architectural services. The meeting established ways that the two groups could work together to provide education and awareness of historic preservation in our community. Two members of the Historic Preservation Commission are members of Historic Rapid City.

The Historic Preservation Commission, with the continued perseverance of the chairman, Pat Roseland, completed the restoration of a two-sided antique clock with stained glass fronts, originally located on the First National Bank Building at 631 Main Street. The clock was restored through the help of Rosenbaum’s Signs, The Clock Shop, and the current building owner. The dedication and re-installation of the clock on the building at 631 Main Street took place on May 21, 2011.

The Historic Preservation Commission participated with the State Historic Preservation Office in drafting minor revisions within the Historic Preservation sections of the South Dakota Codified Law. The law, adopted in the 2011 Legislative session, provides consistency in reviewing projects between the State and the City.

Nore Winter and Company was selected for a multiple phase contract to provide Design Guidelines for the West Boulevard Historic Preservation District. A workshop was held in May 2011 to obtain input from the property owners. On June 14, 2011, the Historic Preservation Commission reviewed and approved the Outline for the Design Guidelines as Phase I of the project. The 2011-2012 CLG grant funds will provide draft guidelines as part of Phase II of the project. Phase III, the final adopted plans, will be requested as part of the 2012-2013 CLG Grant.
YEAR 2011 BLACK HILLS HOME SHOW BOOTH
Historic Preservation Commission

For the eleventh year, the Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission staffed a booth at the Black Hills Home Show from March 25, 2011 through March 27, 2011. This event satisfied the “public workshop” requirement of the 2010/2011 CLG grant. The Home Show was considered to be a successful means of educating the general public on preservation issues and the Commission again elected to participate in the 2012 Black Hills Home Show.

The Historic Preservation Commission provided various historic photo displays in the booth dedicated to the history of Rapid City. An antique vehicle, donated by Scott Sogge of the Historic Preservation Commission, was on display and attracted the attention of Home Show visitors to the booth.

In addition to the historic photo display, the Historic Preservation Commission provided a variety of information at the 2011 Home Show booth including but not limited to: Walking Tour Brochures, Historic District maps, 11.1 Review Guidelines, Financial Program information, and Renovation techniques. Additionally copies of the Farrar, Journey Museum, Rapid City Journal, Swedlund and Roseland historic photographs were reproduced by the Commission and displayed at the event.

Year 2010/2011 CLG grant funds were used to assist in paying for the booth space.

The Historic Preservation Commission again secured two adjoining booths for the 2012 Black Hills Home Show. The additional space will be again utilized to expand the Historic Preservation materials and displays. Year 2011/2012 CLG Grant funds were utilized in paying for the 2012 booth space.
"Celebrating America’s Treasures" was the theme of the month long national celebration of Historic Preservation Month for 2011. The Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission celebrated Historic Preservation Month with a proclamation presented by Mayor Alan Hanks at the May 2, 2011 City Council meeting. In addition, Mayor Hanks presented the Norm Nelson Preservation Awards to ISIS Corporation for their preservation work on the Hotel Alex Johnson and to Fred Thurston, Architect, for his continued work in the field of historic preservation.

The media and public were invited to the May 21, 2011 dedication of the re-installation of the antique clock at the First National Bank building located at 631 Main Street.

The West Boulevard Design Guideline Workshop was held May 12, 2011, to coincide with the May Preservation Month. An overview of the project, along with some basic principles of preservation, was given by Nore Winter and Company. The attendees broke into groups to work on identifying key features and design issues for the West Boulevard District. Their visions for the neighborhood were submitted to Nore Winter to be compiled into an outline for the design guidelines. The Outline for the Design Guidelines was adopted by the Historic Preservation Commission on June 14, 2011 and acknowledged by the City Council on September 6, 2011.
Executive Proclamation
Rapid City, South Dakota
Office of the Mayor

WHEREAS, historic preservation is an effective tool for managing growth and sustainable development, revitalizing neighborhoods, fostering local pride and maintaining community character while enhancing livability; and

WHEREAS, historic preservation is relevant for communities across the nation, both urban and rural, and for Americans of all ages, all walks of life and all ethnic backgrounds; and

WHEREAS, it is important to celebrate the role of history in our lives, and the contributions made by dedicated individuals in helping to preserve the tangible aspects of the heritage that has shaped us as a people; and

WHEREAS, "Celebrating America’s Treasures" is the theme for National Preservation Month 2011 by the National Trust for Historic Preservation,

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Mayor Alan Hanks, do proclaim May 2011 as

Historic Preservation Month

in Rapid City, and call upon the people of Rapid City to join their fellow citizens across the United States in recognizing and participating in this special observance.

Alan Hanks, Mayor
Rapid City, South Dakota
YEAR 2011 11.1 REVIEW APPLICATIONS
Historic Preservation Commission

One of the main responsibilities of the Historic Preservation Commission is the processing of SDCL 11.1 Review applications in accordance with the Joint Powers Agreement.

During 2011, the Commission reviewed 35 Residential and 49 Commercial individual SDCL 11.1 Review applications. These applications included properties in the West Boulevard Historic District, the Downtown Historic District, Individually Listed Properties and properties lying within the environs of the West Boulevard Historic District, the Downtown Historic District, and Individually Listed Properties.

The SDCL 11.1 Review Report provided in Appendix “B” summarizes the 84 individual SDCL 11.1 Review requests addressed by the Commission during 2011. Included in the report is the formal action taken by the Commission and their determination of adverse or non-adverse impact.

Applications for building signs for properties located within the West Boulevard Historic District, Downtown Historic District and Individually Listed Properties are referred to the Historic Sign Review Committee for disposition in accordance with the Joint Powers Agreement. Commission member Roseland provides representation to the Historic Sign Review Committee. During 2010, the Historic Sign Review Committee reviewed 40 sign applications. Information on these applications is also provided in Appendix “B”.

MEETINGS AND ATTENDANCE

Twenty-three (23) regular meetings and two (2) special meetings of the Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission were held in 2011. The following attendance log provides a comprehensive listing of attendance records for the Commission members. All of the projects, goals, and accomplishments of the Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission were discussed at some point during the year at a regular or special Commission meeting. To permit a full review of the discussion pertaining to any Commission matter, a complete set of the 2011 meeting minutes are provided in Appendix “C” of this report and on-line at the following web address: http://www.rcgov.org/Growth-Management/hcp-home-page.html

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Roseland</th>
<th>Sogge</th>
<th>Baumgartner</th>
<th>Kessloff</th>
<th>Grable</th>
<th>Pier</th>
<th>Krull</th>
<th>Mason</th>
<th>James</th>
<th>Knox</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/7/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/20/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/18/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/23/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/18/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/15/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/20/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/3/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/14/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/17/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/15/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/5/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/19/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/16/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/4/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/2011</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX “A”

Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission

West Boulevard Historic District Design Guidelines
West Boulevard
Historic District Design Guidelines

Public Workshop Agenda - May 12, 2011

6:30 PM  Introduction
Design Guidelines Project Overview
• Introductions
• Scope Overview and Schedule

6:45 PM  Historic Preservation Overview
• Preservation Programs Overview
• Benefits of Preservation
• Basic Principles of Preservation
• Neighborhood Tour & Character

7:10 PM  Hands On Activity!
#1 Define the Neighborhood Character (Group -15 minutes)
#2 Identify Key Building Features (Group -15 minutes)
#3 Identify Design Issues (Group- 10 minutes)
#4 Vision of the Neighborhood (Individual Postcard - 10 minutes)

8:00 PM  Summary of Input
Participants report findings

8:20 PM  Questions & Answers

8:30 PM  Adjourn

For more Information contact:
Karen Bulman
Growth Management Dept.
300 6th Street
Rapid City, SD 57701

(605) 394-4120
karen.bulman@rcgov.org

Consultants:
Winter & Company
1285 Yellow Pine Ave
Boulder, CO 80304
303-440-8445
www.winterandcompany.net
West Boulevard
Historic District Design Guidelines

HPC & Staff Agenda - May 13, 2011

Start-up
Design Guidelines Project Overview
- Introductions
- Scope Overview
- Potential Schedule

Design Guidelines Issues
- What works currently?
- What are the key issues that should be addressed?
- Where could more clarity be provided?
- Are there new topics that should be provided?

Crafting the Design Guidelines Document
- Develop an outline
- Review the proposed document format provided by consultants.

Additional Questions and Comments

For more information contact:

Karen Bulman
Growth Management Dept.
300 6th Street
Rapid City, SD 57701

(605) 394-4120
karen.bulman@rcgov.org

Consultants:
Winter & Company
1265 Yellow Pine Ave
Boulder, CO 80304
303-440-8445
www.winterandcompany.net
West Boulevard
Historic District Design Guidelines

Focus Group Agenda - May 13, 2011

Start-up
Design Guidelines Project Overview
- Introductions
- Scope Overview
- Potential Schedule

Design Guidelines Issues
- What works currently?
- What are the key issues that should be addressed?
- Where could more clarity be provided?

Additional Questions and Comments

For more information contact:

Karen Bulman
Growth Management Dept.
300 6th Street
Rapid City, SD 57701

(605) 394-4120
karen.bulman@rcgov.org

Consultants:
Winter & Company
1265 Yellow Pine Ave
Boulder, CO 80304
303-440-8445
www.winterandcompany.net
Community Workshop!

Design Guidelines for West Boulevard Historic District

The City of Rapid City is embarking on a project to develop Design Guidelines for the West Boulevard Historic District. The guidelines are intended to assist property owners in developing projects in the district that will preserve historic resources, accommodate change and maintain the character of the district.

This project is anticipated to be a multi-year undertaking, to be completed in the following steps:

1) Set the Stage
2) Develop Draft #1
3) Develop Final Document

In this session we will introduce the project and collect feedback from citizens in a hands-on workshop. We will discuss preservation principles and identify preservation issues.

Please Join Us!!!

Date: May 12, 2011

Time: 6:30 PM to 8:30 PM

Location: 1011 11th Street
Room 111
Rapid City, South Dakota
Design Guidelines Outline for the West Boulevard Historic District

Rapid City, South Dakota

July 1, 2011

Submitted by:
Winter & Company
Introduction
In this Chapter:

Part I: Overview
A. Background
B. Preservation Goals
C. Basic Preservation Theory
D. Preservation Principles
E. Choosing an Approach Glossary
F. Planning a Preservation Project

Part II: Design Review System
A. West Boulevard Historic District
B. Background of Design Guidelines
C. Determining Compliance with the Guidelines
D. Which Guidelines Apply?
E. Policies Underlying the Design Guidelines
F. Components of Design Guidelines
G. Applying for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)

This chapter introduces the design guidelines and describes how and when they should be used in the community.
Introduction

Part I: Overview

A. Background
There are these benefits of being in a Historic District:
• Livability and Quality of Life
• Economic Benefits
• Adaptability
• Environmental
• Construction Quality
• Building Construction

B. Preservation Goals
The design guidelines address the following goals from the Future Land Use Plan 7/17/08:
• Identify and manage in the public interest’s unique cultural and historic areas within Rapid City.
• Improve, maintain, and enhance the cultural and historic character, and the integrity of Rapid City’s built and natural environment, through responsible land use planning.
• Protect historic and cultural resources by preventing encroachment by incompatible commercial and industrial uses and excessively high density residential development.

C. Basic Preservation Theory
These are the reasons why and how a property is determined to be historic:
• The Concept of Historic Significance
• Period of Significance
• Concept of Integrity
• Alterations

D. Preservation Principles
There are these preservation principles for the Historic District:
• Respect the historic character of the building.
• Seek uses that are compatible with the historic character of the building.
• Protect and maintain significant features and stylistic elements.
• Preserve any existing original site features or original building materials and features.
• Prepare deteriorate historic features and replace only those elements that cannot be repaired.

E. Planning a Preservation Project
When planning a preservation project, it is important to determine the significance of the property and the degree to which it retains its integrity as a historic resource. Then a specific approach to the overall treatment of the property should be established. The steps in planning a preservation project are presented in this section.

Determine Building Approach
Step 1: Determine Building Significance
Step 2: Determine the Building Integrity
Step 3: Define Program Requirements
Step 4: Determine the Overall Treatment Strategy for a Building Using the Following Treatments:
• Preservation
• Restoration
• Rehabilitation
• Reconstruction

Determine Treatment for Individual Building Features
A treatment strategy for key features of a historic building is then determined. A combination of treatments may be appropriate on one building. The following treatments appear in the order of preference:
Treatment 1: Preserve
Treatment 2: Repair
Treatment 3: Reconstruct
Treatment 4: Replace
Treatment 5: Compatible Alteration
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of work:</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Chapter 1: Rehabilitation Guidelines</th>
<th>Chapter 2: General Design</th>
<th>Chapter 3, Guidelines for New Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Alteration of a “contributing property” in the Historic District</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work on a “non-contributing” property in the Historic District</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work on an “individually listed National Register Property” in the Historic District</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. New infill and construction in the Historic District</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A blank box indicates that the chapter does not apply.
Part II: Design Review System

A. Background of Design Guidelines
• What are Design Guidelines?
• Why have Design Guidelines?

B. Working with the Historic Preservation Commission
Use these “tips” for getting a faster approval.
Step 1. Consider professional design assistance.
Step 2. Check other city regulations.
Step 3. Become familiar with the design guidelines.
Step 4. Review the site context.
Step 5. Develop a design concept using the guidelines.
Step 7. Prepare complete submittal application for formal 11.1 review that includes appropriate documentation, such as:
Rehabilitation-
• Photographs existing & historic
• Existing & proposed elevation & plan drawings (dimensioned)
• Existing & proposed material descriptions/changes
• Existing a & proposed site plan (dimensioned)
• Color samples
New Construction-
• Photographs existing site and context
• Proposed elevation & plan drawings (dimensioned)
• Site Plan (dimensioned)
• Material list

C. Path to a “Successful” Project in the West Boulevard Historic District
Consider the following case studies of successful projects in the district:
• Case Study A
• Case Study B
D. Determine Which Guidelines apply?
Use this diagram to determine chapters of the design guidelines that apply to a proposed improvement project. The following property types are addressed:
• Contributing Property
• Non-Contributing Property
• National Register Individual Listing
• New Infill and Construction

E. Policies underlying the design guidelines
The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Properties are general rehabilitation guidelines established by the National Park Service. It is the intent of this document to be compatible with these standards.

F. Components of Design Guidelines
Each design guidelines typically contains a series of components, all of which are used by the City in determining appropriateness: A typical guideline is illustrated here.

Also the following references are made throughout the document. These are publications issued by the Nation Park Service. You may obtain these reports from the National Park Service website at: www.nps.gov/history/preservation/htm.

“Click on Publications”
• Preservation Briefs
• Preservation Tech Notes
Chapter 1

Rehabilitation Guidelines for Historic Properties
This chapter focuses on rehabilitation guidelines for historic buildings. The guidelines are divided into sections discussing the overall character-defining features, the materiality of those features and the individual building features. Guidelines also address special considerations regarding historic residential resources.
Chapter 1
Rehabilitation Guidelines for Historic Properties

A. Architectural Details

Architectural details contribute to the character of a structure. Specific types of details are associated with specific architectural styles. Select an appropriate treatment that will provide for proper preservation of significant features. The method that requires the least intervention is preferred.

1.1 Preserve significant stylistic and architectural details.

1.2 Repair deteriorated features.

1.3 When disassembly of a historic element is necessary for its repair, use methods that minimize damage to it.

1.4 Use technical procedures for cleaning, refinishing and repairing an architectural detail that will maintain the original finish.

1.5 When reconstructing an element is impossible, develop a new design that is a compatible interpretation of it.

1.6 Replace an architectural element accurately.

1.7 Avoid adding details that were not part of the original building.

B. Materials and Finishes

Primary historic building materials should be preserved in place whenever feasible. If the material is damaged, then limited replacement which matches the original should be considered. These materials should never be covered or subjected to harsh cleaning treatments. Preserving original building materials and limiting replacement to only pieces which are deteriorated beyond repair reduces the demand for, and environmental impacts from, the production of new materials and thus is sound sustainability policy.

Primary historic building materials found in Rapid City include wood, stone, brick, and stucco. These guidelines apply to all such materials:

1.8 Preserve original building materials.

1.9 Repair deteriorated primary building materials.

1.10 When replacing materials on primary surfaces, match the original material in composition, profile, scale and finish.

1.11 Do not use synthetic materials, such as aluminum, vinyl or panelized brick, as replacements for primary building materials.

1.12 Covering original building materials with new materials is inappropriate.

1.13 Consider removing later covering materials that have not achieved historic significance.


Brief 16. The Use of Substitute Materials on Historic Building Exteriors.

Brief 33. The Preservation and Repair of Historic Stained and Leaded Glass.


Brief 47. Maintaining the Exterior of Small and Medium Size Historic Buildings.
Cleaning Materials and Methods

1.14 Use the gentlest means possible to clean the surface of a structure.


Wood

Wood was used historically for exterior siding, trim and ornamental details. Early woodwork should be retained, and, if necessary repaired. Traditional wood framing and cladding will usually be very desirable. Contemporary replacement wood is unlikely to have the same resilience. When properly maintained, wood has a long lifespan. To preserve external wood, maintain its painted finish.

1.15 Protect wood features from deterioration.

Tech Notes – Exterior Woodwork No. 1: Proper Painting and Surface Preparation. Sharon Park, AIA. (1986)

Masonry
Masonry includes stone, brick and stucco. These exist as building walls and site walls. Early masonry should be retained, and, if necessary repaired. When properly maintained, masonry has a long lifespan.

1.16 Brick or stone that was not painted historically should not be painted.

1.17 Repoint mortar joints where there is evidence of deterioration.

Preservation Brief 2. Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Brick.


Preservation Brief 38. Removing Graffiti from Historic Masonry.


Paint
Historically, most wood surfaces on the exterior of a building were painted to protect them from weathering. Concrete and stucco structures also were sometimes painted.

