

MINUTES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
March 2, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scott Sogge, Pat Roseland, Jean Kessloff, Richard Grable, Tamara Pier, Shawn Krull, Cynthia Matson, Duane Baumgartner, Michael Bender, John Wagner, Aaron Costello, Council Liaison

OTHERS PRESENT: Bill Kessloff, Bill Groves, Michelle Dennis, Chris Nelson, Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

Call To Order

Roseland called the meeting to order at 5:37 p.m.

Review of Adopted Preservation Plan

Dennis addressed the Commission's work in reviewing and updating the Comprehensive Preservation Plan for Rapid City. Dennis provided a brief review of the components of the Preservation Plan and their application by the Commission. Dennis indicated that the intent of the Preservation Plan was to provide a flexible tool that would allow the Commission to use in achieving their preservation goals for Rapid City.

In response to a question from Dennis, Elkins indicated that the Comprehensive Preservation Plan has been adopted as a component of the City's Comprehensive Plan by both the Rapid City Planning Commission and Rapid City Council. Elkins briefly addressed the numerous documents that comprise the City's Comprehensive Plan.

In response to a question from J. Kessloff, Dennis clarified the historical context and architectural context information that is utilized to evaluate a potential resource. Dennis addressed the importance of "context" in surveying and evaluating properties for nomination to the State and National registers.

Questions for State Staff

Chris Nelson, Historic Preservation Specialist, briefly reviewed his education and experience with the State Historic Preservation Office. Nelson addressed his work with the Certified Local Government program, the National Register program and processing reviews under State and Federal law.

Nelson clarified that a Certified Local Government consists of the Commission and the Chief elected official of a community. Nelson indicated that the 11.1 Review process is implemented when there is a project that has the potential to impact historic property and briefly reviewed the steps of the 11.1 Review process from inception to conclusion. Nelson indicated that when there is a finding of adverse effect the applicant is required to address all feasible and prudent alternatives before the City can approve the project.

Nelson indicated that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards encompass reconstruction, restoration, preservation and rehabilitation. Nelson indicated that rehabilitation is most widely utilized as it allows for the alteration of a structure to provide for a more compatible and contemporary use of the property.

In response to a question from Roseland, Nelson indicated that a sensitive rehabilitation completed within the guidelines of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards would not remove a building from the Historic Register. Nelson urged the Commission to be aware of the cumulative impact of numerous alterations to a structure. Nelson indicated that the quantity of original material remaining is critical in the evaluation of a structure's architectural integrity.

In response to a question, Nelson indicated that environs projects are evaluated for their potential impact on the District. Nelson indicated that an environs project must be highly out of character, such as a parking ramp located within not adjacent to a residential area, to result in a finding of adverse impact.

In response to a question, Nelson encouraged the Commission to work with owners of non-listed properties to use alternative methods to protect the historical integrity of a structure. Nelson addressed the State and Federal tax incentive programs available to individuals performing restoration projects. In response to a question, Nelson indicated that most property listings are originated by the property owner as they value their property and support the historic designation.

In response to a question from Pier, Nelson indicated that other communities actively promote preservation through education by providing speakers, sponsoring workshops and providing training sessions to staff and Commission members. Discussion followed regarding interpretation of the 11.1 Review process state wide and the adoption of Preservation Ordinances by individual communities.

In response to a question from Elkins, Nelson addressed methods to make preservation a positive aspect in the community including clearly marking the boundaries of a historic district on street signs and providing interesting educational speakers. Discussion followed regarding Commission sponsorship of speakers and workshops, the development of the Main Street program in South Dakota, the utilization of history as a tourism attraction and the education of area realtors.

In response to a question from Bender, Nelson addressed in-kind replacement with regard to deteriorated materials, replacement on the primary or secondary façade and attention to character defining features.

In response to a question from Sogge, Nelson indicated that some changes, such as egress windows, are accepted to achieve a contemporary use of the property noting that such changes can also be done in a sensitive manner. Discussion followed regarding preservation standards for the new siding and roofing materials.

In response to a question from Elkins, Nelson indicated that providing District boundary markers is an eligible cost. Discussion followed regarding communities with a façade program and the financing and easement requirements of a façade program.

In response to a question from Krull, Nelson addressed the problems of rehabilitating a property that has suffered years of neglect and deferred maintenance. Nelson indicated that educating the public on the advantages and processes for rehabilitating historic properties is an important element in turning this process around. Nelson indicated that good new infill properties and acceptable rehabilitated properties are elements of vibrant historic districts. He noted the need for allowing some change to historic properties to achieve contemporary use of the buildings.

In response to a question from J. Kessloff, Nelson indicated that the impact of vinyl siding on a District's historic status would require individual evaluation of each property in the district.

Bender recommended that the Commission be educated on the use of alternative siding materials to allow the Commission to provide intelligent assistance to applicants. Discussion followed regarding the harm resulting from the installation of vinyl siding on a historic property.

Meeting Recess

Roseland recessed the meeting at 6:48 p.m. to allow members to move to the First Floor Community Room for the slide show presentation.

MINUTES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
March 2, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scott Sogge, Pat Roseland, Jean Kessloff, Richard Grable, Tamara Pier, Shawn Krull, Cynthia Matson, Duane Baumgartner, Michael Bender, John Wagner, Aaron Costello, Council Liaison

OTHERS PRESENT: Bill Kessloff, Michelle Dennis, Chris Nelson, Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

PUBLIC PRESENT: Jeanette Deurloo, Bill Groves, Lorie Melone, Jomay Steen, Gavin Williams, Crystal Williams, Steve Colgan, Kurt Whitesell, Gary Kruse, Carol Merwin, Frank Gengler

Meeting Reconvened

Roseland reconvened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. in the First Floor Community Room.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards Slide Show

Chris Nelson, Historic Preservation Specialist with the State Historic Preservation Office presented the Secretary of the Interior's Standards slide show for the rehabilitation of historic structures. Nelson discussed the key character traits and elements of historic properties that are considered when proposing a rehabilitation project. Upon completion of the slide show presentation Nelson answered questions from those in attendance regarding siding materials, the honorary and monetary value of historic properties and districts and the 11.1 Review process.

Adjourn

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.