

Meeting of the Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission  
December 17, 2010

Members Present: Jean Kessloff, Eric James, Duane Baumgartner, Pat Roseland, Scott Sogge, Cynthia Matson, Mike Bender and Tamara Pier

Others Present: Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Michelle Dennis, Brad Burns and Eric Monroe

Roseland called the meeting to order at 8:32 a.m.

James moved to approve the agenda with the 11.1 Review for 1711 West Boulevard being moved to the end of the agenda and continued to the next meeting if the applicant is not present and with the addition of Historic Rapid City under new business. The motion was seconded by Matson and approved unanimously.

502 Main Street (10CM052)

Dennis reviewed the history of the building built in 1962 located in the historic district. She noted that the building is non-contributing. Dennis described the proposed changes to the building including the re-facing of the building, the colors of the brick material, the proposed banding, the installation of new windows and changes in the existing window locations, the increased height of the building to hide the HVAC system, the installation of coping and a slight roof overhang, as well as the removal of the overhead doors. Dennis described the two options for first floor depending on the ground floor tenant.

Monroe reviewed the material samples that are proposed to be used on the structure. A brief discussion followed.

**James moved to recommend a finding that the proposed changes to the building at 502 Main Street will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by Bender.**

In response to a question from Elkins, Burns clarified that the alternative elevation of the rear of the structure had not been presented. He stated that the applicant is requesting approval of the elevation of the structures as presented.

**James and Bender concurred with the clarification of the motion indicating that the approval is for the changes identified in the elevations as presented.**

Bender and James both expressed support for the project and the improvements that are being proposed.

Roseland also expressed support and appreciation for the changes that have been presented. He noted that since the building is non-contributing, the Commission does not review the proposed changes to the internal elements of the building.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the proposed changes to the building located at 502 Main Street as outlined in the elevations as presented was approved unanimously.**

Pier clarified that the applicant would need to bring the alternative design back to the Commission for review should they decide to pursue that option. Burns acknowledged that they would bring the project back for review if they pursue the alternative.

#### 17 11 West Boulevard (10RS021)

Uhre reviewed the proposal to replace the existing wood roof on the residence located at 1711 West Boulevard with a metal/steel standing seam roof or an asphalt shingle roof. He indicated that he was leaning toward the installation of a gray roof.

**Bender moved to recommend a finding that the installation of an asphalt shingle roof on the residence located at 1711 West Boulevard will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by Baumgartner.**

Discussion followed regarding the metal roof and whether it was appropriate for the style of the house and the district. Additional discussion followed about the weather impacts on metal versus asphalt roofs and the impact of a metal roof on the historic district and surrounding properties. Discussion followed regarding other material options.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the installation of an asphalt shingle roof on the residence located at 1711 West Boulevard will have no adverse impact was approved unanimously.**

**Pier moved to recommend a finding that the installation of a standing seam metal/steel roof would have an adverse affect. The motion was seconded by Kessloff.**

A brief discussion followed regarding the impacts of the roof on the historic district and the surrounding properties. Pier noted that the comments on the previous motion were appropriate to this motion as well.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the installation of a standing seam metal/steel roof would have an adverse affect was approved on a 7-1 vote (Sogge, Baumgartner, Kessloff, James, Roseland, Sogge and Bender in favor and Matson opposed.)**

#### Approval of the Minutes

**Pier moved to approve the minutes of the December 3, 2010 meeting. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.**

#### 2011 Meeting Dates

Roseland acknowledged the meeting dates for 2011.

#### Historic Rapid City

Sogge expressed his concerns with finding out about Historic Rapid City on the front page of the newspaper. He noted that the Journal article about the calendar mentioned the Historic Preservation Commission; however, the Commission had nothing to do with the calendar or Historic Rapid City. He reiterated the need for a communication policy and better communication by members of the Commission.

Discussion followed regarding the change of names for the Fiegel House Foundation, the similarity and confusion between the two organizations, the concerns with the perceptions of the media and the public, the credit taken by others for the clock project, the status of the clock project.

**Pier moved to authorize Roseland to contact the Rapid City Journal to clarify the issues surrounding the calendar and the role of the Historic Preservation Commission. The motion was seconded by James.**

Pier reiterated the need for better communications with Historic Rapid City.

Extensive discussion followed regarding the increased confusion relative to the role of the Historic Preservation Commission and Historic Rapid City.

Elkins suggested that the Preservation Commission should request a conversation with the Board of the Historic Rapid City about the roles of each group and the potential for cooperation. She also noted the problems and confusion resulting from the similarity of the names of the two organizations.

Discussion followed about the role and scope of Historic Rapid City, the confusion with the names, the existing confusion with the West Boulevard Association, the benefits of having a group supporting Historic Preservation and the benefits of the two boards meeting together.

Dennis pointed out that there was another article in the paper that incorrectly indicated that the sign at the Dakota Middle School being a project of the Historic Preservation Commission.

**The motion carried unanimously.**

Baumgartner reiterated the need for the Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission to have a central contact person for the Commission and that person is the Chairperson. Discussion followed.

**Matson moved to request that staff coordinate a meeting with the Historic Preservation Commission and Historic Rapid City. The motion was seconded by Pier.**

Discussion followed regarding the two groups meeting together to review the recently adopted Historic Preservation Master Plan and comparing those with the goals of Historic Rapid City.

**The motion carried unanimously.**

Commissioner Timesheets

Bulman reviewed the need for the timesheets to be submitted by the first of January to be submitted with the grant reimbursement request.

The Commission expressed their support for Bender's contribution to the Commission.

**James moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Bender and approved unanimously.**