

MINUTES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
July 16, 2010

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Vanessa Wood, Leslie Riss, Holly Ringo, Peter Anderson, Brad Burns, Dale Tech, Todd Peckosh, Steve Bareis, Erich Orris, Dan Senftner, Eirik Heikes, Dale Lamphere, Michelle Dennis, Alan Hanks, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

Call To Order

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

Approval of Meeting Agenda

Pier moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to approve the Meeting Agenda as presented.

907 Clark Street (10RS015)

Wood presented the request to install an air conditioning unit on the front façade in a mirror location to the air conditioning unit of the adjoining unit noting that this location would provide symmetry to the duplex façade. In response to a question from Krull, Wood reviewed the alternate side and rear locations noting the site concerns with those locations.

Bender moved to recommend a finding that the installation of the HVAC unit, including the required mechanical upgrades, to the front façade location identified by Option "A" on the property located at 907 Clark Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. Matson seconded the motion.

Kessloff referred to the Secretary of Interior's Standards for the installation of new mechanical equipment on historic properties and recommended that the air conditioning unit not be located on the front façade.

In response to a question, Bulman indicated that per the State Historic Preservation Office the Commission recommendation will be made on the current "non-contributing" status of the property. Discussion followed regarding the possible misclassification of the structure and the physical issues associated with the side and rear optional locations for the placement of the air conditioning unit.

Kessloff encouraged the Commission to follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards with regard to the request.

The motion to recommend a finding that the installation of the HVAC unit, including the required mechanical upgrades, to the front façade location identified by Option "A" on the property located at 907 Clark Street will have no adverse effect on historic property carried with Roseland, Grable, Matson, Baumgartner and Bender voting Yes and Kessloff, Pier and Krull voting No (5 to 3).

1404 Mt Rushmore Road (10CM025)

Riss presented the application to demolish the existing pitched roof noting that the present structure consists of an existing house surrounded by an office front. Riss indicated that the new roof design will be pitched membrane to address the leaking issues of the existing roof. Riss indicated that the removal of the current pitched roof will expose the air conditioning unit noting that the unit will not be visible from the street elevation. In response to a question, Riss stated that the existing fascia will be replaced with a 16/12 pitch asphalt shingled new front fascia.

Krull moved, Grable seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the removal of the existing pitched roof and that the construction of a pitched membrane roof with a 16/12 pitch asphalt shingled fascia on the property located at 1404 Mt Rushmore Road will have no adverse effect on historic property.

816 South Street (10CM026)

Ringo presented the request to install a freestanding pergola in the front yard area of the property. Ringo indicated that a pea gravel base will be utilized beneath the cedar wood pergola.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Ringo indicated that the intent of the project is to provide a more inviting front entrance to the business. Kessloff addressed the impact of the structure on the front façade noting that historically these structures were located in the side and rear yards.

In response to a question from Krull, Ringo indicated that the structure would have a natural finish. In response to a question from Bender, Ringo indicated that the structure would be placed on concrete footings.

Kessloff moved to recommend a finding of adverse effect on historic property. The motion failed for lack of a second.

Matson moved to recommend a finding that the placement of a free standing pergola in the front yard area on the property located at 816 South Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. Baumgartner seconded the motion.

In response to a question from Bender, Kessloff stated that while the structure will be free standing it introduces an incompatible element to the front façade and setting of the structure. Discussion followed regarding actions that would constitute an adverse effect.

Dennis addressed the architectural incompatibility of the house and proposed pergola. In response to a question from Pier, Dennis outlined landscape elements that would be compatible with the architectural style of the house.

The motion to recommend a finding that the placement of a free standing pergola in the front yard area on the property located at 816 South Street will have no adverse effect on historic property carried with Roseland, Grable, Matson, Baumgartner and Bender voting Yes and Kessloff, Pier and Krull voting No (5 to 3).

510 Main Street (10CM027)

Anderson presented the request to demolish the front nine feet, seven inches of the existing storefront to restore the façade to the recessed storefront as reflected by the photograph of the structure prior to the construction of front and rear additions. Anderson briefly addressed the proposed design for the front and rear façades noting that the rear façade windows will be removed and replaced to complement the front façade. In response to a question, Anderson clarified that there will be no alteration to the size of the rear façade door and window openings.

