

MINUTES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
June 4, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scott Sogge, Pat Roseland, Jean Kessloff, Tamara Pier, Shawn Krull, Cynthia Matson, Duane Baumgartner, Michael Bender

OTHERS PRESENT: Jim Headid, Ed Eixenberger, Bob Fuchs, Neal Schlottman, Erich Orris, Bob Brandt, James Adams, Beth Young, Michelle Dennis, Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

Call To Order

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

Approval of Meeting Agenda

The following item was added to the agenda:

- Treasurer's Report – Approve Journey Museum rental \$250

Baumgartner moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to approve the meeting agenda as amended.

513-521 Main Street (10CM018)835

Headid presented the request to reroof the buildings at 513, 515, 517, 519 and 521 Main Street. Headid presented photographs documenting the condition of the roofs and the buildings that have line of sight to the new roofs. Headid addressed the materials to be removed and the manner in which leaking areas will be addressed. Headid provided material samples of the insulation and membrane that will be utilized in the roofing project.

Baumgartner moved, Sogge seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the reroofing of 513-521 Main Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.

1316 West Boulevard (10RS011)

Bulman indicated that the application has been resubmitted as the porch was not completed in accordance with the stipulations of approval. Elkins indicated that drain opening were not installed and the top cap dimensions do not comply with the stipulations of approval and require the Commission's review.

Eixenberger indicated that he was unaware that drain sleeves were required noting that the spacing in the deck flooring provides sufficient drainage. Eixenberger indicated that the deck railing top cap is $\frac{3}{4}$ inch narrower than the specified dimension. Elkins indicated that staff has no objections to the alterations.

Matson moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the modifications including the modification of the drainage openings and the installation of a top cap $\frac{3}{4}$ inch less in width on the property location at 1316 West Boulevard will have no adverse effect on historic property.

Sogge complemented the changes noting that the porch appearance is more complementary to the structure. Eixenberger indicated that the porch on the adjacent property was utilized as a guide in rebuilding this porch.

610 Main Street (10CM021)

Fuchs presented the request to install an outside walk-in freezer on the rear of the property. Fuchs indicated that the 6 foot by 8 foot freezer unit will be placed on a concrete pad noting that electrical service will be provided to the unit directly through the rear wall. Fuchs indicated that the structure will not exceed the roof line and will be rubber roofed. In response to a question, Fuchs indicated that the compressor will be installed to the back side of the unit.

Bender moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the installation of a standalone freezer at the back of the building, including electrical service, on the property at 610 Main Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.

520 7th Street (10CM019)

Schlottman presented the request to install an interior door opening between the 518 and 520 tenant spaces. Kessloff indicated that the historic fabric removed to create the door opening is not a character defining feature of the building.

Baumgartner moved, Sogge seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the installation of an interior door opening between the 518 and 520 tenant spaces on the property at 520 7th Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.

518 7th Street (10CM020)

Orris addressed the interior improvements and changes proposed for the tenant space at 518 7th Street to allow for the creation of a cigar lounge. Orris addressed the electrical, mechanical and plumbing improvements required to provide the ADA bathrooms, bar and walk-in cooler. In response to a question Orris indicated that an air scrubber is utilized at the facility noting the efforts taken to seal the lounge area off from other public spaces.

In response to a question from Baumgartner, Orris indicated that no exterior changes, other than signage, are anticipated at this time.

Baumgartner moved, Pier seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the remodel of the existing lavatory, addition of a second lavatory, removal of non-load bearing walls and addition of a non-load bearing wall including all plumbing, mechanical and electrical upgrades on the property at 518 7th Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.

1103 West Boulevard (10RS010)

Brandt presented the request to modify the original application to permit demolition of the existing addition, to permit the new addition to be connected to the garage, to permit construction of a covered patio and to permit demolition of the top floor porch.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Brandt indicated that the top floor porch door will be replaced with a window noting the manner in which the roofline of the new addition would impact the window placement. Kessloff indicated that the lack of elevation drawings make the determination of "effect" difficult.