1.18 Plan repainting carefully.

1.19 Using the historic color scheme is encouraged.


C. Individual Building Features

Windows

The character-defining features of a historic window, its distinct materials and its location should be preserved. In addition, a new window should be in character with the historic building.

1.20 Preserve the functional and decorative features of a historic window.

1.21 Preserve the position, number and arrangement of historic windows in a building wall.

1.22 Preserve the size and proportion of a historic window opening.

1.23 Preserve the historic ratio of window openings to solid wall on a primary facade.

1.24 Match a replacement window to the original in its design.

1.25 In a replacement window, use materials that appear similar to the original.

1.26 Match, as closely as possible, the profile of the sash and its components to that of the original window.


Doors
The character-defining features of a historic door and its distinct materials and placement should be preserved. In addition, a new door should be in character with the historic building.

1.27 Preserve the decorative and functional features of a primary entrance.

1.28 Maintain the original proportions of a significant door.

1.29 When a historic door is damaged, repair it and maintain its general historic appearance.

1.30 When replacing a door, use materials that appear similar to that of the original.

1.31 When replacing a door, use a design that has an appearance similar to the original door, or a door associated with the building style.

1.32 If energy conservation and heat loss are a concern, consider enhancing the energy efficiency of the door instead of replacing it.

Roofs

The character of a historical roof should be preserved, including its form and materials, whenever feasible.

1.33 Preserve the original roof form of a historic structure.

1.34 Preserve the original eave depth of a historic structure.

1.35 Preserve original roof materials.

1.36 New or replacement roof materials should convey a scale and texture similar to those used traditionally.

1.37 Avoid using conjectural features on a roof.

1.38 Minimize the visual impacts of skylights and other rooftop devices.

1.39 If they are to be used, metal roofs should be applied and detailed in a manner that is compatible with the historic character and does not distract from the historic appearance of the building.

Porches
A porch is one of the most important character-defining elements of a facade. It provides visual interest and influences perceived scale. Preserve a porch in its original condition and form.

Repair a deteriorated porch instead of removing or replacing it. This approach is preferred because the original materials contribute to its historic character. Even when replaced with an exact duplicate, a portion of the historic building fabric is lost; therefore, such treatment should be avoided when feasible.

If necessary, replace a missing porch with one that appears similar to that seen historically. The first step is to research the history of the house to determine the appearance and materials of the original porch. The most important aspects of a replacement design are its location, scale and materials. Unless reconstructing a porch from historic documentation, it is not necessary to replicate the details of the original porch or a porch design copied from a similar style house. It is important that new details be compatible (similar form, scale and materials) for the design of the porch and the style of the house.

1.40 Preserve the original porch, when feasible.

1.41 Repair those elements of a porch that are deteriorated.

1.42 If a porch has been altered, consider restoring it back to its original design.

1.43 When replacing a porch is necessary, it should be similar in character, design, scale and materials to those seen traditionally.

1.44 Porch supports should be of an appropriate size to complement the entry and existing structure.

1.45 A new porch should use materials similar to those seen historically.

_Preservation Brief 45. Preserving Historic Wooden Porches._
C. Special Considerations

Additions to Residential Properties
An addition should be compatible with the primary structure and not detract from one's ability to interpret its historic character.

1.46 A new addition should respect the mass and scale of the original structure.

1.47 Place an addition at the rear of a building or set it back from the front to minimize the visual impacts.

1.48 The roof form of a new addition should be in character with and subordinate to that of the primary building.

Historic Additions
Some early additions may have taken on historic significance of their own. One constructed in a manner compatible with the original building and associated with the period of significance may merit preservation in its own right. These existing additions should be evaluated for potential re-use.

In contrast, more recent additions that detract from the character of the building should be considered for modification or removal.

1.49 Preserve an older addition that has achieved historic significance in its own right.


Secondary Structures
Preserving the historic fabric along an alley in a historic district is important. This includes sheds, garages and carriage houses. They are traditionally subordinate in scale and character to the primary structure and are typically located to the rear of the lot. These features should be retained.

1.50 Preserve an existing secondary structure when feasible.
Adaptive Reuse
Converting a building to a new use that is different from that which its
design reflects is considered to be “adaptive re-use.” For example,
converting a residential building to an office is adaptive re-use. A
good adaptive re-use project retains the historic character of the
building while accommodating its new function.

1.51 Seek uses that are compatible with the historic character of
the building.

Accessibility
Where it applies, owners of historic properties should comply to the
fullest extent possible with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
provisions, while also preserving the integrity of the character-defining
features of their buildings and sites.

1.52 Generally, creating an accessibility solution that does not al-
ter a building’s historic integrity is encouraged.


D. Energy Efficiency
Building Design
Improvements to enhance energy efficiency and energy collection
should be planned to retain and complement the original building.

1.53 Retain and enhance the energy efficiency of the original
building.

1.54 Enhance the energy efficiency of original windows and doors.


Preservation Brief 24. Heating, Ventilating, and Cooling Historic Build-
ings: Problems and Recommended Approaches.
Site Design
Site designs, including landscapes and structures, should take advantage of microclimatic conditions for energy conservation. Consider solar and wind exposure in design decisions.

1.55 Design landscapes and site features to promote energy efficiency.
Chapter 2

General Design Guidelines
This chapter covers general design guidelines for all projects. It includes a variety of topics that may arise in rehabilitation projects, new building designs and site improvements.

In this Chapter:

A. Street Patterns
B. Streetscape
C. Site Design
D. Other
Chapter 2
General Design Guidelines

This chapter contains general design guidelines that may affect the character of both new infill and historic properties.

A. Street Patterns

Historic settlement patterns seen in street and alley plans often contribute to the distinct character of the historic district and therefore they should be preserved. These street plans influence the manner in which primary structures are sited and they also shape the manner in which secondary structures and landscape features occur.

2.1 Respect historic settlement patterns.

B. Streetscape

Maintain the traditional character of the streetscape and landscape in the public right-of-way. This includes a rich collection of varying street designs, sidewalk types and mature trees.

2.2 Continue the use of planting strips along the public right-of-way.

2.3 Continue the pattern of street trees in the public right-of-way.

2.4 Preserve and maintain mature trees along the public right-of-way.
C. Site Design

Topography
Site work should be planned to protect the assets of the existing topography.

2.5 Minimize the visual impacts of cut and fill on a site.

Parking
The visual impact of parking should be minimized. On site parking should be subordinate to other uses and the front of the lot should not appear to be a parking area.

2.6 Minimize the visual impact of surface parking in residential neighborhoods.

2.7 Provide alley access to parking when feasible.

2.8 Design a new driveway in a manner that minimizes its visual impact.

Hierarchy of Public and Private Space
A key feature of the district is the “hierarchy of space” that is experienced along the street. The hierarchy of public and private space is a progression that begins at the street, which is the most public space, proceeds through the front yard, which appears “semi-private,” and ends at the front door, which is the “private” space. This transition enhances the pedestrian environment, contributes to the character of the district and should be maintained.

2.9 Provide a walkway from the street to the building.

2.10 Provide a front yard.
Alignment
A front yard setback serves as a transitional space between the public sidewalk and the private building entry. When repeated along the street, these yards enhance the character of the district, and provide interest to pedestrians. In many blocks, the relatively uniform alignment of building fronts contributes to the sense of visual continuity and should be maintained.

2.11 Locate a new building within the range of alignments seen traditionally in the block.

Orientation to the Street
Traditionally, the primary entrance of a building faced the street and was sheltered by a one-story porch. This orientation helps to establish a sense of scale to the district and should be continued.

2.12 Maintain the traditional orientation of a building to the street.

Fences and Retaining Walls
Traditionally, front yard fences were relatively low in height (4’ max.) and had a “transparent” character that allowed views into yards, providing interest to pedestrian. “Transparency” was achieved by the spacing of vertical boards/pickets. Solid plank wood fences (6’ max.) were used occasionally along alley edges. A new or replacement fence should be similar in character with those used traditionally in the neighborhood. In addition, fences should relate in character to the principal structure on the lot.

On some sites retaining walls are also found. They typically align along the edges of sidewalks, and help to establish a sense of visual continuity and should be maintained.

2.13 A new fence should be in character with those seen traditionally.
   • Use traditional materials, such as wood.

2.14 A new retaining wall should be in character with those seen traditionally.
Site Lighting
Traditionally, site lighting was limited in residential neighborhoods. This low level of lighting contributes to the area’s residential character. Therefore, light spill onto adjacent properties and into the night sky should be minimized.

2.15 Lighting shall be shielded to prevent off-site glare.

D. Other
The visual impact of ancillary improvements within the historic district should be minimized.

2.16 Minimize the visual impact of trash storage and service areas.

2.17 Minimize the visual impact of new mechanical systems.
Chapter 3

New Construction
In this Chapter:

A. Architectural Character
B. Building and Roof Form
D. Building Mass & Scale
E. Solid-to-Void Ratio
F. Materials
G. Secondary Structures
F. Energy Efficiency in New Design

This chapter provides guidelines for the design of new buildings. These same guidelines also apply to improvements for existing, non-contributing structures. (The intent is that these existing buildings should be compatible with the context, but preservation principles do not apply.)
Chapter 3
New Construction

This chapter contains general design guidelines that may affect the character of both new infill and historic properties.

A. Architectural Character

In order to assure that historic resources are appreciated as authentic contributors to the district, it is important that new buildings be distinguishable from them. Therefore, new construction should appear as a product of its own time, while also being compatible with the historically significant features of the area.

3.1 Design a new building to reflect its time period, while respecting key features of its context.

3.2 Contemporary interpretations of traditional designs and details may be considered.

3.3 The exact imitation of older historic styles is discouraged for newer structures.

B. Building and Roof Form

A similarity of building and roof form contributes to a sense of visual continuity in residential areas. In order to maintain this sense of visual continuity, a new building should have basic building and roof forms similar to those seen traditionally.

3.4 Use building and roof forms similar to those seen traditionally in the area.
C. Building Mass and Scale

Traditionally residential buildings had varied heights, articulated masses and pedestrian-scaled front facades. A new building should continue to provide a variety of pedestrian-friendly scales and visually appealing masses. Buildings should not be monolithic in scale or greatly contrast with the existing scale of those seen traditionally in the district.

A sense of human scale is achieved when one can reasonably interpret the size of a building by comparing features of its design to comparable elements in one’s experience. Using a building material of a familiar dimension such as traditional brick or wood lap siding is an example. Using traditional sized building features such as windows, doors and porches is also encouraged.

These features are some of the important characteristics of residential buildings and should appear in all new construction.

3.5 Construct a new building to reflect the mass and scale of traditional residential buildings.

3.6 Express facade components in ways that will help to establish a human scale.

3.7 A facade should reflect dimensions similar to traditional buildings in the district.

3.8 Keep the shape and proportions of window and door openings similar to traditional buildings in the district.

D. Solid-to-Void Ratio

Most buildings had a similar amount of glass resulting in a relatively uniform solid-to-void ratio. On a new building, the amount of facade that is devoted to wall surface, as compared to that developed for openings, should be similar to that of historic buildings within the district.

3.9 Use a ratio of solid-to-void (wall-to-window) that is similar to that found on historic buildings within the district.
E. Materials

Building materials for new structures and additions to existing buildings should contribute to the visual continuity of the district. They should appear similar to those seen traditionally.

3.10 Building materials shall be similar in scale, color, texture and finish to those seen traditionally in the district.

3.11 Use masonry that appears similar in character to that seen traditionally.

3.12 New materials that are similar in character to traditional ones may be acceptable with appropriate detailing.

F. Secondary Structures

The visual impact of ancillary improvements within the historic district should be minimized.

3.13 Locate secondary structures to the rear of the lot.

3.14 Locate a garage such that its visual impacts will be minimized.

3.15 Detached accessory dwellings should remain subordinate, in terms of mass and scale, to the primary structure on the lot.
F. Energy Efficiency in New Design

The conservation of energy is a key objective in site design, building design and orientation, and landscapes. The site design process should include an evaluation of the physical assets of the site to maximize energy efficiency and conservation in the placement and design of a building. Designs should consider seasonal changes in natural lighting and ventilation conditions.

A design should also take into account the potential effect on an adjoining property, in terms of its solar access and ability to implement the same environmental design principles. Careful consideration should be given to balancing sustainable design principles with those related to maintaining the traditional character of the area.

3.16 Locate a new building, or an addition, to take advantage of microclimatic opportunities for energy conservation.

3.17 Design a building, or an addition, to take advantage of energy saving and generating opportunities.

3.18 Maximize solar access for all properties.

3.19 Use landscape designs to promote energy efficiency and water conservation. Appropriate strategies include the following:

Energy Efficiency in Building Massing

A building should be oriented to maximize the potential for natural daylighting as well as solar energy collection. In doing so, careful consideration should be given to first relating the building’s mass to the historic context.

3.20 Shape a building’s mass to maximize solar energy potential.

3.21 Orient a building to maximize green principles while ensuring compatibility with adjacent, lower-scale structures.
Environmental Performance in Building Elements
The elements that make up a building, including windows, mechanical systems and materials, can significantly impact environmental performance. These should be designed to maximize the building’s environmental performance, while promoting compatibility with surrounding sites and structures. New materials that improve environmental performance are appropriate if they have been proven effective in this climate.

3.22 Use green building materials whenever possible.

3.23 Incorporate building elements that allow for natural environmental control.

Solar and Wind Energy Devices
Solar and wind energy devices (i.e., solar panels, wind turbines) should be positioned to have a minimal effect on the character of the district.