Burns presented samples of the materials and colors that will be used on the building and awning noting that the window and panel trim will be painted wood. In response to a question from Roseland, Anderson indicated that windows will have simulated divided lights with mullions on both the inside and outside of the windows. Discussion followed regarding the lighting provided by the front façade sconces and the possible extension of the wrought iron railing into the existing walkway.

Bender recommended that the Commission address the front and rear facades independently.

Kessloff provided photographs documenting the natural progression of the front façade to the current 1950 façade noting that if the District were to be resurveyed the structure would be contributing. Kessloff expressed her concern with the loss of the 1950 façade. Anderson thanked Kessloff for her photographic contributions of the building.

In response to a question from Krull, Anderson indicated that the owner prefers the look of the recessed façade noting that it will bring a new interest element to the downtown area. In response to a question from Krull, Burns indicated that the awning will extend out approximately eight feet.

Bulman addressed the concerns of the State Historic Preservation Office with the current “contributing” classification of the structure noting that they are considering submitting the structure for review and possible reclassification to “non-contributing”.

Kessloff indicated that the Standards state that a structure provides a physical record of a specific time. Discussion followed regarding the structure’s period of significance.

Dennis stated that this is a new construction review and addressed the elements that should be considered. Dennis encouraged the retention of the current character defining setback. Bender indicated that the only identifiable historic element of the structure is the recessed setback. Discussion followed regarding the remaining historically significant elements of the structure.

Krull moved to recommend a finding that the demolition of the 9 feet 7 inches of the front façade back to the 1925 storefront and the reconstruction of a new storefront in the location of the 1925 storefront as reflected in the Front Façade rendering on the property located at 510 Main Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. Matson seconded the motion.

Kessloff expressed concern that approval of the demolition of the 1950 façade could establish a precedent. Bender indicated that the documentation of the original setback establishes the criteria for approving the request and does not establish a precedent. Anderson indicated that he is unaware of any other structure in the downtown area that has a documented recessed front façade suggesting that approval of the request should not establish a precedent.

Pier indicated her intention to abstain from the vote due to the concerns associated with the disposition of the 1950 façade.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Anderson addressed the ADA accessibility issues and logistic issues associated with the reconstruction of the original stair entrance. Kessloff suggested that the ADA accessibility issues could be addressed using the rear entrance. Anderson addressed the impact the original stair entrance would have on both the exterior and interior of the structure. Discussion continued.

In response to a question, Anderson addressed the manner in which the adjacent facades would be repaired once they are exposed by the removal of the 1950 façade.

Bulman indicated that the State Historic Preservation Office is interested in the Commission's comments regarding the request to demolish the 1950 façade and the reconstruction of the new façade.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Dennis indicated that the contributing feature is the original recessed setback noting that this is a unique issue. Dennis stated that the 1950 storefronts can be lost unless the Downtown Historic District is resurveyed and updated to reflect the structures as contributing.

The motion to recommend a finding that the demolition of the 9 feet 7 inches of the front façade back to the 1925 storefront and the reconstruction of a new storefront in the location of the 1925 storefront as reflected in the Front Façade rendering on the property located at 510 Main Street will have no adverse effect on historic property carried with Roseland, Grable, Krull, Matson, Baumgartner and Bender voting Yes, none voting No and Kessloff and Pier Abstaining (6-0-2).

Anderson indicated that the rear façade would utilize the same material and color design as the front façade noting that the rear awning would extend into the alley right-of-way and is not included with this application. In response to a question from Bender, Anderson indicated that there would be no alteration to the size of the door and window rough openings. Bulman recommended that the motion clarify the window design.

Pier moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the refurbishing of the rear façade as reflected in the Rear Façade rendering, including the redesign of the rear windows, on the property located at 510 Main Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.

518 7th Street (10CM029)

Orris presented the application to approve the construction of a landing and handrails between the 518 and 520 7th Street properties. Orris indicated that the landing is required due to the significant elevation differences between the two properties and provides patrons with an interior walkway between the two businesses.

In response to a question from Krull, Orris indicated that the International Building Code specifies the size of the landing noting that railing spindles are not required and will not be installed.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Orris indicated that the flooring is a rough finish marble.

Krull moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the construction of a landing with handrails for the internal access between the 518 7th Street and 520 7th Street properties to comply with the safety guidelines required under the International Building Code on the property located at 518 7th Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.

