

Minutes of the October 1, 2010
Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present: Jean Kessloff, Duane Baumgartner, Pat Roseland, Cynthia Mattson, Eric James, Mike Bender, Scott Sogge

Others Present: Bonnie Peterson, Marcia Elkins, Douglas Bradley, Mason Thorson, Gene Williams, Brad Dudley, Dan Claymore, Darwin Buus, Jr., Rev. Bob Evans, Robert Martin, Brian Cheborad, Bill Barber, Todd Peckosh, Matt Freidel and Doug Jones

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

Approval of Meeting Agenda

Roseland requested that an item entitled "Legal and Finance Discussion of 516 6th Street Window Replacement" be added under New Business.

Mattson moved to approve the agenda as amended. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.

11.1 Review of 710 Kansas City Street (10CM037)

B. Dudley reviewed the proposed window replacement at the First Presbyterian Church noting that this project is a continuation of the window replacement project approved previously.

Motion by Baumgartner and second by James to recommend a finding that the Window Replacement (61 windows) at 710 Kansas City Street has no adverse impact.

Kessloff expressed her concerns with the use of fiberglass window replacement and referred to her previous objections to the original project. She expressed her opinion that the windows negatively impacted the historic building and have a negative impact on the aesthetics of the building.

Evans reminded the Commission that the building is not on the National Register and is being reviewed because it borders the Downtown Historic District. He commented on the benefits of energy conservation and the importance of the window replacement and other improvements to provide the Church with the ability to stay in its downtown location. In response to a question, Evans indicated that the original building was constructed in 1951 and the additional wing shown in the photograph was constructed between 1958 and 1960.

Bender noted the difference between the original window and the replacement windows and the difference in the appearance as evidenced by the photograph. He expressed concern with the impact on the building and indicated that the building is eligible to be listed on the National Register.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Evans indicated that he had spoken to representatives from Pella and Warren Window and that they had indicated that there is no external grid that is currently available for their application that is appropriate for the weather conditions experienced at this location. He noted his ongoing support for historic preservation in numerous communities including the efforts to preserve and maintain the building in question.

Barber encouraged the Commission to support the window replacement project noting the Church's efforts to be more energy efficient and to protect the building.

Elkins reminded the Commission that the building is located in the environs and that they had recommended approval of the first phase of the window project.

James noted the consideration given to the building being located outside the district and the previous approval granted for the initial phase of the window project. He encouraged the Commission to support the project noting the effort to improve the energy efficiency of the building and upgrade the existing structure.

Kessloff indicated that this was an example of the difficulty the Commission has in making decisions without having the materials in front of the Commission when they make decisions on applications.

Motion carried 5-2 (Mattson, Sogge, Roseland, Baumgartner, James voting aye and Bender and Kessloff voting nay.)

11.1 Review of 315 Rapid Street (10CM038)

Brad Dudley presented the request to demolish the wooden storage building located at 315 Rapid Street. He noted that the building is located within 50 feet of an individually listed building; however, he indicated that he had a survey of the site that identified the building as being 50.02 feet from the property located on the National Register. He indicated that the building is being used for storage. Dudley stated that the owners are requesting approval to demolish the building due to the concerns with the condition of the building, the issue of vagrants sleeping under the building and concerns with fire and possible impact on adjoining historic properties.

Williams indicated that the building was originally constructed as a lumber storage building. He noted that other similar buildings had been removed from the site in the 1960's at the request of the City due to their poor condition. He indicated that the building has no plumbing and no heating. He requested that the Commission recommend approval of the demolition of the building.

Motion by Mattson and second by James to recommend a finding that the demolition of the wood storage building at 315 Rapid Street will have no adverse impact.

Kessloff reviewed her research of the 1930's Sanborn maps of the property and expressed her opinion that the building is in good condition and not in imminent danger of falling down. Kessloff stated that the building is worth saving.

Mattson expressed her opinion that the goals of the Preservation Commission are to preserve history of the community and encourage businesses to locate in the downtown. She expressed her belief that the Commission's role is to assist businesses in improving their property and that the Commission must be careful not to freeze the downtown in place and make it impractical for businesses.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Dudley indicated that the property would be used for parking for now.

Kessloff suggested the building could be eligible for tax credits for an adaptive reuse of the structure.

Dudley indicated that he was aware of the tax credits.

Elkins asked for a copy of the survey and indicated that she would be reviewing the issue with the State noting that she was not certain if the demolition of the building was required to go through the review process. She suggested that the Commission continue with their review and make a recommendation so that the applicant would not have to come back to the Commission in the future if the review is required.

A brief discussion followed.

Bender expressed his opinion that the structure is not as significant as many other buildings noting that it is a wooden warehouse. He suggested that it might be appropriate to preserve the building by measuring and photographing the building.

Williams indicated that they have a picture of the site from May 1929 but that the building was not in that photograph.

James expressed his opinion that the public interest of maintaining the historic character of the community has to be weighed against the private property rights. He expressed concern with the safety of the structure due to its location adjacent to other historic properties and also expressed concern with possible liability if the unsafe building is kept on the site.

Bender reiterated his position that it would be appropriate to preserve the history of the structure through photographic documentation and allow the project to proceed.

