

Minutes of the May 4, 2012
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present: Jean Kessloff, Heather Knox, Michelle Dennis, Pat Roseland, Duane Baumgartner, Richard Grable, Eric James, Shawn Krull and Gavin Williams

Members Absent: Cynthia Matson

Others Present: Karen Bulman, Jeanne Nicholson, Kip Harrington, Kari Bortnem, Greg Hanson, Mike Robeck and Bonny Petersen, Council Liaison

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

Approval of Meeting Agenda

James moved to approve the meeting agenda. The motion was seconded by Krull and the motion was approved unanimously.

11.1 Reviews

908 South Street (12RS005)

Dennis moved to continue the 11.1 Review for 908 South Street to the May 18, 2012 meeting. The motion was seconded by James and the motion was approved unanimously.

1025 Fairview Street (12RS010)

Hanson reviewed the proposed request to replace shingles and to re-brick the chimney. He added that he wants to improve the house aesthetically and that the chimney will be shortened approximately eight inches to a foot.

Baumgartner moved to recommend a finding that replacing the shingles and re-bricking the chimney will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Knox.

In response to a question from Dennis, Hanson explained that brick for the chimney will be replaced with a brick that closely matches the existing brick.

The motion to recommend a finding that replacing the shingles and re-bricking the chimney will have no adverse effect on historic property carried unanimously.

1210 9th Street (12RS011)

Harrington reviewed the proposed request to add a porch and briefly addressed fascia, drainage and the pitch of the porch roof.

James moved to recommend a finding that adding a porch will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Grable.

In response to a question from Krull, Dennis advised that she visited with the applicant and noted that the proposed porch would not negatively affect the historic appearance of the house. A brief discussion followed regarding the pitch of the porch roof and replication of the existing pediment.

The motion to recommend a finding that adding a porch will have no adverse effect on historic property carried unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

Baumgartner noted that his name should be added to the members absent in the April 20, 2012 meeting minutes.

Grable moved to approve the April 20, 2012 meeting minutes with the noted correction. The motion was seconded by Krull and carried unanimously.

New Business

Case Report for 811 St. Andrew

Bulman informed the Committee that Mr. Robeck has submitted a letter to the City Council, along with estimates, the contractor's letter and the Case Report for the demolition of the garage at 811 St. Andrew Street. A brief discussion followed.

Robeck identified the issues with the access door, overhead door and cracked flooring of the garage. He expressed his opinion that there are no alternatives to rehabilitate the garage.

Bulman reminded the Committee that their motion that will be submitted to the State should be to agree, to disagree or to not comment on the Case Report.

In response to a question from Krull, Robeck advised that a new garage will be built and will meet City setbacks. He added that the new two car garage will have the same footprint as the existing garage and carport.

In response to a question from Dennis, Robeck advised that his intent is to reuse the windows from the existing garage. Additional discussion followed.

Dennis moved to agree with the Case Report for 811 St. Andrew Street and thanked the applicant for a well written Case Report. The motion was seconded by Grable.

In response to a statement from Kessloff, Robeck advised that he understands that the Historic Preservation Committee assists in the preservation of the integrity of the neighborhood.

The motion to agree with the Case Report for 811 St. Andrew Street carried unanimously.

In response to a question from Dennis, Bulman explained that if the State finds that the project is still an adverse effect in the district, then the Case Report will go before the City Council sometime around the first of June.

Case Report for President's Plaza

Bulman explained that the Case Report was received late Thursday afternoon and therefore provided less than 24 hours ago to the Committee members. She noted that because the

members have not had adequate time to review the Case Report, the Case Report could be continued to a special meeting or to the next regularly scheduled meeting. Bulman added that the applicant is not at today's meeting and that they cannot move forward with their project until the Case Report process is completed.

Dennis stated that the Case Report does not specifically identify the materials that will be used to construct the building. Dennis expressed her opinion that the height of the structure is still an issue and that the Case Report does not clearly identify the height of the building.

Krull expressed his opinion that the Case Report does not address all the issues and may not constitute a complete Case Report.

In response to a question regarding the Department of Interior guidelines, Bulman advised that height standards are not specified in the guidelines, but are State Administrative Rules adopted by the Legislature. Additional discussion followed.

Dennis also expressed her opinion that the report drawings are not to scale, that the Case Report does not specify whether all prudent and feasible alternatives have been considered and the actual number of parking spaces that will be provided in the structure.

Krull expressed his opinion that a feasibility study needs to be completed for the structure. Additional discussion followed.

James expressed his opinion that the Case report is incomplete. Grable concurred.

Bulman recommended that the Committee continue the Case Report for two weeks and to inform the applicant about the Committee's concerns with the Case Report not thoroughly addressing building materials, parking and the mass and scaling of the structure in comparison to the existing downtown buildings.

James moved that due to the Case Report being submitted to the City late yesterday afternoon, that the Case Report for the President's Plaza be continued to the May 18, 2012 meeting with the understanding that the State agrees that a decision does not need to be made at this meeting; however, if the State requests that the Case Report be heard at this meeting, the Historic Preservation Commission does not agree with the Case Report. The motion was seconded by Grable.

Discussion followed regarding the height of the tower, the misrepresentation of the mass and scaling of the structure and building materials.

The motion that due to the Case Report being submitted to the City late yesterday afternoon, that the Case Report for the President's Plaza be continued to the May 18, 2012 meeting with the understanding that the State agrees that a decision does not need to be made at this meeting; however, if the State requests that the Case Report be heard at this meeting, the Historic Preservation Commission does not agree with the Case Report carried unanimously.

Dennis moved that a subcommittee be created to work with the applicants regarding the compatibility of the proposed structure with the Historic Downtown area. The motion was seconded by Krull and the motion carried unanimously.

Dennis, Krull and Williams volunteered to be on the subcommittee and were appointed by Chairman Roseland.

Petersen addressed the proposed parking spaces that will be provided upon completion of the President's Plaza. She added that from the City Council's perspective, President's Plaza will provide additional parking in the downtown area and will be an economic boost for the City. A brief discussion followed.

Old Business

Design Handbook

The Committee concurred that the discussion of the Design Handbook be continued for two weeks.

Dennis moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:54 a.m. The motion was seconded by Knox and approved unanimously.