6th Street Reconstruction (10CM028)

Tech presented the request to reconstruct the Sixth Street Right of Way from Omaha Street south to Kansas City Street. Tech stated that the street section will not change from its current design noting that water lines will be replaced, minor sewer improvements will be completed and the storm sewer will be upgraded. Tech indicated that the sidewalk design will be the same as Kansas City Street with the exception of the dedicated bike lane which will be incorporated into the driving lane.

Tech addressed the design elements of the project including ADA access improvements, landscaping areas, new street and pedestrian lighting, and utilization of banded color concrete. Tech indicated that seven basements encroach into the 6th Street right of way noting that three of the basements will be filled in. Tech indicated that the basements are being addressed in response to the liability concerns outlined by the City Attorney's office.

Tech addressed the installation of the rain guards, the retention of the Alex Johnson loading zone, and the replacement of the Alex Johnson access hatch in compliance with current safety standards. Tech indicated that the Main Street and St. Joseph Street intersections will not be impacted by the reconstruction project. Tech reviewed the split sidewalk design on the east side of Prairie Edge noting that an ADA access ramp will be installed on the north end of the sidewalk. Tech indicated that a pedestrian crossing will be installed on 6th Street at the Milo Barber Center noting that a street clock will be installed at the Center.

In response to a question from Matson, Tech indicated that traffic studies are being conducted regarding providing a dedicated pedestrian only crossing and its resulting impact on traffic flows.

In response to a question from Krull, Tech reviewed the reasons for the retention of four of the right of way basements. Bender indicated that historically these were not basements but access to lower level stores.

Kessloff indicated that the Pipe and Knuckle design was historically used for railings and recommended the design be utilized for the Prairie Edge railing. Discussion followed regarding the Prairie Edge railing design and code requirements for railings more than 30 inches off the ground. Krull voiced support for the Pipe and Knuckle railing design. Tech indicated that staff would review the height requirements with regard to the Pipe and Knuckle railing design.

In response to a question from Krull, Tech addressed the grading issues with regard to the two level sidewalk at Prairie Edge. Bender encouraged adherence to the ADA requirements with regard to the trench grading. Discussion followed regarding utilizing a timeless design to prevent the project from becoming dated.

Krull moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the reconstruction of the Sixth Street Right-Of-Way extending from Omaha Street south to Kansas City Street will have no adverse effect on historic property with the stipulation

that the Prairie Edge sidewalk railing be a Pipe and Knuckle design in black color with horizontal cabling utilized to address code requirements should it be necessary.

In response to a question from Bareis, Bender indicated that the pipe railing color is to be black and recommended that the Rapid City Fruit building railing be utilized as a design guide.

Main Street Square Presentation

Senftner provided a brief introduction of the project noting that Dale Lamphere will be providing the artistic emphasis for the project.

Heikes provided an informal presentation of the project noting the input received from the Commission's Subcommittee regarding design elements. Heikes addressed the utilization of the first level of the parking garage for the mechanical room and public restrooms. In response to a question from Dennis, Heikes indicated that the parking garage awnings would be retractable by remote control.

Heikes addressed the placement of significant stone elements in the right of way depicting the Badlands and Black Hills. In response to concerns voiced by the Commission, Heikes indicated that the stone elements are classified as art under the 11.1 Review process. Lamphere addressed the cultural integrity of the stone tapestries and his efforts to create elements that are intrinsic to the area.

Heikes provided a brief overview of the facility noting that the Sears building improvements are private and are not the charge of Main Street Square at this time. Discussion followed regarding the pedestrian flow and access through the park, artistic contributions and the impact of the stone tapestries on the historic view shed.

Heikes indicated that Main Street Square holds the position that the stone tapestries are art which is viewed differently under the 11.1 Review process. Discussion followed regarding scheduling a meeting between Main Street Square and the State Historic Preservation Office to discuss the tapestry elements prior to the completion of the design drawings.

Other Business

Costello expressed his appreciation for the Commission members work on the 11.1 Reviews noting that abstention from voting should be done only when there is a conflict of interest. Costello recommended that the conflict be clarified prior to any discussion on the application and that the member refrain from participating in the discussions.

Approval of Minutes

Krull moved, Pier seconded and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the July 2, 2010 meeting.

Treasurer's Report

Baumgartner moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to approve the Rapid City Journal On-Line Ad in the amount of \$27.05.

Adjourn

There being no further business, Baumgartner moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 9:45 a.m.