3.24 Minimize the visual impacts of energy devices on the character of the district.
APPENDIX “B”

11.1 Review Applications
## 2011 11.1 Review Report - Residential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1015 12th Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Re-roofing</td>
<td>W. Blvd Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1016 12th Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Replace north and South Basement Walls W. Blvd Historic</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1018 11th St</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Re-roof annex building</td>
<td>West Blvd Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1019 St. James</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Add 16' x 20' addition to back of house West Boulevard</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1019 St. James</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Remove chimney and re-shingle roof</td>
<td>West Blvd Historic</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1023 St. James St</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Demolish existing shed/garage</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>Adverse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111 9th St</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Addition to Garage</td>
<td>W. Blvd Historic</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1123 12th St</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Repair foundation</td>
<td>West Boulevard</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1123 12th Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Move Stairs to back of house for foundation work</td>
<td>West Blvd Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1123 Fulton St</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Repair wood railing and steps, extend raling across front porch</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1212 Columbus St</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Remove existing deck and replace with new deck and railing/ reviewed again on 5-6-11 and approved to have 2&quot;x2&quot; railings.</td>
<td>West Blvd Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1212 Columbus St</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Rebuild porch roof</td>
<td>West Boulevard</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1305 W. Main St</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Demolish residential structure (used commercially)</td>
<td>W. Blvd Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310 Kansas City</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Demolish residence</td>
<td>Environs W.Blvd District</td>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>Adverse Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1311 W. Main St</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Demolish garage</td>
<td>Environs W. Blvd District</td>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>Adverse Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1319 12th Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Replace wood shakes with shingles</td>
<td>Environs of W. Blvd District</td>
<td>Environs</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1329 9th Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Remove an addition to the house</td>
<td>West Boulevard Historic</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>Approved by State</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1421 West Blvd</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Partial demolition and reconstruction of garage</td>
<td>West Blvd Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Tabled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501 West Blvd</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Re-roof residence, garage &amp; shed</td>
<td>West Blvd Historic</td>
<td>Contributing&amp;Non-Contrb</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611 9th Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Re-roof asphalt roof with new asphalt (Bolt Construction) for property owner William Scheele</td>
<td>West Boulevard Historic</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved by State</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815 9th Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Demolish Addition and construct rear yard addition to house</td>
<td>West Boulevard Historic</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved by State</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100 West Blvd</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Re-roof house from wood shingles to asphalt</td>
<td>Environs Of Individually L.</td>
<td>Environs</td>
<td>Approved by State</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609 West St</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Demolish residential structure</td>
<td>West Blvd Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617 West St</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Demolish residential garage</td>
<td>Environs of W.Blvd Historic</td>
<td>Environs</td>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617 West St</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Demolish residential structure</td>
<td>West Blvd Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623 West St</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Demolish residential structure</td>
<td>West Blvd Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727 South Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Repair foundation and stone on west side of McGillycuddy house</td>
<td>West Boulevard Historic</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved by State</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>907 West Blvd</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Remove and replace stairs and landings</td>
<td>West Blvd District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910 St. Cloud St</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Re-roof house with shingles and replace turbines with vents</td>
<td>West Boulevard Historic</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911 Clark St</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Re-roof house and garage; house roof leaking; sent to State as emergency</td>
<td>West Blvd Historic</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved by State</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911 Quincy St</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Re-roof house with asphalt shingles</td>
<td>West Boulevard</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917 9th St</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Remove interior chimney extending through roof</td>
<td>West Blvd Historic</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>919 Fulton Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Re-roof garage from shake shingles to asphalt shingles</td>
<td>West Blvd Historic</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved by State</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920 11th St</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Re-roof residence</td>
<td>West Blvd Historic</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>Approved by State</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2011 11.1 Review Report - Commercial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1011 11th Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Replace windows</td>
<td>West Blvd Historic District</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1107 Kansas City</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Vinyl Residing &amp; Asphalt Reroofing</td>
<td>West Blvd Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved roofing</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1311 W. Main St</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Demolish structure, of which a portion is located in the environs</td>
<td>Environs of W Blvd District</td>
<td>Environs</td>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1317 Mt. Rushmore Rd</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Repair rock foundation wall</td>
<td>West Blvd Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1424 Mt. Rushmore</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Demolish building and build parking lot adjacent to new building</td>
<td>Environs of W. Blvd District</td>
<td>Environs</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306 7th Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Repair ramp and railing at entrance</td>
<td>Individually Listed Property</td>
<td>Individually Listed</td>
<td>Approved by State</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315 St. Joseph St</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Re-roofing Courthouse</td>
<td>Individually Listed Property</td>
<td>Individually Listed</td>
<td>Approved by State</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402 St Joseph Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>To relocate electrical service</td>
<td>Individually Listed Property</td>
<td>Individually Listed</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402 St. Joseph St</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Retuckpoint parapets, reroof and add 4 skylights</td>
<td>Individually Listed Property</td>
<td>Individually Listed</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415 Main Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Interior remodeling rear of building, reroofing, skylights, new interior stairs, new entry</td>
<td>Individually Listed Property</td>
<td>Individually Listed</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502 &amp; 512 Main St</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Canopy and weather shade at 502 and interior renovations and stairs at 512</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing/Non-Contribig</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502 Main St</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Add outriggers, exterior staircase, courtyard modifications, garage door/window modifications</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502 Main Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Change design of metal courtyard railing</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502 Main Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Add outriggers, exterior staircase, roof deck and elevator</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502-512 Main</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Door and window openings, exterior lighting</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing/non-contribb</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502-512 Main St</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Improvements to sidewalks, entryways, paving, handrails, and other improvements in ROW</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contrib &amp; Non- Contrib</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508 6th Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Interior Remodel of Building</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508 6th Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Add interior walls</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508 and 512 Main St</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>To replace the cornice at 508 Main, to install awning over the entrance, to replace the doors and to install a USPS mail box at 512 Main</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved by State</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508 Main Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Canopy System over rear courtyard</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508&amp;512 Main st</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>508: Courtyard with pavers, and concrete wall with metal railing, and 512: interior modifications</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508-510 Main St</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Rebuild wall with door and awning, add vestibule and window, change style of 6 windows</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510 9th St</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Remodel 1st floor, replace carriage doors and side door and 2 garage doors, remove 2 doors and replace with windows, infill door, and remove exterior shed roof</td>
<td>Individually Listed Property</td>
<td>Individually Listed</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510 9th Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Demolish interior walls and fixtures and ceilings, demolish patio roof</td>
<td>Individually Listed Property</td>
<td>Individually Listed</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510 9th Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Add ramp and stairs and light over doors</td>
<td>Individually Listed Property</td>
<td>Individually Listed</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510 9th Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Patio Renovation including covered area, wall, ramp, stairs</td>
<td>Individually Listed Property</td>
<td>Individually Listed</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512 Main St</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Interior remodel into a restaurant</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512 Main Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Renovate building; adding windows, doors and awnings to west side, adding window to north side, removing interior partitions, and adding 2 stairways</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513 Main St</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Remove drop ceiling and interior walls, Add track lighting</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523 6th Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>To renovate storage area in lounge for public use</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601 Columbus St</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Theater Seating</td>
<td>Individually Listed Property</td>
<td>Individually Listed</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601 Columbus St</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>West Addition and RCHS renovation</td>
<td>Individually Listed Property</td>
<td>Individually Listed</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603 Quincy Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>New Windows, Trim &amp; Siding &amp; rear entrance and rear staircase</td>
<td>Environs of IL Property</td>
<td>Environs</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616 Main Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Block Addition on rear of lot</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625 St. Joseph St</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Interior alterations and exterior rehabilitation</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629 St. Joseph St</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Restore storefront, create 2 bathrooms, interior remodeling</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629 St. Joseph St</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Restore 4 windows &amp; entrance, and relocate furnace and electrical, Stairwell enclosure</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631 Main Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Replace roof with rubber roofing system</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631 Main Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Replace historic clock on building</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th &amp; Main</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Parking ramp and alleyway improvements</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704 St Joseph St</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Add interior wall to height of dropped ceiling</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved by State</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704 St. Joseph St</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Reinstall bathroom fixtures, install wall to drop ceiling to divide bathroom from storage area</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved by State</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715 Kansas City St</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Re-roof flat roof</td>
<td>Individually Listed Property</td>
<td>Individually Listed</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725 St. Joseph St</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Install Ventilation Hood and relocate louver</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>738 St. Joseph St</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Remove portion of building and add parking lot</td>
<td>Environ-Downtown District</td>
<td>Environ</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>808 St. Joseph</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Relocate Laundry Room, create fire escape hall</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>819 Main Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Replace exterior brick, window frames and glass</td>
<td>Environ of IL Property</td>
<td>Environ</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>902 Main Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Remove awning, add windows and side shingles or metal face</td>
<td>Environ of IL Property</td>
<td>Environ</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>929 Kansas City St</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Replace damaged siding</td>
<td>West Blvd Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2011 11.1 Review Report - Signs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>315-317 Main St</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Wall Sign</td>
<td>Environ of Individually Listed</td>
<td>Environs</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321 7th Street</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>2 wall signs to enclose banners</td>
<td>Environ of Individually L. P</td>
<td>Environs</td>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>Adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333 6th St</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Monument sign for Milo Barber</td>
<td>Environ of Downtown D.</td>
<td>Environs</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 5th Street</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Add Pedestrian Sign</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508 6th Street</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>10 Wall Signs for 506 6th Street</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508 6th Street</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Wall Sign for Karma Boutique</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508 6th Street</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Window Sign</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510 9th Street</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Copy Change on existing signs for Murphys</td>
<td>Individually Listed Property</td>
<td>Individually Listed</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510 9th Street</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Change color and size of wall signs</td>
<td>Individually Listed Property</td>
<td>Individually Listed</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512 Main St</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>relocation of 3 Wall Signs &amp; 1 pedestrian sign</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512 Main Street</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>21 Wall and Pedestrian Signs</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512 Main Street</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>2 Window Signs</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512 West Blvd</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Wall Sign</td>
<td>Environ of Individually LP</td>
<td>Environs</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512,508,510 MainSt</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>5 Wall Signs, 3 window signs, 1 pedestrian sign</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513 Main St</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Wall Sign</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515 West Blvd</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>3 New Signs on existing sign structure</td>
<td>Individually Listed Property</td>
<td>Individually Listed</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523 6th Street</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Neon Pedestrian Sign</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523 7th St</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Wall and Pedestrian Sign</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601 12th Street</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Replace 2 wall signs</td>
<td>Individually Listed Property</td>
<td>Individually Listed</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601 Columbus St</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Monument Sign to be declared a public purpose sign</td>
<td>Individually Listed Property</td>
<td>Individually Listed</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No Adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607 Main Street</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Add Additional Letters to Wall Sign</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609 St. Joseph</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Wall &amp; Pedestrian Sign color change</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615 Main St</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Pedestrian Sign</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616 Main Street</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>3 Pedestrian and 1 wall sign</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625 St. Joseph St</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Wall Sign</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627 St. Joseph St</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Wall Sign</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628 6th Street</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>3 Wall Signs and 6 Pedestrian Signs</td>
<td>Environ of Individually Lstd</td>
<td>Environ</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628 6th Street</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Wall Sign for First Western Insurance</td>
<td>Environ of Individually Lstd</td>
<td>Environ</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628 St. Joseph St</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Pedestrian Sign</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629 St. Joseph</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Copy change on wall sign from 4-27-11</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629 St. Joseph St</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Wall Sign</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631 Main Street</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Re-installing historic clock on historic bank building</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632 Main Street</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>3 wall signs and one monument sign</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>non-Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706 St. Joseph St</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Wall Sign</td>
<td>Downtown Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715 Kansas City St</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Change Monument Sign</td>
<td>Individually Listed Historic</td>
<td>Individually Listed</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>738 St. Joseph</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Wall Sign</td>
<td>Environ of Downtown HD</td>
<td>Environ</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>809 South Street</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Wall Sign</td>
<td>West Blvd Historic District</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>822 Main Street</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Change Sign Face</td>
<td>Individually Listed Property</td>
<td>Individually Listed</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>822 Main Street</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Change face on Wall Sign</td>
<td>Individually Listed Property</td>
<td>Individually Listed</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>926 Main Street</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Re-face existing pole sign</td>
<td>Environ of Individually Ltd</td>
<td>Environ</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>No adverse impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX “C”

2011 Meeting Minutes
MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2011
RAPID CITY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Members Present: Duane Baumgartner, Jean Kessloff, Pat Roseland, Scott Sogge, Cynthia Mattson, Eric James, Shawn Krull, Rich Grable

Others Present: Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Frank Morrison, Michelle Dennis, Bonnie Peterson, Anthony Demaro, Jake Boerger, Scott Vincent, Barbara Soderlin, Janelle Fink, Dan Senftner, Dan Tribby, Eric Monroe, Bob Brandt, Brad Burns.

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:30 am.

James moved to approve the agenda with the addition of “Tour of Rapid City High School” under New Business. The motion was seconded by Sogge and approved unanimously.

11.1 Review - 1424 Mt. Rushmore Road (11CM001)
Janelle Fink reviewed the proposal to remove the existing non-contributing structure located on the site due to the condition of the building and construct a parking lot.

Grable and Peterson entered the meeting at this point in time.

Mattson moved to recommend a finding that the demolition of the structure and the construction of the parking lot on the property located at 1424 Mt. Rushmore Road will have no adverse impact. Sogge seconded the motion.

In response to a question from Krull, Fink indicated that the existing dwelling on the adjacent lot will be removed; however, that property is located outside of the environs.

The motion was approved unanimously.

In response to a question, Fink indicated that the new building will also be located outside the environs.

11.1 Review - 512 Main Street (11CM002)
Dennis reviewed the proposed changes to the south elevation of the structure including the installation of a vertical sign and removal of the reflective film from the windows. She described the changes to the rear of the building including the installation of a double hung window and the installation of another vertical sign. Dennis indicated that there would be no changes to the east elevation. She described the description of the changes to the west elevation building noting that the adjacent building was likely removed in the 1960’s. She reviewed the storefront elevations proposed for the wall including the awnings, doors, and windows on both the first and second floors. Dennis reviewed the changes in the floor plan including the removal and relocation of the existing partition walls. She identified that an
additional stairwell will be installed providing access from the first floor to the basement level. She noted that the proposal is to remove all of the non-structural partition walls in the basement.

Monroe described in more detail the changes to the basement and the materials that will be used including the reuse of the existing bricks that are being removed from the new building openings.

Dennis noted that the ghosting on the west elevation from the original adjacent structure will remain to reflect the history of the building. She also noted that the knee walls that appear in the elevation drawings are part of the previously approved Main Street Square building.

Discussion continued.

Krull moved to recommend a finding that the renovations of the exterior of the building including the installation of the double hung aluminum clad windows in the north elevation; the installation of fixed pane display windows with aluminum framing to match the windows on Main Street, with narrow operable awning windows above, the precast concrete beneath the windows (similar to the stone on Main Street), the installation of single storefront doors, the installation of retractable canvas awnings over storefronts and entries all on the west elevation first floor; and, the installation of double-hung aluminum clad windows in groups of three per bay with pre-cast concrete sills on the west elevation second will have no adverse impact. James seconded the motion.

Discussion followed.

Baumgartner asked that the record reflect that Crown Clothing and other wood structures had been located on the adjacent site to the west. He noted that the structures and a tree were removed to accommodate the parking lot.

The motion was approved unanimously.

James moved to recommend a finding that the interior renovations including the removal of the existing partition walls on the first floor and basement as well as the installation of one or two new stairways will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by Mattson.

In response to a question from Krull, Tribby indicated that the tenant finishes will be addressed as the areas are leased out. Tribby indicated that owner will insure coordination and flow throughout the building and the block.

The motion was approved unanimously.
Boerger indicated that they are requesting to demolish the interior sheet rock walls, fixtures and ceilings and demolish the patio roof. He indicated that they wish to expose the original rock walls noting that they would retain the two pillars.

Demaro indicated that the work they are doing now is exploratory and they have retained Fred Thurston to assist them once they have uncovered the underlying materials.

Sogge moved to recommend a finding that the demolition of the interior sheet rock walls, fixtures and ceilings, and the demolition of the patio roof will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by James.

Discussion continued on the history of the building, the availability of plans from the early 1980’s and the exploratory nature of the work.

The motion was approved unanimously.

11.1 Review - 819 Main Street (11CM004)

Brandt presented the proposal to rebuild the front of the building that was damaged the previous week as a result of an automobile accident. He described the replacement of the exterior brick and installation of double pane windows and aluminum frame and the addition of a door. He noted that the owner is proposing to leave the wood frame in place and insert the aluminum frame. He described the installation of the door on the east end matching the existing doors with the required recess. He noted that they will be matching the size of the existing one foot bricks; however, the colors will not match as the materials are not available. Discussion followed.

Mattson moved to recommend a finding that the replacement of the exterior brick wall, installation of the double pane windows and aluminum frame including all of the windows (both east and west), and the addition of the door will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by Sogge and approved unanimously.

Approval of the Minutes

Krull moved to approve the minutes of the December 17, 2010 Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.

Election of Officers

Baumgartner moved to retain Roseland and Sogge as Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson. Grable seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Sogge moved to elect James as Secretary. The motion was seconded by Mattson and approved unanimously.

Tour of Rapid City High School
Elkins indicated that Kris Bjerke has arranged for the Commission to tour the Rapid City High School Theatre Construction on Monday, January 10, 2011 at 3:30 pm.

**Commissioners’ Time Sheets**
Bulman reminded the Commission members to submit their time sheets so they can be submitted for grant reimbursement.

**Recess**
James moved to recess the meeting to 3:30 pm on Monday, January 10, 2011 at the Rapid City High School for the tour of the building. The motion was seconded by Sogge and approved unanimously.

**Call to Order**
Roseland called the meeting back to order on January 10, 2011 at 3:40 pm in the Rapid City High School.

Members Present: Pat Roseland, Rich Grable, Cynthia Mattson, Jean Kessloff and Duane Baumgartner

Others Present: Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Michelle Dennis and Kris Bjerke

Bjerke briefed those present on the work being done on the Theatre. A brief discussion of the work followed.

Roseland adjourned the meeting as a quorum was not present.
MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2011
RAPID CITY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING

Members Present: Pat Roseland, Heather Knox, Cynthia Matson, Duane Baumgartner, Jean Kessloff, Scott Sogge and Rich Grable

Members Not Present: Tamara Pier, Shawn Krull and Eric James

Others Present: Karen Bulman, Marcia Elkins, Michelle Dennis, Mayor Alan Hanks, Terry McLaughlin, Jake Boerger, Barbara Soderlin, Patri Riker and Fred Thurston

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:30 am.

Approval of the Agenda

Baumgartner moved to approve the Agenda with the addition of Soderlin 11.1 Review under Old Business. The motion was seconded by Sogge and approved unanimously.

11.1 Review - 907 West Boulevard (11RS001)

McLaughlin indicated that he was representing the owner, Dawn Renee Coyle in the request to remove and replace the existing stairs and deck landing. He indicated that he would be replacing the existing structure with the same construction as it has deteriorated and does not meet the current code.

Grable entered the meeting at this time.

Matson moved to recommend a finding that the removal and replacement of the existing stairs and deck landing at 907 West Boulevard has no adverse effect. Baumgartner seconded the motion.

Kessloff asked McLaughlin if the owner would consider reversing the stairs to lead to the back of the building. Discussion followed regarding there being a separate apartment upstairs, the location of windows on the wall, the construction that the builder has started and the location of the parking.

Dennis outlined her suggestion to reverse the direction of the stairs to reduce the impact of the non-historic stairs on the front view of the historic home. Discussion continued regarding contacting the property owner and the potential impact of the changes on the use of the property.

Sogge made a substitute motion to continue the 11.1 Review for 907 West Boulevard (11RS001) to the end of the meeting. Grable seconded the meeting and it was approved unanimously.

11.1 Review - 415 Main Street (11CM006)

Riker presented the proposal to complete a partial interior demolition, demolish the rear floor area for the new stairs, create a second access at the rear of the building, construct two walls at the front with
display cases, encase the stairs with walls, add windows to the west wall, replace the front and rear doors, remove of non-bearing walls in the basement, construct a canopy along the rear of the structure, install guard rail at the rear of the structure along the exterior landing with stairs, install new hand rails at both the front and rear of the building and construct new walls in the basement. She reviewed the photos of the existing structure noting the clay tile that will remain exposed. She also reviewed the installation of the landscaping at the rear of the building. In response to a question from Elkins, Riker reviewed the installation of linear skylights at the front and the rear of the building, and described the installation of light tubes to the basement as well as, the installation of a new roof with a tapered insulated membrane roof. Discussion continued.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Riker reviewed the extension and enclosing of the staircase at the front of the building. Thurston outlined the use of the shelving unit and glass wall at the front of the building to preserve the original storefront feel at the front of the building. Additional discussion followed regarding the location of the enclosure of the stairs at the front. Discussion continued on the original stair rail, the potential retention of the existing lights if they can be made functional and the retention of the elevator shaft as a skylight.

Sogge moved to recommend a finding that the proposed partial interior demolition, remodeling of the rear half of the main floor, the reroofing and installation of sky lights and tube lights, the demolition of the rear floor area and construction of new stairs, the construction of the new walls at the front of the building, the enclosure of the front stair well, the installation of new hand rails at both the front and rear of the building, the construction of new walls in the basement, the installation of new exterior windows and the conversion of the new loading dock at the rear entry including the replacement of the railings and installation of the canopy on the property located at 415 Main Street(11CM006) will have no adverse impact. Matson seconded the motion and the motion was approved unanimously.

11.1 Review - 907 West Boulevard
McLaughlin indicated that he had contacted the owner and she indicated that she would prefer to retain the stair entrance at the front of the building to avoid additional congestion along the alley. Sogge indicated he spoke briefly with the owner and he confirmed the conversation.

Matson moved to recommend approval of a finding that the request to remove and replace the existing stairs and deck landing at 907 West Boulevard (11RS001) will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by Baumgartner and approved with Matson, Baumgartner, Roseland, Sogge, Knox, Grable voting in favor of the motion and Kessloff voting against the motion.

11.1 Review - 629 St. Joseph Street (11CM005)
Upon a question from Roseland, Kessloff removed herself from the Commission.