In response to a question from Sogge, Brandt indicated that the garage roofline height will be extended across the addition, eliminating the varying height rooflines. Discussion followed regarding the design of the roofline over the addition. In response to a question, Dennis

indicated that dropping the addition roofline under the garage roofline would provide the required delineation. Discussion followed regarding lowering the roofline of the addition and the resulting impact on the dormer window, house window and covered patio design.

In response to a question from Roseland, Brandt indicated that wood Marvin windows with top divided lights will be installed. In response to a question from Bender, Brandt indicated that the original elevations incorrectly reflect the location of the kitchen windows, noting that they will be the same height as the house windows.

Discussion followed regarding the impact of the addition roofline and materials to be used to side the addition. In response to a question, Brandt indicated that the covered patio will not be attached to the house or garage.

Krull moved to recommend that a minimum 18 inch drop between the garage and addition rooflines be provided for delineation, that the pitch of the addition roofline match the pitch of the garage, that the kitchen windows be the same top height as existing windows, that a taller window be provided in the dormer and that the trim on the 6 foot by 6 foot covered patio posts be painted. Bender seconded the motion.

Kessloff and Pier indicated that due to the lack of elevation drawings there is insufficient information to accurately address the request.

Discussion followed regarding alterations to the covered patio design resulting from the required height reduction to the addition roofline and the need for elevation drawings to accurately determine the roofline impact on the dormer window, house window and covered patio.

Krull withdrew the motion, Bender concurred.

Bender moved, Sogge seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the demolition of the existing addition, authorization of the connection of the new addition to the garage subject to the approval of a variance and to permit the footing and foundation permit for the new addition on the property at 1103 West Boulevard will have no adverse effect on historic property with the elevation drawings addressing the roofline details, the window details, the covered patio details and the dormer window details to be continued to the June 18, 2010 meeting to allow the applicant to provide additional information.

913 St James Street (10RS012)

Young addressed the privacy concerns prompting the request to reduce the size of two windows and remove one window from the bathroom area. Elkins clarified that the structure is classified as non-contributing. Baumgartner indicated that the window alterations would not be an adverse effect due to the non-contributing status.

Kessloff indicated that the consideration should also be given to the impact the window alterations will have on the house and neighborhood. Adams indicated that the replacement windows will be multi-pane wood construction. In response to a question from Bender, Adams indicated that the windows are original to the house noting that the rear of the house is steel sided and the remainder of the house is a composite siding.

Sogge indicated that the window alterations will have minimal impact on the property's primary facade. In response to a question from Sogge, Adams indicated that in the early 1970's two rooms were combined to enlarge the bathroom area.

Kessloff suggested retaining the windows and using interior shutters for privacy. Discussion followed regarding the current code requirements for windows installed above tubs and the design of the divided lights in the new windows. In response to a question from Krull, Adams indicated that the replacement siding will match the existing siding.

Krull moved to recommended a finding that the removal of a rear window, the size reduction of one window on the rear and one window on the east side with the stipulation that the windows include inside and outside divided light extrusions and adhere to current code requirements and that the replacement siding match the existing siding on the property at 913 St James Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. Sogge seconded the motion.

Bender addressed the State Historic Preservation Office discussion on "cumulative changes" noting that the window alterations are not on the primary façade and do not constitute a massive change.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Adams indicated that the remainder of a wall, removed to enlarge the bathroom, will be completely removed.

The motion to recommended a finding that the removal of a rear window, the size reduction of one window on the rear and one window on the east side with the stipulation that the windows include inside and outside divided light extrusions and adhere to current code requirements and that the replacement siding match the existing siding on the property at 913 St James Street will have no adverse effect on historic property carried with Kessloff voting No.

1021 Quincy Street (10RS009)

Krull moved, Sogge seconded and carried unanimously to recommended that the application for 1021 Quincy Street be continued to the June 18, 2010 meeting to allow the applicant to provide additional information.