In response to a question from Bender, Dudley indicated that he agreed to provide a week to the Commission to allow Bender to document the building photographically. Additional discussion followed.

The motion carried 6-1 (Mattson, Sogge, Roseland, Baumgartner, James and Bender voting aye and Kessloff voting nay.)

11.1 Review of 6th Street Reconstruction (10CM039)

Todd Peckosh representing the City of Rapid City requested that the Commission reconsider their previous action requiring a pipe and knuckle style railing for the guard rail to be located along the western sidewalk on 6th Street adjacent to Prairie Edge. He presented a drawing of an alternate rail design.

In response to a question from Bender, Friedel indicated that the design team had reviewed the option of including a cable railing; however, there were concerns with the safety and aesthetics associated with the cable system. He also noted the cable railing has a tendency to rust and can fail when individuals stand or sit on the cable.

Discussion followed regarding other railing applications in the downtown area including the Buell Building, alternative designs and use of cables or other designs, the ADA requirements and the aesthetics of the various designs.

Bender indicated that he felt that the design was a good compromise.

Motion by Bender and second by James to recommend a finding that the revised railings design would have no adverse impact.

Kessloff expressed concern with the railing design being obtrusive and negatively impacting the Prairie Edge building. She distributed pictures of other railings from Deadwood and other communities.

Discussion followed regarding the safety standards, the ADA requirements, the visual impact and the color of the railing.

The motion approved unanimously.

11.1 Review of 924 Quincy Street (10CM040)

Dan Claymore reviewed the request to replace the shingle roof at 924 Quincy Street.

Motion by Mattson with second by Sogge to recommend a finding that the replacement of the shingle roof on the commercial structure at 924 Quincy Street will have no adverse impact.

Mattson accepted a friendly amendment to include both the replacement of the shingle roof and the gutters. Sogge concurred.

Discussion followed regarding the color of the shingles and the affect on the appearance of the structure. Mattson clarified that the color was not included in her motion.

The motion to recommend a finding that the replacement of the shingle roof and gutters on the commercial structure on the structure at 924 Quincy Street will have no adverse impact carried unanimously.

Approval of the Minutes

Baumgartner moved to approve the Minutes of the September 17, 2010 meeting. The motion was seconded by James and approve unanimously.

Treasurer's Report

Elkins indicated that there was no Treasurer's Report.

New Business

516 Sixth Street - Legal and Finance Committee Review

Roseland indicated that he had reviewed the video of the Legal and Finance Committee meeting. He noted that there was confusion regarding Kessloff's presentation to the Legal and

Finance Commission. He expressed concern with the perception that resulted when Kessloff spoke against the request after a 9-1 vote by the Commission on a motion to find that the removal of the window would have no adverse impact. He noted concern that the Legal and Finance Committee had been left with the impression that Kessloff was speaking on behalf of the Preservation Commission. He also noted concerns with the impression left by Kessloff's presentation that there was conflict and friction between the State Office of History and the Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission, when that is not accurate.

Discussion continued regarding the discussion that occurred at the Legal and Finance Committee.

Mattson expressed concerns with the comments at the Legal and Finance Committee and the confusion that created for the property owner who was relying on the State's comments that the options were not economically viable.

Discussion continued.

Bender expressed concern with applicants using the safety word to justify demolition and owners allowing property to deteriorate.

Kessloff indicated that she erred in not indicating that she was representing herself rather than the Commission when she began her presentation. She commented on the misuse of the safety issue with no documentation of the building condition. Kessloff indicated that Nelson's comments on the condition of the stain glass transom were based on only one artisan and she felt additional opinions and cost estimates should be obtained.

Discussion continued on the review process and the role of the State Office of History and the local Preservation Commission and the fact that the two groups work well together. Additional discussion followed on the options of encapsulating the transom window, removing the window and rehabilitating the window. Discussion continued.

Old Business

Subcommittee Reports

Roseland remove Item # H and Item #8 from the Subcommittee Reports as the Alex Johnson project is complete. He also noted that the Sweeney house will be put on market.

Dakota Middle School Liaison Committee

Roseland provided a briefing on the Subcommittee's meeting with the architect. He reviewed the inclusion of a smaller theatre practice space with no permanent seating and indicated that the School District might reuse the old restored seats in the smaller theater if permanent seating is installed in the future. He noted that the plans call for the plaster to be restored and for the windows to be retained in place. He presented information regarding the revisions to the existing central aisle and the ADA requirements, replacement of the flooring to address the heating and ventilation system and the location of the control room on the first floor. Discussion followed on the space below the stage being filled in and the other changes that would occur as part of the project.

In response to Mattson's questions, Baumgartner and Roseland indicated that they are very comfortable with the plans and information that have been provided with the exception of a few issues they are waiting on additional information from the State Office of History.

Discussion followed on the role of the Commission and its subcommittees. Kessloff stated that the Dakota Middle School Liaison Committee is not representing her. Additional discussion followed on the specific changes to the building as well as on the role of subcommittees and the members relying on subcommittees to do their work.

Adjournment

Mattson moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.

Roseland adjourned the meeting.