Kessloff presented the 11.1 application for 629 St. Joseph Street on behalf of the owner, Dan Senftner. She described the proposal to restore four windows and the entrance on the west wall of the building.
In response to a question from Roseland, Kessloff indicated that the request did not include the replacement of the display window at the front of the building or the windows at the rear of the building as a structural engineer must review the proposed work. Kessloff described the relocation of the furnace, the removal of an existing partition half-wall, removal of the furnace enclosure, the electrical work and the installation of railings on the steps in the interior of the building.

Discussion continued.

Baumgartner moved to recommend approval of a finding that the restoration of the seven first floor windows on the west wall, construction of the display window at the front of the building, the reconstruction of the original doorway, the relocation of the furnace, the electrical work, the removal of the existing partition half-wall and the installation of the railings at 629 St. Joseph Street (11CM005) will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by Sogge and was approved unanimously with Kessloff abstaining.

Kessloff rejoined the Commission at this time.

510 9th Street (11CM007) – Preliminary Review Only

Nick Boerger reviewed the demolition work that has been completed and presented a photo of the proposed interior finishes and reviewed the interior floor plan. Riker described the replacement of the original front door with a functional door. Discussion followed regarding ADA accessibility to the front of the building and the inset of the door.

Roseland requested that a tour of the building.

Discussion followed regarding the artist’s rendition of the proposed interior of the building.

In response to Sogge’s offer to assist the applicant with their project, Roseland appointed Sogge as the liaison from the Historic Preservation Commission to the 510 9th Street project.

Mattson moved to approve the Chair’s appointment of Sogge as the Historic Preservation Commission’s liaison to the 510 9th Street project. The motion was seconded by Baumgartner and approved unanimously.

Old Business

Soderlin reviewed the previous 11.1 application and the issues that were discovered when they opened up the building. She noted that as a result of the damage and wood rot they found, the contractor removed the entire wall. She requested the Commission’s support for the variance request to reduce the side yard setback.

Discussion followed regarding the variance process and criteria for review of variances.
Mattson moved to authorize Sogge to draft a letter to the Zoning Board of Appeals in support of the variance request to reduce the setback for the Chairperson’s signature and authorize Sogge to appear at the hearing and speak in favor of the variance request on behalf of the Historic Preservation Commission. The motion was seconded by Grable and approved unanimously.

Discussion followed on the criteria for variances.

Baumgartner moved to approve the minutes of the January 7, 2011 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mattson and approved unanimously.

Discussion followed on the home show booth March 25 to 27, 2011. Knox and Sogge offered to serve on the Home Show Committee.

Mattson made a motion to confirm the Chair’s appointment of Knox, Sogge and Krull to the Home Show Committee. The motion was seconded by Baumgartner and carried unanimously.

Roseland appointed Elkins, Bulman, Sogge, Brennan and Roseland to the Design Guidelines Consultant Selection Committee.

Baumgartner moved to confirm the Chair’s appointment of Elkins, Bulman, Sogge, Brennan and Roseland to the Design Guidelines Consultant Selection Committee. The motion was seconded by Mattson and approved unanimously.

Discussion followed regarding a possible date for the Historic Preservation Commission to meet with Historic Rapid City Board. Dennis indicated that her board is willing to meet.

Sogge move to hold a Special Historic Preservation Commission Meeting on February 23, 2011 to meet with the Historic Rapid City Board. The motion was seconded by Knox and approved unanimously.

Roseland updated that Commission on the status of work on the clock. Roseland outlined the work that he has been doing on the project and an overview of the funds that have been expended to date. In response to a question from Mattson, Roseland provided an overview of the Clock Project to be installed on the First National Bank building at 7th Street and Main Street. Discussion followed on the ownership of the clock, the use of the clock project as a centerpiece of Historic Preservation Month in May and the need for agreements with the property owner and insurance requirements.

Heather Knox introduced herself to the Commission.

Peterson reviewed HB 1099, a bill regarding the criteria for the review of projects in locally designated Historic Preservation Districts. Discussion followed with Bulman noting that the bill has been approved by the House and action is now pending before the Senate. Discussion continued.
Roseland invited Peterson to participate in the Design Guidelines Consultant Selection Committee.

Baumgartner asked for clarification of the impact of the 10% 2012 State Budget cuts on the State Office of History.

Discussion followed on the Zoning Ordinance requirements for the West Boulevard District and future grant applications to undertake additional work on possible Zoning District Overlays for the West Boulevard District.

Mattson moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Sogge and approved unanimously.
Minutes of the February 18, 2011
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present: Duane Baumgartner, Heather Knox, Jean Kessloff, Rich Grable, Eric James, Shawn Krull, Scott Sogge

Members Not Present: Pat Roseland, Tamara Pier, Cynthia Mattson

Others Present: Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Steve McCarthy, Frank Smyle, Jake Boerger, Patri Riker, Tony DeMaro

Sogge called the meeting to order at 7:30 am.

Approval of Meeting Agenda
Kessloff requested that a discussion of “Gas Meters on Sixth Street” be added under New Business. Sogge requested that “Roofing” be added under New Business.

James moved to approve the agenda with the addition of “Gas Meters on Sixth Street” and “Roofing” added under new business. The motion was seconded by Baumgartner and approved unanimously.

11.1 Reviews
508 6th Street (529 Main Street) (11CM008)

McCarthy reviewed the proposed remodel of the interior of the building. He noted how the gas meters will be addressed on his building. McCarthy reviewed the demolition work that has been completed to date.

Krull moved to recommend a finding that the remodeling of the interior and the re-roofing to include new mechanical roof units of 508 6th Street (529 Main Street) will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by James.

In response to questions from Kessloff, McCarthy indicated that this is a tax credit project. He proceeded to review the changes being made to the windows and the exterior of the building. McCarthy reviewed the installation of the roof mounted HVAC units and the replacement of the rubber roof and the installation of a new rubber membrane roof. He indicated that there would be no changes in the roof structure or the roof installation.

The motion was approved unanimously.

510 9th Street (11CM007)
DeMaro reviewed the demolition work that has been completed to date noting the timber girders that have been revealed and the brick columns. DeMaro and Riker reviewed the proposed carriage door replacement on Main Street and 9th Street as well as the restoration of the single door on the north side of the building. They reviewed the changes to the east side and the infill of the door on the south side of the building. They continued with the description of the replacement of the two garage doors with (one operable and one inoperable door) mimicking the garage door onto the patio.
In response to a question from Kessloff, DeMaro indicated that the project is a tax credit project.

Discussion followed regarding the removal of the shed roof on the east side of the building with DeMaro noting that the request includes the removal of the shed roof.

James moved to recommend a finding that the interior remodel of the first floor, replacement of the carriage doors, side door and two garage doors on the patio, the removal of the two doors and replacement with windows on the east side, the infill door on south side and the removal of the exterior shed roof on the east side of the building will have no adverse effect. The motion was seconded by Grable and approved unanimously.

James moved to table the Approval of the February 4, 2011 Meeting Minutes. The motion was seconded by Baumgartner. The motion was approved unanimously.

Sogge reminded the Commission that they needed to sign up for the Home Show.

Bulman noted that the Design Guidelines Consultant Selection Committee has met and will be interviewing consultants on Tuesday.

Bulman noted that the meeting with the Historic Rapid City group has been scheduled for February 23, 2011 at 5:30 pm in the Third Floor West Conference Roof.

Sogge reviewed the concern with roofing permits now being subject to historic review requirements. Discussion followed. James and Krull indicated that they felt the roofing permits should be submitted for review and approval of the roof replacement. Discussion continued.

Kessloff reviewed the issue of Montana Dakota Utilities installing gas meters on the front of Historic Buildings in the Downtown Historic District. In response to a question from Kessloff, Bulman reviewed her discussions with a representative of Montana Dakota Utilities noting that the right-of-way permits are subject to review through the Historic Preservation Commission. Discussion continued.

Bulman noted that there were additional updates needed to the Membership List indicating that she will resend the list on Monday.

James moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Kessloff and approved unanimously.
MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 23, 2011
SPECIAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Members Present: Duane Baumgartner, Pat Roseland, Scott Sogge, Shawn Krull, Rich Grable, Cynthia Matson, Jean Kessloff

Members Not Present: Tamara Pier, Heather Knox, Eric James

Others Present: Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Bill Kessloff, Dave Stafford, Fred Thurston, Bonnie Peterson.

Roseland called the meeting to order at 5:40 pm.

Thurston distributed discussion points to facilitate the conversation. He reviewed the history of the Feigel House Foundation and its transformation into Historic Rapid City. He described the activities of the Historic Rapid City group. He noted that Historic Rapid City can accomplish things that the Preservation Commission cannot undertake.

Discussion followed about the confusion that has been resulting in the community. Matson requested that Historic Rapid City consider how changing their name might help distinguish between the two groups.

J. Kessloff described the furniture from a West Boulevard House documented in the book Black Hills, White Sky that Historic Rapid City acquired and noted that Historic Rapid City is seeking a location to display the period furniture.

Thurston reviewed the potential for the non-profit group to seek grants and tax deductible contributions. He discussed other projects that Historic Rapid City is undertaking including documenting the tunnels underground in Downtown Rapid City.

In response to a question from Elkins, Thurston indicated that Historic Rapid City has not decided on how they will be offering memberships and are only now exploring how the two Committees can interact.

Thurston described the Historic Rapid City’s desire to market Historic Preservation to the community through the provision of architectural services.

Peterson entered the meeting at this time.

Discussion followed on how the communications can be improved between the two groups, the issue of name confusion, the need for education, the need for architectural resources for applicants, and the potential cooperative activities that will benefit the historic resources in the community. Discussion continued.
Krull spoke about the benefits of having a group such as Historic Rapid City. Discussion followed on the role of the advocacy group, the benefits of a non-public entity being involved in Historic Preservation in the community and the benefits of early intervention in the design process.

B. Kessloff invited the Commission members to attend the next Historic Rapid City meeting.

Discussion followed on focusing on cooperative efforts to benefit the historic resources in the community.

Baumgartner noted that there is a need for storage for historic pieces that are removed from structures.

Discussion followed on the need for fund raising,

B. Kessloff thanked the Commission for initiating the conversation.

Roseland and the other Preservation Commission members thanked the Historic Rapid City members for their willingness to come and explain their organization.

Roseland adjourned the meeting at 6:40 pm.
Minutes of the March 4, 2011
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present:  Pat Roseland, Eric James, Rich Grable, Duane Baumgartner, Scott Sogge, Jean Kessloff, Shawn Krull and Heather Knox

Members Not Present:  Cynthia Matson, Tamara Pier

Others Present:  Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Michelle Dennis, Patri Riker, John Seward, Eirik Heikes, Fred Thurston, Dave Ziebarth, Pam Lang, Bonnie Peterson and Virginia Clark

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:30 am.

Krull requested that “Discussion of Possible Changes to 502 Main Street” be added to the agenda.

James moved to approve the agenda with the addition of “Discussion of Possible Changes to 502 Main Street” be added to the agenda. The motion was seconded by Baumgartner. The motion was approved unanimously.

11.1 Reviews
6th and Main Street (11CM009)
Heikes presented the proposed improvements to the alley lying north of Main Street between 5th Street and 6th Street. He noted that the project included the relocation of overhead power lines underground, drainage improvements, installation of brick pavers, installation of light standards, installation of planters and bollards, installation of awnings, relocation of the approach to the parking ramp and the installation of a dumpster within the parking ramp.

Krull moved to recommend a finding that the relocation of overhead power underground, the drainage improvements, the installation of brick pavers, the installation of light standards, the installation of planters and bollards, the installation of awnings, the relocation of the approach to the parking ramp and the installation of a dumpster within the parking ramp on the parking ramp and alley lying north of Main Street between 5th Street and 6th Street will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by Sogge.

A brief discussion followed regarding the dumpster locations and improvements to the rear of the buildings located along the alley.

James moved to amend the motion to allow the use of bollards similar to the existing bollards in the area. The amendment was seconded by Sogge.

Discussion followed regarding the installation of brick pavers.
The motion on the amendment to allow the use of bollards similar to the existing bollards in the area was approved unanimously.

The motion as amended to recommend a finding that the relocation of overhead power underground, the drainage improvements, the installation of brick pavers, the installation of light standards, the installation of planters and bollards (allowing the use of bollards similar to the existing bollards in the area), the installation of awnings, the relocation of the approach to the parking ramp and the installation of a dumpster within the parking ramp and the alley lying north of Main Street between 5th Street and 6th Street will have no adverse impact was approved unanimously.

1212 Columbus Street
Clark presented the proposal to remove the existing deck and replace it with a new deck and railings constructed of unpainted cedar.

Krull moved to recommend a finding that the removal of the existing deck and the construction of a new deck and railings on the property at 1212 Columbus Street will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by James.

Discussion followed on the use of painted material, the maintenance of painted material versus unpainted materials as well as the use of 1 inch by 4 inch pickets with a bottom railing and open space for removal of snow.

Sogge made a substitute motion to recommend a finding that the removal of the existing deck and the construction of a new deck and railings using 1 inch by 4 inch pickets spaced approximately 4 inch off the bottom of the deck on the property located at 1212 Columbus Street will have no adverse impact. Krull seconded the motion.

Discussion continued on the use of maintenance free materials, use of painted or integral colored material, the future paint color of the house, the use of white stain, and maintenance of the property.

In response to a question from Roseland, Clark indicated that she was in agreement with the substitute motion.

The substitute motion to recommend a finding that the removal of the existing deck and the construction of a new deck and railings using 1 inch by 4 inch pickets spaced approximately 4 inch off the bottom of the deck on the property located at 1212 Columbus Street was approved unanimously.

402 St. Joseph Street (11CM010)
Thurston reviewed the proposed changes to 402 St. Joseph Street including tuck pointing the parapet walls, the installation of a new white single-ply membrane roof, the addition of four sky tubes as well as the removal and relocation of the electrical connections on the parapet wall.
James moved to recommend a finding that the tuck pointing of the parapet walls, the installation of the new white single-ply membrane roof, the addition of four sky tubes as well as the removal and relocation of the electrical connections on the parapet wall on the property located at 402 St. Joseph Street will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by Krull and approved unanimously.

515 Main Street (513 Main Street) (11M011)
Lang reviewed the proposed changes to the property at 515 Main Street including the removal of drop ceilings, the removal of interior partition walls and the installation of track and pendant lighting.

Krull moved to recommend a finding that the removal of the drop ceilings, the removal of the interior partition walls and the installation of track and pendant lighting on the property located at 515 Main Street will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by Baumgartner and approved unanimously.

Discussion of 502 Main Street
Krull indicated that he has been in discussions with the owner of the building regarding the proposed renovations. Krull and Dennis briefed the Commission on the various options and improvements being discussed with the owners. Dennis noted that the building is the oldest commercial structure in Rapid City. Dennis indicated that because the project was a possible tax credit project, she would be reviewing the alternatives with the staff at the State Office of History.

Approval of Minutes
James moved to approve the minutes of the February 4, 2010, February 18, 2011 and February 23, 2011 meetings. The motion was seconded by Grable and approved unanimously.

New Business
Discussion followed regarding the set up for the Home Show and providing individuals in the booth throughout the Home Show. Discussion continued regarding the restorations that have occurred within the community over the past ten years and how the information can be presented in the booth.

Bulman reviewed the proposed contract with Nore Winter to complete Phase I of the Design Guidelines project. Bulman reviewed the selection process for the consultant, the proposed scope of work and the multiple phases of the project. She indicated that there has been discussion with the State Office of History about extending the existing year contract.

James moved to authorize entering into a contract with Nore Winter for Phase I of the Design Guidelines Project using the allocated grant funds. The motion was seconded by Sogge.

A brief discussion followed regarding the consultant, his qualifications and the various phases of the project.
The motion to authorize entering into a contract with Nore Winter for Phase I of the Design Guidelines Project using the allocated grant funds carried unanimously.

Bulman reviewed the proposed grant application suggesting that the grant request include $2,000 for Certified Local Government operations, $12,000 for Phase 2 of the Design Guidelines Project and $2000 for the 2012 Home Show or other educational activities.

Discussion followed on possible grant activities.

James moved to submit a 2011-2012 Certified Local Government Grant application in the amount of $16,000 to include $2,000 for Certified Local Government activities, $2,000 for public education and outreach and $12,000 for Phase 2 of the Design Guidelines Project. The motion was seconded by Knox.

Discussion followed on the grant acknowledgement date, the need to move forward with grant activities early in the grant year and the documentation of the matching time from the Commission members.

The motion to submit a 2011-2012 Certified Local Government Grant application in the amount of $16,000 to include $2,000 for Certified Local Government activities, $2,000 for public education and outreach and $12,000 for Phase 2 of the Design Guidelines Project was approved unanimously.

Roseland distributed photos of the Clock that is in the process of being restored. Discussion followed on the donation of funds and time that have been made by Rosenbaum Signs and The Clock Shop for the restoration as well as the commitment made by Don Perdue for the installation of the clock. Roseland noted that an additional $2400 will need to be raised to restore the top on the clock. He explained the work that has been done on the insurance, installation and location of the clock. Discussion continued.

Discussion followed regarding including a monthly update of the activities of Historic Rapid City and the good discussion that occurred between the two groups at the Special Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

Sogge moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Grable and carried unanimously.
Members Present: Pat Roseland, Cynthia Matson, Rich Grable, Duane Baumgartner, Scott Sogge, Jean Kessloff, Shawn Krull and Heather Knox

Members Not Present: Eric James and Tamara Pier

Others Present: Patsy Horton, Karen Bulman, Mayor Alan Hanks, Dan Tribby, Eric Monroe, Michelle Dennis, Barbara Soderlin and Bonnie Peterson

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:30 am.

Kessloff requested that “Discussion of Possible Changes to 1015 12th Street” be added to the agenda.

Baumgartner moved to approve the agenda with the addition of “Discussion of Possible Changes to 1015 12th Street” be added to the agenda. The motion was seconded by Sogge. The motion was approved unanimously.