Approval of Minutes

Krull moved, Baumgartner seconded and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the May 21, 2010 meeting.

Treasurer's Report

Kessloff moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to approve the following expenditures: \$230-Ramkota Lodging for Yapp Seminar; \$40-Rapid City Window & Glass for shipping of Plexiglas; and \$250-Journey Museum for theatre rental.

Proposed changes to the Memorandum of Joint Powers Agreement

Matson suggested amending the Memorandum to forward all demolition of contributing structures directly to the State Historic Preservation Office. Matson suggested that directing this specific activity to Pierre may help to improve the public perception of the Commission.

Elkins presented the language change to Item 6A of the Memorandum noting that the change has been reviewed with the State Historic Preservation Office. Elkins indicated that this language change will give the Commission the ability to recommend a finding of “no adverse effect” on the demolition of non-contributing buildings or buildings located in the environs. Discussion followed regarding the proposed language change.

Krull moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to recommend that the proposed language change to Section III, Item 6A, of the Memorandum of Joint Powers Agreement be adopted:

MEMORANDUM OF JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT

Section III. GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES

6. The Parties recognize and agree that the Projects listed below will potentially have Adverse Effects on Historic Properties, are not subject to Section III (5) of this Agreement, and must be submitted to the Office for review under SDCL 1-19A-11.1, after the Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission has reviewed and commented on the Projects.

- A. The issuance of demolition permits for Projects on Individually Listed Historic Properties or contributing buildings in the historic districts. This does not include non-contributing buildings or buildings located in the environs. “Demolition” for this subsection is defined as the complete removal of the building.**

City of Rapid City and Property Owner Letters on Rapid City High School Nomination

Kessloff indicated that the letters were provided to the Commission for information purposes.

Rapid City High School Committee Liaison Report

Krull indicated that the proposed changes to the auditorium interior will not adversely affect the auditorium acoustics. Discussion followed regarding the need for the Liaison Committee Commission members to be actively involved with the architect meetings. Roseland, Krull and Baumgartner briefly addressed the project presentations they have participated in.

Dennis indicated that there are several individuals from the general public who are interested in attending the Historic Preservation meeting when the architect plans are presented for review.

Discussion followed regarding the level of contact between the architect and the Commission liaisons. Elkins indicated that if additional meetings are required to contact her or the School so meetings can be scheduled. Discussion followed regarding the changes to the auditorium seating and the HVAC system.

In response to a question, Elkins indicated that she would work with the School to arrange a presentation on the auditorium design for the Commission.

Commission Vacancy

Bulman advised the Commission that John Wagner resigned his position effective June 1, 2010. Bulman suggested that the members advise individuals interested in serving on the Commission to submit a Citizen Interest application with the Mayor’s Office.

Commissioners Timesheet Report

Elkins encouraged the members to submit their monthly timesheets noting that attendance at the Legal & Finance Committee meetings, the Yapp seminars and the West Boulevard Historic District open house are qualifying activities.

New Business – West Boulevard Historic District Open House

Kessloff addressed the public comments received at the meeting noting the issues voiced against the Commission. Elkins indicated that there appeared to be confusion between the West Boulevard Homeowners Association and the Historic Preservation Commission. Elkins addressed the need to provide a distinction between the two entities and the need to continue positive public outreach programs such as the Yapp seminars. Discussion continued regarding the information presented at the open house and the need to develop design guidelines. In response to a question from Roseland, Elkins indicated that, with the approval of the new grant, the Commission could hire a consultant to develop design guidelines. Discussion followed.

Other Business

Kessloff commented on the need for more involvement and support from the Commission members with the activities scheduled for Preservation Month.

In response to a request from Kessloff, **Baumgartner moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to recommend that Destination Rapid City be publicly recognized for their volunteer work on the Downtown Historic Signs.**

Adjourn

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:24 a.m.