11.1 Reviews

502-512 and Main Street (11CM012)
Tribby noted for the Commission that the design will be similar in nature with the proposed Main Street Square, the Plaza and the new area activities. Dennis presented the proposed improvements to the structures adjacent to the alley lying north of Main Street between 5th Street and 6th Street. She noted that the renovation project included double-door entry, exterior lighting and awnings, storefront entrance enhancements with metal landing and stairs, electrical box relocation to the interior, wall partitions and the addition of an elevator. Additionally, windows and two exterior doorways will be added, removal of the existing flooring with concrete subfloor and wood floor installation, reroof the 508 Main Street building, and reopen the previously existing structure openings on the north side of the building. The interior renovations will retain the interior brick walls. Dennis noted that the owners will be presenting information to the Commission regarding proposed interior changes to 502 Main Street at the next Commission meeting. She also indicated that the restrooms in the Sears building will be available for public use.

Matson moved and seconded by Grable to recommend a finding that the renovation project including double-door entry, exterior lighting and awnings, storefront entrance enhancements with metal landing and stairs, electrical box relocation to the interior, wall partitions and the addition of an elevator, the addition of windows and two exterior doorways, the removal of the existing flooring replaced with new concrete subfloor and wood floor installation, reroofing the 508 Main Street building, and reopening the previously existing structure openings on the north side of the building, along with retaining the interior brick walls during renovation will have no adverse impact. The motion carried with Krull abstaining.

1015 12th Street
Kessloff requested approval to reshingle the roof at 1015 12th Street. She indicated that the seal around the trap door is failing. She presented the Commission with the proposed materials
that match the property’s breezeway and garage. She noted that some electrical repairs may also be necessary.

Baumgartner moved and Matson seconded to recommend a finding that the replacement of the roof membrane with color and shingles to match the breezeway and garage at 1015 12th Street will have no adverse impact. Motion carried unanimously with Kessloff abstaining.

Approval of Minutes
Krull moved, Knox seconded and motion carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the January 7, 2011 meeting.

Sogge moved, Krull seconded and motion carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the March 4, 2011 meeting.

Old Business
Discussion followed regarding the final work schedule and booth display for the Home Show.

Bulman informed the Commission that the Variance Board approved the zero foot setback variance at 920 Fairview Street.

Roseland shared correspondence from Harriett White regarding support of the First National Bank clock restoration.

Sogge moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Grable and carried unanimously.
Minutes of the April 1, 2011  
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present: Pat Roseland, Cynthia Matson, Rich Grable, Duane Baumgartner, Scott Sogge, Jean Kessloff, Shawn Krull and Heather Knox

Members Not Present: Eric James and Tamara Pier

Others Present: Patsy Horton, Karen Bulman, Dan Tribby, Eric Monroe, Brad Burns, Chris Bolton, Justin Hendrickson, John Cain, Tim Smith, Joel Lapade, Barbara Soderlin and Council Member Bonnie Peterson

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:30 am.

Baumgartner requested that “Discussion of Recognition/Awards” be added to the agenda.

Baumgartner moved and Sogge seconded a motion to approve the agenda with the addition of “Discussion of Recognition/Awards” be added to the agenda. The motion was approved unanimously.

11.1 Reviews

1018 11th Street (11RS005)
Cain reviewed the proposed replacement of the roof at 1018 11th Street for the West Park Apartments Annex. He indicated that he would be utilizing rock materials. He noted that the project will include a new roof and removal of the existing asbestos materials.

Matson moved and Krull seconded a motion to recommend a finding that the West Park Apartments Annex roofing project including the asbestos material removal and reroofing utilizing rock materials will have no adverse impact. Motion carried unanimously.

502 Main Street (11CM013)
The applicant reviewed the proposed addition of an interior elevator for accessibility, the installation of outriggers with lighting pendants, and an exterior metal staircase leading up to the roof deck with the landscaping. He indicated that the proposed improvements are similar to the Main Street Square, striving to create a visually pleasing entrance into downtown. The applicant noted that the plans were to open a restaurant in the building with a roof patio for additional seating, decorative structures, outriggers, beams, tenant theme, subdued soft lighting through canister lights shining directly onto the patio not the surrounding area, and additional screening items.

Matson moved to recommend a finding that the remodeling of the exterior including the stairway, reroof deck/garden area, metal stairway and elevator at 502 Main Street, will have no adverse impact. Motion carried unanimously.

Krull recused himself from discussion.

Matson referenced the approval of the rooftop improvements at the Alex Johnson Hotel. Baumgartner indicated that screening was not appropriate for the district. Additional discussion ensued regarding the architectural design of the staircase. The applicant indicated that additional information would be presented to the Commission at a future meeting.
The motion carried with Krull abstaining.

625 Saint Joseph Street (11CM014)
The applicant reviewed the proposed changes to the interior of 625 Saint Joseph Street, including the restoration of the storefront to include exterior lighting and interior renovations to include the addition of two new bathrooms, closing the opening between the two stores, the installation of interior lighting, the installation of vents for the proposed oven, raising the dropped ceiling and moving the duct work as necessary, and making changes to the electrical and plumbing as necessary. Smith and Hendrickson noted that the facility will include the sale of specialty beers and wine, including Neapolitan beers.

Krull moved and Knox seconded a motion to recommend that the proposed changes to the historic structure located at 625 Saint Joseph Street will have no adverse impact on the historic property. Motion carried unanimously.

910 Saint Cloud Street (11RS006)
The applicant presented information regarding the proposed emergency roof repairs to the structure at 910 Saint Cloud Street. He indicated that the 30 year old roof leaks behind the chimney. He noted that the project includes new 50 year shingles the same color as exists today. The proposed materials are a Class 4 impact rating and will provide a 15-25% discount on homeowner’s insurance. He also noted that the existing turbine vents used for attic ventilation will be removed and correct venting installed.

Krull moved and Matson seconded a motion to recommend that re-roofing the historic residence with Malarkey shingles to match the existing asphalt shingles, and removing the turbines on the roof and replacing them with a venting system, located at 910 Saint Cloud Street will have no adverse impact on the historic property. Motion carried unanimously.

Approval of Minutes
Matson moved, Baumgartner seconded and motion carried unanimously to approve the March 18, 2011 meeting.

New Business
Sogge reviewed progress on the Home Show activities and recruited Commission volunteers to organize and catalog the photo notebooks. Discussion included the potential to check out books for public use.

Baumgartner requested that a certificate be issued to the Alex Johnson and other historic property owners acknowledging preservation efforts, to include IFIS Corporation, Weiseler and Senftner as potential recipients, based on their recently finished historic renovation projects.

Baumgartner also requested that the Commission honor individual historic preservation efforts. Discussion ensued regarding potential activities during May because of historic preservation month.

Sogge moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:37 a.m. The motion was seconded by Grable and carried unanimously.
Minutes of the April 15, 2011
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jean Kessloff, Richard Grable, Heather Knox, Tamara Pier, Pat Roseland, Scott Sogge, Duane Baumgartner, Eric James, Cynthia Matson and Shawn Krull

OTHERS PRESENT: Gale Johnson, Anthony DeMaro, Don Purdue, Jim Jackson, Dan Claymore and Michelle Dennis

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m.

Baumgartner moved to approve the agenda with the addition of “631 Main Street – Clock Installation.” The motion was seconded by Sogge. The motion was approved unanimously.

11.1 Reviews

738 St. Joseph Street (11CM015)
Gale Johnson of the Real Estate Group reviewed the proposed interior renovations to the non-contributing structure in the environs of the Downtown Historic District located at 738 St. Joseph Street. The proposal includes partial demolition of the rear and center walls, a covered drive-under garage for disabled persons using the existing roofing of the building, adding 9 parking stalls at the rear entrance of the building with one ADA van accessible stall, installing a sprinkler system for fire protection, upgrading the water system with new water lines and individual water meters for each separate tenant, adding bathrooms, and potentially adding awnings.

Brief discussion regarding the proposed renovations followed.

Pier moved and Sogge seconded a motion to recommend a finding that the demolition of the rear and center walls and the addition of the parking lot, using the roofing of the building, at 738 Saint Joseph Street will have no adverse effect on the historic property. Motion carried unanimously.

510 9th Street (11CM016)
DeMaro reviewed the proposed renovations to include repurposing the 1910 front doors, creating an ADA accessible ramp to the Main Street entrance by maintaining the grade from the corner to door, adding rail along the ramp constructed of black metal with cable as the railing, repairing the sidewalk, adding exterior lighting over the door similar the 1910 version, and changing out the rear entrance to simulate garage doors. He indicated that the improvements should meet the requirements for a tax credit project, and that the amendment had already been sent to the state.

Discussion regarding the proposed ramp railing ensued.

James moved and Matson seconded a motion to recommend a finding that the addition to the contributing structure of the ramp and stairs, exterior lighting over the front door and changing the rear entrance to simulate garage doors at 510 9th Street will have no adverse effect on the historic property. Motion carried unanimously.

1501 West Boulevard (11RS008)
Claymore reviewed the proposed improvements to the contributing structure located at 1501 West Boulevard to include potentially replacing the skylights, re-roof the residence, garage and shed with same type of material to include possibly rustic redwood similar to the existing color.

Sogge moved and Krull seconded a motion to recommend a finding that the re-roofing of all structures on the property, including removing or reinstalling the skylights on the residence at 1501 West Boulevard will have no adverse effect on the historic property. Motion carried unanimously.

631 Main Street (11CM017)
Don Purdue reviewed the proposed clock re-installation to be located on the original First National Bank located at 631 Main Street.

Discussion followed regarding the clock visibility, installation, renovation and lighting of the clock. The Commission suggested that the clock be located on the corner with the existing sign underneath the clock or, in the alternative, locate the clock on the 7th Street building face if necessary.

James moved and Matson seconded a motion to recommend a finding that installing an historic exterior clock on the corner of 7th and Main Street or on the west side of the building along 7th Street at 910 St. Joseph Street will have no adverse effect on the historic property. Motion carried unanimously.

Approval of Minutes
James moved, Grable seconded and motion carried unanimously to continue consideration of the April 1, 2011 meeting minutes to May 6, 2011.

New Business
Roseland reviewed the activities planned for May as Historic Preservation Month, including the recognition certificates, West Boulevard design workshop, the clock re-installation and the proclamation. Discussion occurred regarding the scheduled promotional activities and coordination of those activities.

Sogge moved and Matson seconded a motion to recognize ISIS Corporation and Fred Thurston for their activities involved in historic preservation. Motion carried unanimously.

Jim Jackson of Rosenbaum Signs shared with the Commission that although recent decisions were made to prohibit neon signs on the parking garage because a neon sign was not “historical,” he noted that neon signs have been in Rapid City since 1928. Those include neon signs for Murphy’s Bar, Who’s Hobby House, SD Stockgrowers Association, the Alex Johnson Hotel and Rapid City Laundry. He noted that he is currently restoring the Motor Service Sign, that the Rapid City Laundry sign is also being preserved and that the Smiley’s Pizza Sign may have been painted or covered up.

Krull noted that he has located a commercial storage facility housing antiques and collectibles for storage of items the Commission may receive.

Adjourn
Baumgartner moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by James and carried unanimously.
Minutes of the May 6, 2011
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present:  Pat Roseland, Shawn Krull, Duane Baumgartner, Scott Sogge, Jean Kessloff, Cynthia Matson, Tamara Pier, and Heather Knox

Members Not Present:  Eric James and Rich Grable

Others Present:  Karen Bulman, Patsy Horton, Mike McDonald, Renee Moen, Michelle Dennis, Virginia Clark and Fred Thurston

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:30 am.

Call To Order

Approval of Meeting Agenda
Mattson moved, Sogge seconded and motion carried unanimously to approve the agenda as presented.

Fred Thurston expressed his appreciation to the Commission for receiving the Norman Nelson Preservation Award and iterated the importance of preserving structures and history in Rapid City.

11.1 Reviews

1023 St. James Street (11RS010)
McDonald reviewed the request to demolish the shed/garage, the structural integrity of the existing shed/garage and the pictures provided to the committee.

Discussion followed.

Matson moved and Sogge seconded a motion to recommend a finding of adverse effect because the shed/garage is a contributing structure, but it appears that there is no reasonable and prudent alternative to demolition.

Discussion ensued regarding the loss of historic structures.

Motion carried with Roseland, Krull, Matson, Knox, Pier, Baumgartner and Sogge voting in favor and Kessloff voting no.

917 9th Street (11RS012)
Moen provided background information on the need to demolish the existing chimney extending from the roof.

Matson moved, Knox seconded and motion carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the removal of the existing chimney extending from the roof will have no adverse effect.

508 – 510 Main Street (11CM018)
Dennis provided information regarding the request to rebuild the exterior wall at 508 Main Street to include a single door and sidelights, in addition to an awning. She reviewed the pictures of back alley wall opening and noted that the slump block had deteriorated to the point that you could put a finger through wall. Additionally, she indicated that a vestibule and window will be added to 510 Main Street along with replacing the awning. Dennis noted that the owners also propose to change the style of 6 windows on east side of building.

**Sogge moved, Matson seconded and motion carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the reconstruction of the exterior wall at 508 Main Street along with changing the opening to a single door with sidelights, and adding an awning to the building will have no adverse effect.**

Discussion followed regarding the proposed improvements at 510 Main Street. Committee members expressed concern about too much coordination and requested that the owner strive to make improvements keeping in character with the existing building.

**Krull moved and Matson seconded a motion to recommend a finding that the renovation to 510 Main Street that includes a single door with sidelights and the addition of an awning to the non-contributing building constructed similarly to the structure design with concrete headers will have no adverse impact. The motion carried unanimously.**

**1212 Columbus (11RS015)**
Clark requested authorization to install 2 inch by 2 inch style railing on the attached two story deck instead of the previously approved 1 inch by 4 inch pickets, noting that the effective strength and integrity between the two railings would be minimal.

Sogge noted the Commission’s previous comments related to the character of the structure not the strength.

**Matson moved, Baumgartner seconded and motion carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the 2 inch by 2 inch style railing for the two story deck will have no adverse effect.**

**Approval of Minutes**
Matson moved, Sogge seconded and motion carried unanimously to continue the approval of the April 1, 2011 and the April 15, 2011 meeting minutes until the May 20, 2011 meeting.

**New Business**
Bulman reviewed the agenda for the public input sessions and encouraged all members to participate in the West Boulevard Historic District design guideline public meetings.

Roseland noted that Mike Kenton from the Rapid City Area School District has donated the Dakota Middle School chairs to the Historic Preservation Commission. Roseland indicated that the Commission could sell the chairs with the proceeds going to the Historic Preservation Commission.

**Old Business**
Roseland indicated that he received the Executive Proclamation from Mayor Alan Hanks at the May 2, 2011 City Council meeting acknowledging May as Historic Preservation Month. Additionally, he noted that ISIS Hospitality and Fred Thurston received the Norman Nelson
Preservation Award at the same Council meeting. The Committee reviewed action items regarding the promotion of Historic Preservation Month.

**Other Business**

Kessloff indicated that the Commission could use the Coolidge School sign board to wrap up the promotion of Historic Preservation Month.

**Adjourn**

Matson moved, Sogge seconded and motion carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 9:04 a.m.
Minutes of the May 20, 2011
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present:  Pat Roseland, Duane Baumgartner, Heather Knox, Jean Kessloff, Rich Grable, Eric James

Members Not Present:  Tamara Pier, Cynthia Mattson, Shawn Krull, Scott Sogge

Others Present:  Karen Bulman, Eric Monroe of Chamberlin Architects, Michelle Dennis, Virginia Clark, Laurie Martin, Jack Caudill of KEVN

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:30 am.

Approval of Meeting Agenda
Kessloff requested that the discussion of “Historic Garages” under New Business be continued to the June 3, 2011 meeting.

James moved to approve the agenda with the discussion of “Historic Garages” under new business continued to the June 3, 2011 meeting. The motion was seconded by Grable and approved unanimously.

11.1 Reviews
1019 St. James Street (11RS014)
Martin reviewed the proposed request to remove the chimney and re-shingle the roof. Martin explained that the chimney has not been in use since 1976, and the chimney is falling apart.

Baumgartner moved to recommend a finding that the removal of the chimney and the re-shingling of the roof at 1019 St. James Street will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.

1212 Columbus Street (11RS015)
Clark reviewed the proposed request to rebuild the porch roof. Clark explained that during the construction of the new stairs and decking, the roof began to fall down. Clark further stated that the roof will be rebuilt with the same materials and design as the original roof. In response to a question by Kessloff, Clark indicated that the roof has been rebuilt.

James moved to recommend a finding that rebuilding the porch roof at 1212 Columbus Street will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by Grable and approved unanimously.

508-512 Main Street (11CM019)
Dennis reviewed the changes taking place in the two tiered courtyard behind 508 Main Street. The courtyard will be on two levels due to the topography of the area. The courtyard will be paved with concrete pavers and the retaining walls will be faced with slump block texture to be consistent with the north wall of the building. An ADA ramp will be located along the west edge of the courtyard and a metal railing system will be used along the retaining walls.
Dennis reviewed the realignment of the center hallway at 512 Main Street. The walkway through the building will continue to be located from the west and the openings for the doors and windows will remain at the same location. Two of the west windows will be service windows, rather than standard windows, to allow for pass-through service for the patrons of the Main Street Square.

James moved to recommend a finding that the courtyard behind 508 Main Street, with the addition of pavers and concrete retaining walls, will have no adverse effect. The motion was seconded by Knox and approved unanimously.

James moved to recommend a finding that the realignment of the center hallway at 512 Main Street will have no adverse effect. The motion was seconded by Knox and approved unanimously.

Knox moved to recommend a finding that changing two west windows to service windows within the approved opening will have no adverse effect. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.

James commended the design team for following historic guidelines in the renovation of the properties at 502-512 Main Street.

Minutes
James moved to continue the approval of the April 1, 2011, April 15, 2011, and May 6, 2011 meeting minutes until the June 3, 2011 meeting. The motion was seconded by Knox and approved unanimously.

Old Business
Roseland stated that the clock has been installed and he is working with the property owner and the City Attorney’s Office on a maintenance agreement. Roseland further stated that Rosenbaum Signs will be adding a brass plate to the clock to identify those who were responsible for the restoration of the clock. Kessloff indicated that the dedication of the clock will be Saturday, May 21, 2011. Roseland stated that the media has been notified.

Roseland and Kessloff indicated that the comments from the Nore Winter workshop were positive. Discussion followed on the process for reviewing the initial outline of the Design Guidelines and the timeframes to obtain the final guidelines.

Roseland adjourned the meeting at 8:00 am.
Minutes of the June 3, 2011
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present: Jean Kessloff, Duane Baumgartner, Scott Sogge, Cynthia Matson, Rich Grable, Eric James, Shawn Krull

Members Not Present: Tamara Pier, Pat Roseland, Heather Knox

Others Present: Karen Bulman, Jeannine Nicholson, Mike Stanely, Michelle Dennis, Brad Burns, Dan Tribby, Erik Heikes, Shannon Fischer, Jeff and Patty Danielson, Angela Rykhus

Sogge called the meeting to order at 7:32 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Agenda
James moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Baumgartner and approved unanimously.

11.1 Reviews

1111 9th Street (11RS013)
Danielson reviewed the proposed request for an addition to the garage. He noted that the existing size of the garage does not accommodate newer vehicles and that the addition would also allow additional storage. He added that the siding and doors on the garage will be the same as on the house.

In response to a question from Sogge, Danielson reviewed the new roof line for the garage and the addition. He also noted that the garage doors will be the same height but will be wider.

Matson moved to recommend a finding that the addition to the garage at 1111 9th Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Krull.

Kessloff suggested that one alternative would be to install one big door instead of two doors. She expressed concern with the size of the garage and addition. Additional discussion followed.

The motion to recommend a finding that the addition to the garage at 1111 9th Street will have no adverse effect on historic property carried unanimously.

1123 12th Street (11RS016)
Rykhus reviewed the proposed request to repair the sandstone foundation. She noted that the foundation is crumbling and that there is water in the basement. She added that the plumbing and heating is also being affected by the foundation issues.

Matson stated that she would support fixing all of the foundation as long as it is not larger than the original floor plan.
Kessloff informed the applicant that grants are available to fix the foundation and encouraged the applicant to apply for them. Kessloff and Krull volunteered to assist the applicant in applying for the grants.

Mattson moved to recommend a finding that repairing or replacing the sandstone foundation at 1123 12th Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Baumgartner and approved unanimously.

**502 Main Street (11CM020)**
Dennis briefly reviewed the approved plans and the proposed changes for the upper courtyard. She also reviewed the proposed location for the entrance to the lower courtyard, fencing materials, railing system, benches, concrete pavers, brick planters, the location of the ADA access and the location of the windows and doors. She added that a variance will need to be obtained for the height of the proposed fence. A brief discussion followed.

James moved to recommend a finding that the fencing around the property at 502 Main Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Matson and approved unanimously.

James moved to recommend a finding that the balance of the modifications and additions to the exterior space at 502 Main Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Matson and approved unanimously.

**502-512 Main Street Right-of-way (11CM021)**
Heikus reviewed the proposed request and advised that private funds will be used for the improvements to the public right-of-way along Fifth Street and Main Street. He addressed ADA compliant walks and ramps, walls, steps, pavement treatments, handrails, landscaping, lighting and sidewalk improvements.

Krull expressed his opinion that spacing between the fencing pickets should be farther apart and that the hand rail should be smaller.

In response to a statement from Kessloff regarding brick sidewalks, Heikus advised that they are trying to tie in the Main Street Square theme along this area.

Discussion followed regarding improvements to nodes and an increase of historic improvements in the downtown district.

Dennis expressed her opinion that the hand rail should be smaller in diameter and that the pickets should be spaced farther apart. Additional discussion followed.

Matson moved to recommend a finding that the alterations as noted at 508-512 Main Street, with the stipulation that the hand railings at 512 Main Street will be reduced to two inch railings and a minimum of two feet between pickets, will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.

**Minutes**
James moved to continue the approval of the April 1, 2011, April 15, 2011 and May 6, 2011 meeting to the June 17, 2011 meeting and to approve the minutes of the May 20, 2011 meeting. The motion was seconded by Grable and approved unanimously.
**New Business**
Kessloff suggested that the Historic Garages item be continued to the next meeting.

**Subcommittees**
Sogge stated that the Committee members for the Subcommittees need to be reviewed and reassigned.

James volunteered to be on the Main Street Square Subcommittee.

**Salvaging of Materials from Historic Properties**
Krull expressed his opinion that the sandstone blocks from the Rykhus property should be retrieved for historic purposes from the property owner if she is not going to use them in the rebuilding of the foundation. Krull added that when he or Jean visits with Rykhus about the grant applications, they can ask the property owner if she would be interested in donating the blocks. A brief discussion followed.

**Historic Design Guidelines for the West Boulevard Historic District**
Kessloff expressed her opinion that the Committee needs to meet to review the guidelines outline. A brief discussion followed. Bulman advised that she would check and see what meeting rooms are available for Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 4:00 p.m.

James moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 a.m. The motion was seconded by Grable and approved unanimously.
Minutes of the June 17, 2011
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present:  Pat Roseland, Duane Baumgartner, Heather Knox, Tamara Pier, Eric James, Shawn Krull and Scott Sogge

Members Not Present:  Jean Kessloff, Rich Grable and Cynthia Mattson

Others Present:  Karen Bulman, Jeanne Nicholson, Michelle Dennis, Patri Acevedo-Riker, Jake Boerger, Tim Kobes and Rob Eddy

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Agenda

Roseland requested that the “Possible Acquisition of 1929 Fire Truck” be added to the agenda as Item 2 under New Business.

James moved to approve the agenda with the addition of “Possible Acquisition of 1929 Fire Truck” be added to the agenda as Item 2 under New Business. The motion was seconded by Pier. The motion was approved unanimously.

11.1 Reviews

625 St. Joseph Street (629 St. Joseph St) (11CM021)

Dennis reviewed the proposed request for the addition of a door, window, hallway, half-walls, closet, new ceiling and canvas awning. She noted that because of egress requirements, the bathrooms need to be moved to allow for the installation of a door. She added that the railings for the stairwell are being changed to half walls for safety reasons. She also noted that when the drop ceiling was being removed, it was discovered that preparations for a ceiling existed. She added that the ceiling will now be sheet rocked instead of a drop ceiling. She also reviewed the location of the doors, windows and columns for the storefront. She added that the awning will be retractable and will be made of canvas.

James moved to recommend a finding that the additions of the door, window, hallway, half-walls, closet and new ceiling to the interior and the addition of the canvas awning will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Pier.

In response to a question from Roseland regarding the columns, Dennis advised that the columns would be frames for the windows. Roseland added that he might know the location of some columns that could be used on the storefront. Roseland added that he would check into it and get back to her.

In response to a question from Krull, Dennis explained that the east wall will be stripped to the brick and cleaned, the back wall in the kitchen area will be sheet rocked, the west wall will have some original framing that will be retained and that the south wall will be plastered. She added that recessed can lighting will be used and that the wood floors are being refinished.
The motion to recommend a finding that the additions of the door, window, hallway, half-walls, closet and new ceiling to the interior and the addition of the canvas awning will have no adverse effect on historic property carried unanimously.

512 Main Street (11CM022)
Riker reviewed the proposed request for interior remodeling including vestibule and slide-through window. She added that the exterior of the building has been approved and that the request is to add the sliding glass window to serve customers that are outside the building. She reviewed the proposed layout of the interior, the dining facilities, the flooring, the ceiling and the tile.

Baumgartner moved to recommend a finding that the interior remodeling including vestibule and slide-through window will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Sogge and the motion carried unanimously.

510 9th Street (11CM023)
Riker reviewed the proposed request to renovate the patio including covered area, roofed bar, wall and stairs. She noted that the tax credit paper work has been filed at the Federal level. She identified the building materials that will be used for the wall on the face of the street and added that the railing will be similar to the interior railing.

Sogge moved to recommend a finding that the renovation of the patio, a covered area, roofed bar, wall and stairs will have no adverse effect on the historic property. The motion was seconded by Krull.

A brief discussion followed regarding the outside railing.

The motion to recommend a finding that the renovation of the patio, a covered area, roofed bar, wall and stairs will have no adverse effect on the historic property carried unanimously.

Minutes
James moved to continue the approval of the April 1, 2011 and April 15, 2011 to the July 1, 2011 meeting and to approve the minutes of the May 6, 2011 and the June 3, 2011 meetings. The motion was seconded by Sogge and approved unanimously.

New Business
Tim Kobes, Rapid City Fire Department, explained that an antique car collector contacted the department stating that he has a 1929 LaFrance Ladder Truck that previously belonged to the Rapid City Fire Department. Kobes added that the owner is offering to sell the fire truck to the City of Rapid City for $18,000. He noted that the truck will need some repairs and that the major issue will be the storage of the fire truck.

Rob Eddy, Rapid City Fire Department, stated that a fundraiser will be held. Kobes added that they have someone who would deliver the truck to Rapid City just for the mover's expenses.

Roseland expressed his support for purchasing the fire truck and stated that if any of the Committee members has ideas for storage to provide them to Karen Bulman.
**Historic Garages**
Roseland suggested that due to Kessloff’s absence, the discussion on Historic Garages should be scheduled on the next agenda.

**Clock Project**
Roseland stated that negotiations on the service agreement for the clock are ongoing and will keep the Committee advised.

**Donated Property to the Historic Preservation Commission**
Baumgartner asked if property that is donated to the Commission can be sold by the Commission. Discussion followed regarding ownership of the property. Pier advised that she will do further review on the subject and report back to the Commission. Additional discussion followed.

A brief discussion followed regarding the storage and ownership of the chairs from the Dakota Middle School Theatre.

James moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:18 a.m. The motion was seconded by Pier and approve unanimously.
Minutes of the July 1, 2011
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present: Jean Kessloff, Duane Baumgartner, Tamara Pier, Eric James, Shawn Krull and Cynthia Mattson

Members Not Present: Rich Grable, Pat Roseland, Heather Knox, and Scott Sogge

Others Present: Karen Bulman, Vicki Alexander, Michelle Dennis, Erik Monroe, Tim Hook, Richard Holzmuller, and Curt Bechtel

James called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Agenda

Pier moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Mattson. The motion was approved unanimously.

11.1 Reviews

508 Main Street (11CM025)
Dennis reviewed the proposed request for the rear courtyard canopy. She stated this would be a fixed canopy to cover the courtyard seating area. Dennis added that this is a ridged metal system that would attach to the back of the 502 Main Street property and will slope away from the building to allow for proper drainage. She advised that the fabric canopy top would be a natural color allowing for light to shine through.

In response to a question from Mattson regarding retractable awnings, Monroe explained that a retractable awning wouldn’t hold up to adverse weather conditions and requires continued maintenance. He added that this will be a leased space and there are potential concerns that the awning wouldn’t be maintained properly. Monroe stated that various options of awnings have been explored and this was the best option. Monroe suggested that the fixed awning would allow them to use the outside area for a longer period of time during the cooler months. If space heaters were needed, the fixed awning would allow for better heat retention.

In response to a question from Mattson, Dennis advised that the fixed canopy is what the owner is requesting. A brief discussion on brick options and fabric options followed.

Discussion followed on the City ordinances and the requirements for awnings.

James requested information on any City ordinance that makes a distinction between building awnings for owner occupied versus tenant occupied properties. Pier requested that Curt Bechtel join the meeting to discuss awning requirements.

Mattson moved, and Baumgartner seconded, that 508 Main Street review be tabled until Bechtel could attend. The motion was approved unanimously.
631 Main Street (11CM026)
Bulman gave a brief explanation on the 631 Main Street review. Bulman left the meeting.

Hook reviewed the proposed request for replacing the roof with rubber roofing materials and to repair the metal sheeting. He explained the existing roof is a hot tar roof. Hook added that they plan on installing hard board and then 16 mill rubber over the top, giving the roof a 20 – 30 year life expectancy.

Holzmuller entered the meeting.

**Mattson moved to recommend a finding that replacing the roof with rubber roofing materials and repairing the metal sheeting will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by James and the motion carried unanimously.**

508 Main Street (11CM025)

Bechtel entered the meeting. Bulman re-entered the meeting.

In response to a question from Pier, Bechtel explained that he was not aware of any City ordinance reflecting fixed awnings or retractable awnings based on the occupants of the building. Bechtel stated that he didn’t think there was a retractable awning that could retract out 18 feet and also handle a snow load.

Discussion followed regarding safety issues, size of the awning, entrance issues, and the preferences between retractable and fixed awnings.

**Mattson moved to recommend a finding that the addition of a fixed rear courtyard canopy and fabric materials will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Baumgartner and the motion carried unanimously.**

**Approval of Minutes**

Mattson moved to approve April 1, 2011, April 15, 2011, and the June 17, 2011 meeting minutes. Baumgartner seconded and approved unanimously.

**New Business**

Kessloff suggested that the discussion on Historic Garages should be scheduled at a later date.

**Krull moved to remove the Historic Garages discussion to an indeterminate time. Mattson seconded and motion carried unanimously.**

**Other Business**

Dennis briefly discussed the 5th Street and Main Street issues and the challenges they present. She thanked the Committee for raising issues and concerns to meet the Secretary of Interior Standards.

Mattson thanked Dennis for the help and advice she provides the Committee. A brief discussion followed.
Mattson moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:04 a.m. The motion was seconded by Pier and approved unanimously.
Minutes of the July 15, 2011
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present: Jean Kessloff, Pat Roseland, Cynthia Matson, Heather Knox, Eric James, Richard Grable, Tamara Pier, Duane Baumgartner, Shawn Krull, Scott Sogge, Jordan Mason – Council Liaison, Ron Sasso, Council Liaison Alternate


Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Agenda

James moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Sogge. The motion was approved unanimously.

11.1 Reviews

1016 12th Street (11RS017)
Block reviewed the proposed request for the replacement of two basement walls.

James moved to recommend a finding that the replacement of the two basement walls will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Matson.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Block advised that the north and south walls will be replaced.

The motion to recommend a finding that the replacement of the two basement walls will have no adverse effect on historic property carried unanimously.

616 (618) Main Street (11CM028)
Fuchs reviewed the proposed request for the addition to the rear of the building. He added that the addition will be a winery and will be constructed with cinder blocks and have a Drivet façade. He briefly addressed parking, property access, hallway, roof lines and ceiling height. Fuchs noted that Black Hills Power has been contacted about the utilities in the area and the existing building will remain the same. A brief discussion followed.

Sogge moved to recommend a finding that the addition to the rear of the building will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Matson and the motion carried unanimously.

502 & 512 Main Street (11CM029)
Dennis reviewed the proposed request to add a metal canopy with fabric covering over the courtyard and to change the weather shade from wood to metal with a fabric covering. She added that the canopy will be a metal structure with a fabric that is compatible
with the project. She added that the canopy will have a gutter system and that the visual impact of the canopy will be minimized by the trees.

512 Main Street: Dennis reviewed the proposed request to add stairs from the first floor to the basement and to renovate the interior basement walls. She advised that an original floor plan has been discovered showing a stairway from the main floor to the basement and the request is to add the stairwell to allow access from the main floor to the basement.

Monroe briefly reviewed the location of the partition walls in the basement and added that the renovations will better accommodate the four retail spaces. A brief discussion followed.

Matson moved to recommend a finding that the addition of a metal canopy with fabric covering over the courtyard and the change to the weather shade from wood to metal with fabric covering will have no adverse effect on historic property located at 502 Main Street. The motion was seconded by James and the motion carried unanimously.

James moved to recommend a finding that the addition of stairs from the first floor to the basement and the renovations to the interior basement will have no adverse effect on historic property located at 512 Main Street. The motion was seconded by Matson.

In response to a question from Shaw, Monroe advised that no changes will be made to the bearing walls and that the renovations will help maintain the integrity of the common space and corridors.

The motion to recommend a finding that the addition of stairs from the first floor to the basement and the renovations to the interior basement will have no adverse effect on the historic property located at 512 Main Street carried unanimously.

1311 W. Main Street (11CM027)
James briefly reviewed the Joint Powers Agreement between the State Office of History and the City of Rapid City for Historic Preservation.

Pier explained that the Historic Preservation Commission will make a recommendation to the State. A brief discussion followed.

Elkins reviewed the proposed request to demolish the structure, the building history of the structure, the uses of the surrounding properties and the boundaries of the West Boulevard Historic District. She added that a portion of the property is not located in the environs and that the Commission can request that the environs be extended to include the entire property. Elkins suggested that the Commission should request the owner to move any salvageable parts of the structure.

Kessloff expressed her opinion that the request should be continued until the Commission receives legal opinion from the State Attorney General regarding the definition for environs. She added that the owner also needs to show that all alternatives for the structure have been explored and that the integrity of the district will be maintained.

Kessloff moved to recommend that the request to demolish the structure at 1311 W. Main Street be continued until the Commission receives the State Attorney General's legal opinion on the definition of environs. The motion died due to a lack of a second.
Elkins advised that the Commission has the authority to extend the environs and requested that the Commission not delay action on the request. A brief discussion followed.

James moved to recommend a finding that demolishing the structure, or allowing the structure to be removed from the district, will have an adverse effect on historic property due to the intensity of the entire project, with the understanding that the environs include the entire property. The motion was seconded by Sogge.

Bill Kessloff expressed his opinion that the Commission should not take action on the request until a legal opinion is received from the State Attorney General about the definition for the environs.

Elkins expressed her opinion that the motion on the floor includes the entire property and encouraged the Commission to review the Joint Powers Agreement to determine if further clarification needs to be included in the agreement.

Discussion followed regarding the process for 11.1 Reviews.

Roseland expressed concern with the removal of the structure and the lot remaining vacant.

Pier added that the request could possibly set a precedent throughout the Historic District.

Simmons, resident at the corner of Twelfth and Kansas City, expressed concern with the demolition of the eight structures and inquired as to what the owner is proposing to develop on the properties.

James advised that the Commission does not know what the owner's intent is at this time.

Krull briefly reviewed the Historic Preservation Commission’s role throughout the City and expressed concern with the encroachment of commercial development into residential areas.

Shaw expressed his concern with commercial development encroaching into this residential historic district. Additional discussion followed.

The motion to recommend a finding that demolishing the structure, or allowing the structure to be removed from the district, will have an adverse effect on historic property due to the intensity of the entire project, with the understanding that the environs include the entire property carried unanimously.

1311 W. Main Street (11RS018)
Elkins reviewed the proposed request to demolish the garage and noted that the structure is located within the environs of the West Boulevard Historic District.

James moved to recommend a finding that demolishing the garage, or allowing the garage to be removed from the district, will have an adverse effect on historic property due to the intensity of the entire project, with the understanding that the environs include the entire project. The motion was seconded by Pier and the motion carried unanimously.
1310 Kansas City Street (11RS019)
Elkins reviewed the proposed request to demolish the residence and noted that it appears that the structure is being used as storage.

1305 W. Main Street (11RS020)
Elkins reviewed the proposed request to demolish the residence and noted that the residence is a contributing structure.

Matson expressed her opinion that the structure is beautiful and that the structure should be moved and used somewhere else.

Adelstein stated that he would be willing to give the structure to someone at no charge if they can find another appropriate location for the structure.

609 West Street (11RS021)
Elkins reviewed the proposed request to demolish the residence and noted that the structure has been used for both commercial and residential purposes.

617 West Street (11RS022)
Elkins reviewed the proposed request to demolish the residence and noted that the sandstone foundation could possibly be salvaged to be used somewhere else.

617 West Street (11RS023)
Elkins reviewed the proposed request to demolish the garage and that historic records indicate that the garage was built in 1919.

623 West Street (11RS024)
Elkins reviewed the proposed request to demolish the residence and noted that the residence is a contributing structure.

A brief discussion followed regarding whether to take action on each individual request or to take action on all requests grouped together.

1310 Kansas City Street (11RS019)
James moved to recommend a finding that demolishing the residence, or allowing the residence to be removed from the district, will have an adverse effect on historic property due to the intensity of the entire project. The motion was seconded by Pier.

Heikes stated that he lived in this area as a child and that the property at that time was questionable. He expressed his opinion that the property owner should be allowed to make positive changes to the neighborhood and improve the property.

In response to a comment from Bill Kessloff, Adelstein advised that the residence is unlivable and has been vacant for some time.

Shaw stated that this is a residential neighborhood and expressed concern about setting the precedent for allowing commercial development to encroach into residential areas.

Sasso expressed his opinion that the Historic District boundary should be changed if the structure is removed from the property.
Additional discussion followed regarding the 11.1 Review process and the Case Report requirements.

The motion to recommend a finding that demolishing the residence, or allowing the residence to be removed from the district, will have an adverse effect on historic property due to the intensity of the entire project carried unanimously.

**1305 W. Main Street (11RS020)**
James moved to recommend a finding that demolishing the residence, or removing the residence from the district, will have an adverse effect on historic property due to the intensity of the entire project. The motion was seconded by Matson and motion carried unanimously.

**609 West Street (11RS021)**
Matson moved to recommend a finding that demolishing the residence, or removing the residence from the district, will have an adverse effect on historic property due to the intensity of the entire project. The motion was seconded by Grable and the motion carried unanimously.

**617 West Street (11RS022)**
Krull moved to recommend a finding that demolishing the residence, or removing the residence from the district, will have an adverse effect on historic property due to the intensity of the entire project. The motion was seconded by Pier and the motion carried unanimously.

**617 West Street (11RS023)**
Pier moved to recommend a finding that demolishing the garage, or allowing the garage to be removed from the district, will have an adverse effect on historic property due to the intensity of the entire project, with the understanding that the environs included the entire property. The motion was seconded by Matson and the motion carried unanimously.

**623 West Street (11RS024)**
Pier moved to recommend a finding that demolishing the residence, or removing the residence from the district, will have an adverse effect on historic property due to the intensity of the entire project. The motion was seconded by Knox and the motion carried unanimously.

**New Business**
Krull expressed his opinion that it would be beneficial for the Commission to review the Mt. Rushmore Road Corridor Study to review the transition areas between the residential and commercial uses.

Bulman informed the Commission that the meeting minutes are available to the State as soon as they have been completed.

Shaw expressed his concern with commercial development encroaching into residential areas. Discussion followed.
Approval of Minutes
James moved to approve the July 1, 2011 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Matson and approved unanimously.

Other Business
Roseland informed the Commission that he continues to do research on the maintenance for the clock and that he will bring the information to the next meeting.

Bulman reminded the Commission members to complete a timesheet for the Home Show so that she can submit them for the grant reimbursement.

James suggested that the Commission think about creating a way to record preservation of structures and to hire someone or enlist a volunteer to document the information.

James moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:11 a.m. The motion was seconded by Sogge and approved unanimously.
Minutes of the August 5, 2011
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present: Pat Roseland, Cynthia Matson, Shawn Krull, Scott Sogge, Eric James and Duane Baumgartner

Members Absent: Jean Kessloff, Richard Grable, Tamara Pier and Heather C. Knox

Others Present: Michelle Dennis, Richard Peter, Karen Bulman, Jeanne Nicholson, Mike Stanley, Jack Batchelder, Jim Wilber, Julie Wilber and Claudia Laws

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:31 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Agenda

James moved to approve the revised agenda. The motion was seconded by Krull. The motion was approved unanimously.

11.1 Reviews

1421 West Boulevard (11RS025)
Batchelder reviewed the proposed request to partially demolish and reconstruct the garage and explained that the garage was damaged by a construction vehicle.

James moved to recommend a finding that the partial demolition and the reconstruction of the garage will have no adverse effect on the historic property located at 1421 West Boulevard. The motion was seconded by Matson.

Batchelder briefly explained what materials will be used for the foundation, siding and shingles and noted that the addition was not damaged. He added that the shed roof will have a slight slope.

In response to a question from Sogge regarding a gabled roof, Batchelder explained that he was planning on the shed roof because it would be cheaper than a gabled roof and that it would be easier for him to build the garage himself.

Sogge expressed his opinion that the original roof was gabled and a gabled roof would be more historic and because the structure is located in the Historic District, the garage should be rebuilt the same as it was before it was damaged.

Krull also expressed his opinion that the structure should be replaced with the same kind of structure that previously existed. Discussion followed.

Krull made a substitute motion to recommend a finding that the partial demolition and the reconstruction of the garage will have no adverse effect on the historic property located at 1421 West Boulevard and that the reconstructed garage have a gabled roof with a minimum 6/12 pitch. The motion was seconded by Sogge.

Additional discussion followed.
Roseland asked the applicant if he would be available to provide cost estimates for a gabled roof at the next meeting on August 19, 2011.

Krull informed the applicant that Knechts or Dakota Craft would be able to provide him with the costs for a gabled roof.

Batchelder advised that he would be available to attend a future meeting.

James made a substitute motion to continue the partial demolition and reconstruction of the garage at 1421 West Boulevard to the August 19, 2011 meeting. The motion was seconded by Sogge and the motion carried unanimously.

1319 12th Street (11RS026)
Peter reviewed the proposed request to replace the wood shakes with an asphalt roof.

Sogge moved to recommend a finding that replacing wood shakes with an asphalt roof will have no adverse effect on historic property located at 1319 12th Street. The motion was seconded by Matson and the motion carried unanimously.

502 Main Street (11CM031)
Dennis reviewed the proposed request to change the metal courtyard railing and noted that the owner would like the railing changed to better reflect the business that will be located on the property. Dennis added that because of the grade, sandstone blocks will be used along the sidewalk to ensure that the railing will be level.

Krull moved to recommend a finding that changing the metal courtyard railing will have no adverse effect on historic property located 502 Main Street. The motion was seconded by Matson and the motion carried unanimously.

1123 Fulton Street (11RS027)
Jim Wilber reviewed the proposed request to replace the wood railing and steps and to extend the railing across the porch. He added that the house has been sold and that a condition of the sale is to replace the railing and steps. Wilber also indicated his request to extend the railing across the porch is to bring the house into compliance with the building code. A brief discussion followed.

James moved to recommend a finding that replacing the wood railing and steps and extending the railing across the porch will have no adverse effect on historic property located at 1123 Fulton Street. The motion was seconded by Matson.

In response to a question from Bulman, Jim Wilber advised that the new steps and railing will be made of wood.

The motion to recommend a finding that replacing the wood railing and steps and extending the railing across the porch will have no adverse effect on historic property located at 1123 Fulton Street carried unanimously.

Approval of Minutes
Krull moved to approve the July 15, 2011 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Baumgartner and approved unanimously.
**Other Business**

Sogge expressed his opinion that it is not the responsibility of the Commission to determine if the Commission’s recommendation is economically feasible for the 11.1 Reviews. Additional discussion followed.

In response to a question from Roseland, Bulman explained that the City Attorney is currently reviewing the contract between the City of Rapid City and Winter and Company for the next phase of the Design Guidelines. She added that when the final outline is received, staff will send a copy to the Commission members and post the outline on the City’s website.

In response to a question from Matson, Bulman reported that the State concurred with the Commission’s recommendations for the Adelstein requests at the corner of West Street and St. Joseph Street and that the State has requested that one case report encompassing all properties be provided for further review. A brief discussion followed.

**Baumgartner moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:11 a.m. The motion was seconded by Sogge and approved unanimously.**
Members Present: Pat Roseland, Richard Grable, Jean Kessloff, Heather Knox, Duane Baumgartner, Cynthia Matson, Tamara Pier and Ron Sasso, Council Liaison Alternate

Members Absent: Scott Sogge, Eric James, Shawn Krull

Others Present: Karen Bulman, Frank Smyle, Jeanne Nicholson

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Agenda

Kessloff inquired as to whether Brad Solon or Curt Bechtel from Building Inspection could give a brief explanation about the Building Code requirements for porches. Bulman advised that Solon would be available to review the requirements for porches.

Roseland suggested that Building Code – Porches be added under New Business.

Baumgartner moved to approve the agenda with the noted addition. The motion was seconded by Pier. The motion was approved unanimously.

11.1 Reviews

529 Main St (508 6th Street) (11CM032)

Smyle reviewed the proposed request for the addition of the interior walls and noted that the business will be a women’s retail store. He briefly explained the wall heights and finishings, ceiling heights, flooring, lighting and the location of the HVAC ducts.

Matson moved to recommend a finding that the addition of the interior walls will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Baumgartner and the motion carried unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

Baumgartner moved to approve the August 5, 2011 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Matson and approved unanimously.

New Business

Building Code - Porches

Kessloff requested information about the Building Code requirements for porches and ADA access for building fronts.

Solon explained that the Building Code includes exceptions that can be granted for the restoration of historic property. He added that the Residential Code does not specifically address historic property but that staff will review and ensure that safety is addressed when property owners apply for building permits. Discussion followed.
Solon added that if a property owner adds something to an historic property that was not previously a part of the property, the additions or improvements will need to meet the requirements of the Building Code.

**Old Business**

**Design Guidelines Outline**
Bulman advised that the Design Guidelines Outline has been sent to the Committee members and that it is currently posted on the City’s website. She requested that the Committee acknowledge the Design Guidelines Outline. Bulman added that she is currently working on the new contract with Winter and Company for the next phase of the project and that she hopes to have the contract available for Committee review at the next meeting.

Roseland acknowledged the Design Guidelines Outline that has been presented to the Committee.

Pier suggested that a workshop for window replacement similar to the one we previously had would be a great project for the future. She added that the workshop would benefit both the community and the historic preservation of the community. A brief discussion followed.

Grable moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:53 a.m. The motion was seconded by Matson and approved unanimously.
Members Present: Pat Roseland, Richard Grable, Jean Kessloff, Duane Baumgartner, Cynthia Matson, Shawn Krull, and Eric James

Members Absent: Scott Sogge, Heather Knox, and Tamara Pier

Others Present: Karen Bulman, Vicki Alexander, Jerry Mattson, Dale Lutheran, and Steve McCarthy

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Agenda
Roseland stated that the first item on the agenda is to be tabled.

Matson moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Baumgartner. The motion was approved unanimously.

Eric James entered the meeting.

11.1 Reviews

1421 West Boulevard (11RS025)

James moved to recommend tabling the partial demolition and reconstruction of the garage at 1421 West Boulevard until the applicant has submitted additional information. The motion was seconded by Matson and the motion carried unanimously.

1011 11th Street (11CM034)

Mattson briefly reviewed the proposed request to replace the windows on the building at 1011 11th Street. Mattson showed current photos of the building and photos of the new windows.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Lutheran explained that the windows leak and they propose to replace all of the windows in the building.

Discussion followed.

In response to a question from Baumgartner, Lutheran explained that Rapid City Regional Hospital’s intention is to keep the original look of the building.

Matson moved to recommend a finding that replacing windows at 1011 11th Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by James and the motion carried unanimously.
929 Kansas City Street (11CM033)
McCarthy reviewed the proposed request to replace damaged siding on the building at 929 Kansas City Street with Hardie Siding. McCarthy explained that the building was severely damaged from hail; however, the siding will not be added to the non historical addition of the building.

In response to a question from Krull, McCarthy explained the corner pieces and trim will remain the same. He added that they will repaint and reuse the cedar band around the building. McCarthy presented the Committee with photos of the building and explained that currently some of the siding is original and some was replaced previously when he originally purchased the condemned building. He explained the benefits of the siding.

Grable moved to recommend a finding that replacing the siding with Hardie Siding will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Matson and the motion carried unanimously.

Approval of Minutes
Matson moved to approve the August 19, 2011 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Baumgartner and approved unanimously.

New Business
Bulman reviewed the 2010 Annual Report and explained that it needs to be approved before going to Legal and Finance Committee on September 14, 2011.

A brief discussion followed.

Baumgartner moved to approve the 2010 Annual Report. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.

Old Business
Kessloff advised the Committee to be mindful of requests for replacing siding. Kessloff added that sometimes just a few pieces need replacing and not all the siding on the building.

A brief discussion followed.

Baumgartner suggested that the Commission should consider plaques on buildings to recognize architects in the area. Discussion followed.

Grable left the meeting.

Bulman explained to the Committee that the time sheets need to be filled out and sent in as matching dollars for the grant. Bulman added that so far only 70 hours have been documented.

Discussion followed regarding the time sheets and other projects around the Rapid City area.

James moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:04 a.m. The motion was seconded by Matson and approved unanimously.
Minutes of the September 16, 2011
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present: Pat Roseland, Scott Sogge, Duane Baumgartner, Jean Kessloff, Cynthia Matson, Eric James and Shawn Krull

Members Absent: Richard Grable, Tamara Pier and Heather Knox

Others Present: Karen Bulman, Jeanne Nicholson and Aaron Galloway

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Agenda
Matson moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Sogge. The motion was approved unanimously.

11.1 Reviews

911 Quincy (11RS028)
Aaron Galloway reviewed the proposed request to re-roof the house with asphalt shingles and noted that currently there are wood shake shingles and T-lock shingles on the house. He added that the owner’s intent is to re-roof the house in the spring but if the weather cooperates, there is a possibility that the roof could be re-shingled this fall.

Matson moved to recommend a finding that the re-roofing of the house with asphalt shingles will have no adverse effect on the historic property. The motion was seconded by James.

Kessloff commented that there appears to be a finial or finials on the roof and encouraged the property owner to retain them through the re-roofing project.

The motion to recommend a finding that the re-roofing of the house with asphalt shingles will have no adverse effect on the historic property carried unanimously.

1317 Mt. Rushmore Rd (11CM035)
Bulman reviewed the proposed request to repair the rock foundation wall and explained that the dirt wall collapsed which resulted in knocking down the foundation wall.

Sogge moved to recommend a finding that the repairing of the rock foundation wall will have no adverse effect on the historic property. The motion was seconded by Matson and the motion carried unanimously.

Approval of Minutes
Baumgartner moved to approve the September 2, 2011 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.
New Business

Liaison Committee
Roseland informed the Committee that he received a letter from Marcia Elkins requesting that a Liaison Committee be appointed to work with the consultant team for the Block 6, Boulevard Addition properties. Roseland recommended that Jean Kessloff, Eric James and Scott Sogge in addition to Karen Bulman, Ron Sasso and Jordan Mason be on the Committee.

Bulman explained that Elkin’s request is for assistance and guidance in the preparation of the case report. Discussion followed.

Matson moved to appoint Jean Kessloff, Eric James, Scott Sogge, Karen Bulman, Jordan Mason and Ron Sasso to the Liaison Committee. The motion was seconded by Baumgartner and the motion carried unanimously.

Historic Clock
Roseland advised that he has been notified by Don Purdue that the clock is not working and that he does not want to be involved in the maintenance or insurance of the clock. Roseland added that he has visited with Chris Johnson about the repairs and that he has contacted Rosenbaum Signs about a maintenance agreement. Roseland noted that Rosenbaum Signs will agree to a maintenance agreement for $35 per month. Roseland advised that he will be meeting with the Mayor about the City being involved in the maintenance and insurance of the clock.

Collections Seminar
Kessloff informed the Committee that Historic Rapid City applied for and was granted a Mentorship Program from the Midwest Art Conservation Center to host a two night seminar. Kessloff added that she is not sure what the topics will be but there will be a session on how to take care of your collections. Kessloff stated that the scheduled dates are November 4 and 5 at the Clock Shop and more details will be provided as they become available.

Matson moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:48 a.m. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.
**Minutes of the October 7, 2011**

**Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting**

**Members Present:** Pat Roseland, Cynthia Matson, Jean Kessloff, Duane Baumgartner, Richard Grable, Heather Knox, Eric James, Scott Sogge and Bonny Peterson – Council Liaison

**Members Absent:** Tamara Pier and Shawn Krull

**Others Present:** Karen Bulman, Jeanne Nicholson, Kent Kennedy, Angela Rykhus, Jason Alfano, Rob Aker, Laurie Martin and Fred Thurston

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m.

**Approval of Meeting Agenda**

Bulman requested that an 11.1 Review for 1123 12th Street be added to the Agenda. Roseland requested that Dakota Middle School Chairs be added as a New Business item.

James moved to approve the agenda with the noted additions. The motion was seconded by Sogge. The motion was approved unanimously.

**11.1 Reviews**

523 6th St (11CM038)

Kent Kennedy reviewed the proposed request to renovate the storage area for public use. Kennedy advised that currently Paddy O’Neils does not have restrooms and that customers use the restrooms located in the hotel lobby and the coffee shop. Kennedy briefly reviewed the floor plan for the restrooms, noting that the expansion is 725 square feet and that the décor of the hotel will be duplicated in the renovated space.

James moved to recommend a finding that renovating the storage space for public use will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Matson.

In response to a question from Knox, Kennedy explained that the bar is being extended around the corner for additional visual control of the lounge.

The motion to recommend a finding that renovating the storage space for public use will have no adverse effect on historic property carried unanimously.

1019 St. James St (11RS029)

Laurie Martin reviewed the proposed request to add a 16’ x 20’ porch. Martin added that the addition will be larger to expand a bedroom and that the porch has already been removed.

Matson moved to recommend a finding that the porch addition will have no adverse effect on the historic property. The motion was seconded by James.

Bulman advised that the applicant is before the Committee to ensure that her proposed addition is acceptable and/or to receive recommendations from the Committee. Bulman added that she will need to bring professional design plans to the Committee for final approval.
Kessloff reminded everyone that even though the property is non-contributing, the addition will need to blend in with the contributing houses in the neighborhood.

The motion to recommend a finding that the porch addition will have no adverse effect on the historic property carried unanimously.

715 Kansas City St (11CM036)
Jason Alfano reviewed the proposed request to re-roof the flat roof using the same type of system and similar materials. Alfano asked how soon he could start the project because the roof is leaking and the re-roofing needs to be done as soon as possible. Bulman advised that she would submit the Committee’s recommendation for approval immediately and that hopefully an answer would be available today or Monday.

Baumgartner moved to recommend a finding that re-roofing the flat roof will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Matson and the motion carried unanimously.

402 St. Joseph St (11CM037)
Fred Thurston reviewed the proposed request to relocate the electrical service. Thurston added that the existing service is not in compliance and that the new service will be located on the northwest side of the building. He added that the owner has completed the awnings, masonry work and neon lighting on the building and that the property is for sale.

Sogge moved to recommend a finding that relocating the electrical service will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Knox and the motion carried unanimously.

Thurston informed the Committee that the Park Central Building and Murphy’s did not qualify as tax credit projects. He explained that Murphy’s was rejected because of the stairs in the front of the building and that the Park Central Building was rejected because the existing window glass must be retained in the restoration of the building. Additional discussion followed.

1123 12th Street
Angela Rykhus reviewed the proposed request to build temporary steps. Rykhus added that the existing steps will be removed and that she needs additional time to resolve the drainage problems on the property prior to building the permanent steps. She also advised that the roof is being redone with the same type of shingles in a lighter color and that work continues on the foundation.

Matson moved to recommend a finding that building the temporary stairs will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Sogge.

Bulman advised that the applicant will have to bring the plans for the permanent steps to the Committee for approval. A brief discussion followed.

Bulman advised that she will submit the Committee’s recommendation to Pierre and that she will contact the applicant as soon as she receives the approval from Pierre.

Kessloff advised that the improvements on the house may be eligible for a tax moratorium.
The motion to recommend a finding that building the temporary stairs will have no adverse effect on historic property carried unanimously.

Approval of Minutes
Baumgartner moved to approve the September 16, 2011 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by James and carried unanimously.

New Business

Dakota Middle School
Roseland informed the Committee that $2,000 was raised from the sale of the chairs at Dakota Middle School and the funds will be donated to the Historic Preservation Commission. He added that there is an auction scheduled for the remaining chairs this Saturday. A brief discussion followed.

Matson advised that an auction is being held on October 17, 2011 for the Belle Fourche school which was built in 1912.

Historic Clock
Roseland advised that he has visited with Mayor Kooiker and Ritchie Nordstrom about the clock. He added that the clock belongs to the City and is installed on a private building. He added that Don Purdue is not interested in providing the insurance and the maintenance for the clock. Discussion followed.

James moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:06 a.m. The motion was seconded by Sogge and approved unanimously.
Minutes of the October 21, 2011
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present: Cynthia Matson, Richard Grable, Scott Sogge, Jean Kessloff, Shawn Krull and Bonny Petersen – Council Liaison

Members Absent: Tamara Pier, Pat Roseland, Heather Knox, Eric James and Duane Baumgartner,

Others Present: Jeri Antes, Eric Anderson and Ryan Neumiller

Quorum was not present and no action was taken on the agenda items.

11.1 Reviews

1815 9th St (11RS031)
Eric Anderson reviewed the proposed request to demolish and reconstruct the addition. A brief discussion followed regarding the flat roof of the current addition and the delineation of the new addition.

1329 9th St (11RS033)
Jeri Antes reviewed the proposed request to remove the addition to the house. A brief discussion followed.

919 Fulton Street (11RS032)
Bulman informed the Committee that the applicant was not present. Bulman reviewed the request to re-roof the garage from shake shingles to asphalt shingles. A brief discussion followed.
Minutes of the November 4, 2011
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present: Pat Roseland, Cynthia Matson, Eric James, Heather Knox, Jean Kessloff, Shawn Krull, Scott Sogge and Richard Grable

Members Absent: Tamara Pier and Duane Baumgartner

Others Present: Karen Bulman, Jeanne Nicholson, Dan Daly, Jeremy Meyer and Link Legner

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:31 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Agenda
James moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Knox. The motion was approved unanimously.

Sogge entered the meeting at this time.

11.1 Reviews

1019 St. James St (11RS029)
Jeremy Meyer reviewed the proposed request to add a 16’ x 20’ addition to the back of the house. Link Legner added that the shingles for the addition will match the existing shingles and that the roof will have the same pitch as the previous addition.

Matson moved to recommend a finding that the 16’ x 20’ addition will have no adverse effect on the historic property. The motion was seconded by James.

A brief discussion followed.

The motion to recommend a finding that the 16’ x 20’ addition will have no adverse effect on the historic property carried unanimously.

Approval of Minutes
Sogge moved to approve the October 7, 2011 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by James and carried unanimously.

Krull moved to approve the October 21, 2011 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Sogge and carried unanimously.

New Business
Dan Daly, TDG Communications, gave a presentation on the QR Coding Project that was done in Deadwood. Daly advised that TDG Communications would be willing to work with the Committee to set up the project. Daly briefly reviewed the components and costs of the project. Daly added that he has visited with Downtown Rapid City and that they may be interesting in providing some funding for the project.
In response to a question from Matson regarding funding, Roseland explained that the current CLG grant money has been designated for the Design Guidelines.

Bulman advised that the request for new CLG grant application will be provided in February.

James expressed his opinion that the Chamber of Commerce may be willing to provide some funding for the project.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Roseland explained that the Committee is working on the distribution of the funds from the sale of the Dakota Middle School chairs.

Grable expressed his support for the project and volunteered to assist in finding financing for the project.

**Matson moved to recommend that a committee be created to find financing for the QR Coding Project. The motion was seconded by Grable and carried unanimously.**

Grable, James, Knox and Matson volunteered to serve on the Committee.

Roseland reminded everyone that the Home Show will be in March and that the members should start thinking about ideas for the booth. He requested that the Home Show be added to the next meeting agenda.

Kessloff reminded the Committee that a symposium is being held today and tomorrow on the conservation and preservation of art.

**Old Business**
In response to a question from Sogge, Bulman advised that she has not heard anything about the Adelstein project. Roseland advised that he would contact Marcia Elkins to check on the status of the project.

**James moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:05 a.m. The motion was seconded by Sogge and approved unanimously.**
Minutes of the November 18, 2011
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present: Jean Kessloff, Cynthia Matson, Richard Grable, Eric James and Shawn Krull

Members Absent: Pat Roseland, Duane Baumgartner, Tamara Pier, Heather Knox and Scott Sogge

Others Present: Karen Bulman, Jeanne Nicholson, Michelle Dennis, Dan Tribby and Aaron Crowley

Quorum was not present and no action was taken on the agenda items.

Bulman suggested that the Home Show be continued to the next meeting.

Grable advised that the QR Coding Committee has met and that the members are doing research on grants and photographs. He added that the Committee will meet again in a month. James advised that 20 or 30 buildings should be selected for the project. Grable suggested that QR codes could be added to the President statues.

11.1 Reviews

508 and 512 Main Street (11CM040)
Michelle Dennis reviewed the proposed request to replace the metal cornice on the front top of the building at 508 Main Street.

A brief discussion followed regarding the restoration of the cornice.

Michelle Dennis reviewed the request to install an awning over the entrance, to replace the existing (non-historic) doors and door surrounds and to install a USPS required mailbox facility at 512 Main Street.

306 7th Street (11CM041)
Aaron Crowley reviewed the proposed request to repair the entrance ramp and railing.

Bulman informed the Committee that she would inform the State that the Committee had no objections to the 11.1 Reviews.

New Business
Krull expressed his opinion that Skyline Drive should be nominated as an individually listed property on the National Register. A brief discussion followed.

The meeting adjourned at 7:56 a.m.
Members Present: Pat Roseland, Richard Grable, Jean Kessloff, Heather Knox, Cynthia Matson, Shawn Krull and Scott Sogge

Members Absent: Duane Baumgartner, Tamara Pier and Eric James

Others Present: Karen Bulman, Jeanne Nicholson, Charles Desmond, Mike Kenton, Steve Jastrom, Kris Bjerke, Dick Dempster, Timothy Mitchell, Ron Reed, Sam Kooiker, Michelle Dennis, David Viall, Ron Sjodin, Gale Johnson, Forrest Thompson and Bonny Petersen – Council Liaison

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:34 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Agenda
Kessloff requested that the McGillycuddy House be added as an item under New Business.

Matson moved to approve the agenda with the noted addition. The motion was seconded by Krull and the motion was approved unanimously.

11.1 Reviews

603 Quincy (11CM043)
Gale Johnson reviewed the proposed request to install new windows, trim and siding and a rear entrance and staircase. He added that a new sprinkler system, new heating system, individual air conditioner units and an elevator will be installed in the building. Johnson noted that the outside appearance of the building will be very similar to what currently exists on the building.

Matson moved to recommend a finding that installing new windows, trim and siding as well as a rear entrance and staircase will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Sogge.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Forrest Thompson explained that the aluminum windows will be replaced with vinyl windows and for safety reasons, the larger ones will be slider windows instead of double hung windows.

Kessloff expressed her opinion that windows in a similar style to the current windows should be installed even though the property is not located in the Historic District. A brief discussion followed.

The motion to recommend a finding that installing new windows, trim and siding as well as a rear entrance and staircase will have no adverse effect on historic property carried with Roseland, Knox, Grable and Matson voting yes and Kessloff, Sogge and Krull voting no.
Johnson informed the Committee that there are approximately 30 fin radiators and 22 Murphy beds that are being removed from the property and that will be for sale if any of the members know anyone that may be looking for these items.

1107 Kansas City St (11CM044)
Sjodin reviewed the proposed request to install new siding and roofing. He informed the Committee that there is substantial hail damage to both the shingles and the siding. He added that the shingles will be replaced with asphalt shingles. He noted that the request is to replace the siding with similar looking vinyl siding instead of wood siding because of the additional costs for the wood siding.

Bulman suggested that the Committee take separate action on the roof and the siding. She added that she has visited with the State and that they have indicated that the siding needs to be replaced with the same kind of siding or that the existing siding be repaired.

Krull moved to recommend a finding that replacing the asphalt roofing material with asphalt roofing would have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Matson and the motion carried unanimously.

Krull moved to recommend a finding that replacing the wood siding with vinyl siding would have an adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Kessloff.

Bulman further explained the siding requirements. Additional discussion followed.

Kessloff suggested that the applicant check into available tax credits for the repairs and check into different painting techniques. Krull added that rental income properties are usually eligible for tax credits.

Sjodin advised that the windows will eventually be replaced with the same size windows.

Kessloff advised that she would be willing to meet with the applicant to review the available tax credits and painting techniques if the Committee has no issues with it. The Committee had no opposition to Kessloff meeting with applicant.

Sjodin indicated he would replace the wood siding with wood siding.

Bulman informed the Committee that they could amend the motion to specify the type of siding that could be used in order to prevent a time delay for the applicant. Additional discussion followed.

The motion to recommend a finding that replacing the wood siding with vinyl siding would have an adverse effect on historic property passed unanimously.

Krull moved to recommend a finding that replacing the wood siding with wood siding to replicate the historic siding would have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Matson and the motion carried unanimously.

601 Columbus St (11CM046)
Steve Jastrum reviewed the proposed request for renovations and to add the west addition to Dakota Middle School. He advised that the current entrance will be the entrance for the theatre
and that the main entrance to the school will be located in the new west addition. Jastrom also advised that the football field will become a parking lot and that Columbus Street will remain a public street but will be incorporated into the parking lot. He reviewed the renovations that will be made to the existing entrance, restrooms, commons and cafeteria areas and school offices. He briefly addressed the improvements to the lighting, heating, air conditioning, sprinkler protection and electrical systems, elevators and windows. Jastrom noted that the corridors including the flooring and the ceilings will retain the original look of the school. He briefly reviewed the signage for the Performing Arts Theater and for the school.

In response to a question from Michelle Dennis regarding the utility building, Jastrom reviewed the proposed mechanical and electrical system and the ability to remove the energy plant built in the late 1970’s.

**Matson moved to recommend a finding that the renovations and the new west addition would have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Sogge.**

In response to a question from Krull, Dennis explained that the proposed design for the existing structure and the addition meet the streetscape requirements.

Grable expressed his opinion that the renovations and the addition clearly have an adverse effect and destroy the character of the historic building.

In response to a question from Kessloff regarding window replacement, David Viall explained that the windows will be custom made and the thermal glass will be made as thick as necessary to fit the existing frames. Additional discussion followed.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Jastrom advised that the doors will be replaced with new metal doors and insulated glass, if possible. A brief discussion followed.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the renovations and the new west addition would have no adverse effect on historic property carried with Roseland, Kessloff, Knox, Sogge, Matson and Krull voting yes and Grable voting no.**

601 Columbus St (11CM047)
Bulman advised the Committee that chairs are being brought for review, but an 11.1 Historic Review is not needed. She added that the State has indicated that the seating can be removed and replaced through the previous 11.1 Historic Review.

Mike Kenton advised that all of the old seats have been sold.

Kris Bjerke reviewed the seating plan for the main level and balcony, the acoustic ceiling panels and the entrance locations.

Dick Dempster briefly reviewed the carpet samples and the upholstery for the chairs. A brief discussion followed.

Bjerke informed the Committee that the lights are being restored. A brief discussion followed.

Ron Reed informed the Committee that the State Prison System will refinish the old remaining wood chairs.
725 St. Joseph St (11CM048)
Charles Desmond reviewed the proposed request to install a ventilation hood and to relocate a louver.

**Matson moved to recommend a finding that installing the ventilation hood and relocating the louver would have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Krull and the motion carried unanimously.**

**Approval of Minutes**
Matson moved to approve the November 4, 2011 and November 18, 2011 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Knox and carried unanimously.

**New Business**

**Home Show**
Bulman informed the Committee that the booth rental for the Home Show has been paid and that the equipment still needs to be ordered.

Roseland asked for volunteers for the Working Committee for the Home Show. He suggested that the Home Show be added to the next agenda.

**McGillycuddy House**
Kessloff advised that the pictures of the McGillycuddy House have been restored. She advised that Historic Rapid City would like to borrow the pictures for approximately a year to display in the house.

Bulman explained that the Historic Preservation Commission paid for the restoration of the pictures and that the Committee could authorize Historic Rapid City to use the pictures for display in the McGillycuddy House.

**Matson moved to allow Historic Rapid City to display the pictures in the McGillycuddy House for a year. The motion was seconded by Knox and the motion carried unanimously.**

**QR Coding Project**
Grable advised that the Committee met with Don Purdue and he indicated that he would be responsible for the QR codes to be placed on the Presidents. Grable stated that there is a lot of interest in the project and that the dollar amounts need to be established for the placement of the window coding decals in the businesses. A brief discussion followed.

Bulman suggested that a working session be scheduled sometime in January for the Committee members to determine the Commission’s comprehensive goals. She added that the amount of grant funding will not be known until March or April.

Roseland informed the Committee that Scott Sogge was not reappointed to the Historic Preservation Commission for next year. He thanked Scott for his dedication and hard work. Roseland added that Michelle Dennis has been appointed to the Historic Preservation Commission.
Bulman advised that a building permit for a small wall to separate the conference room and library was approved for 704 St. Joseph, which is a contributing structure. She added that an 11.1 Historic Review was sent to the State and that they approved the application.

902 Main Street (11CM042)
Roseland asked the Committee if they would like to make a recommendation on the application for 902 Main Street.

Bulman briefly reviewed the proposed request to remove the awning, to add a window and to replace the shingles. She added that the applicant has not decided on what will be used for the mansard. A brief discussion followed.

Knox moved to continue the application for 902 Main Street to the next meeting. The motion was seconded by Grable and the motion carried unanimously.

Kessloff moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:50 a.m. The motion was seconded by Knox and approved unanimously.