

MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
September 7, 2007

MEMBERS PRESENT: Duane Baumgartner, Mike Bender, Richard Baumann, Ken Loeschke, Adrienne Kerst, Jean Kessloff, Norm Nelson, Pat Roseland, Dan Senftner and Scott Sogge

STAFF PRESENT: Karen Bulman and Risë Ficken

OTHERS PRESENT: Mary Rafferty, Josh Usera, Scott Aust, Hani Shafai, Tom Weurtz, Rich von Lührte, Mike Stanley, Dennis Halterman, Ray Summers, Reid Riner, Gene Fennel, Jim Shaw and Bill Kessloff

Call to Order

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

11.1 Review - 1714 West Boulevard (07RS014)

Mary Rafferty described the proposed new custom Marvin door noting that the size of the door opening would be expanding to accommodate the double door. Rafferty displayed a sample of the wood to be used in the door.

**Roseland moved and Senftner seconded to recommend a finding that the replacement of the front door on the property at 1714 West Boulevard will have no adverse affect on historic property.**

Discussion followed concerning the custom door design and grill-work shown on the various door models contained in the Marvin door catalogue.

Bender expressed concern regarding the use of a Tuscan-style door on a cape-cod style house. Discussion followed.

In response to a question from Nelson, Rafferty advised that the concrete for the front porch has been poured noting that rockwork would be applied to the base.

**The motion carried to recommend a finding that the replacement of the front door on the property at 1714 West Boulevard will have no adverse affect on historic property. (7 to 2 with Bender and Kerst voting no and with J. Kessloff abstaining)**

J. Kessloff thanked Rafferty for donating the doors removed from the structure for re-use.

11.1 Review - 516 7<sup>th</sup> Street (07CM033)

Josh Usera advised that he is updating the property for use as a martial arts studio noting that he is also required to install illuminated exit signs.

**Bender moved and Kerst seconded to recommend a finding that the lighting installation and related electrical work, toilet and sink installation and related plumbing work on the property at 516 7<sup>th</sup> Street will have no adverse affect on historic property.**

In response to a question from Kerst, Usera advised that the Historic Sign Review Committee will consider the related sign application next week.

Usera advised that there is an existing sprinkler head in the room located in the room directly east of the proposed bathroom shown on the site plan. Usera asked the Commission if they would consider allowing the toilet and sink to be installed in the eastern room, if ADA requirements could be met, as an additional sprinkler head would not have to be installed.

**Bender amended the motion to recommend a finding that the lighting installation and related electrical work, toilet and sink installation and related plumbing work (with the additional approval for the bathroom toilet and sink to be located in either the room as shown on the site plan or the room immediately east of the room identifying the toilet and sink as shown on the site plan) on the property at 516 7th Street would have no adverse affect on historic property. Kerst accepted the amendment to the motion.**

Discussion followed concerning the need for the applicant to discuss the proposed changes to the site plan with the Building Inspection staff.

**The motion unanimously carried to recommend a finding that the lighting installation and related electrical work, toilet and sink installation and related plumbing work (with the additional approval for the bathroom toilet and sink to be located in either the room as shown on the site plan or the room immediately east of the room identifying the toilet and sink as shown on the site plan) on the property at 516 7th Street would have no adverse affect on historic property.**

#### 11.1 Review - The Rushmont - Southeast corner of Sixth St and Saint Joseph St (07CM032)

In response to a question from Loeschke, Hani Shafai requested that the Commission provide input on the building design as submitted with the 11.1 Review application. Shafai specifically requested that the Commission make a determination on the height, materials and fenestration proposed for the structure. Tom Wuertz requested that action be taken on the proposed massing and height and that input and suggestions be provided related to the materials and fenestration proposed for the structure.

J. Kessloff read a brief statement outlining the Commission's obligation to follow the Secretary of Interior Standards guidelines noting that the Commission is obligated to make a finding of adverse affect based on the proposed height of the structure. J. Kessloff expressed concern that the proposed multi-use structure does not meet the four point approach or the eight guiding principles for revitalization as provided by the National Trust's Main Street Program. J. Kessloff objected to the size and scale of the proposed building.

**J. Kessloff moved and Kerst seconded to recommend a finding that the proposed new construction on the property located at the southeast corner of Sixth Street and Saint Joseph Street will have an adverse affect on historic property.**

Discussion followed concerning the suggestion to address the issue related to the height of the structure in a separate motion from the concept, design and massing of the structure.

**Loeschke offered a friendly amendment to the motion to recommend a finding that the design architecture as proposed for the new construction to be located at the southeast corner of Sixth Street and Saint Joseph Street will have an adverse affect on historic property. J. Kessloff and Kerst accepted the friendly amendment.**

Nelson stated that he liked the design of the lower levels and the emphasis on the 25 foot lot lines noting the design efforts made to match the flow of the existing downtown buildings. Nelson expressed concern regarding the height of the tower.

Loeschke indicated that he liked the placement of the parking toward the back of the structure with the streetscape focusing on retail. Loeschke expressed concern with the proposed height of the tower noting that it looks like an apartment tower and does not seem to fit with the rest of the building.

Senftner expressed concern with the height of the tower and requested clarification concerning whether one or two levels could be removed. Senftner spoke in support of the project noting the potential for increased growth activity in the Downtown area. Senftner addressed issues related to growth in Rapid City and he suggested that additional efforts be made to address tower setbacks.

Kerst expressed concern with sprawl in the Rapid City community noting the need for sensible growth. Discussion followed concerning issues related to views that would be available as a result of the height of the proposed tower.

Roseland spoke in support of the proposed structure noting that the project will help to bring people Downtown.

Kerst requested clarification concerning whether lower scale townhomes could be accommodated within the proposed development.

Shafai indicated that the project would not be economically feasible if the height of the structure was reduced noting design issues resulting from the limited ground space available on the site. Shafai added that while the other three tower structures in the vicinity of the West Boulevard Historic District were not reviewed for historic compatibility, they do not detract from the value of those historic properties. Shafai indicated that only a three story structure would be allowed under the current Secretary of Interior Standards.

Dennis Halterman noted the need for the Commission to be aware of the proposed tower's impact on the Downtown Historic District.

Shafai emphasized that this structure has been designed with the Historic District in mind.

Baumgartner indicated that he liked much of the design and the 25 foot horizontal breaks. He expressed concern with the height of the proposed tower. Nelson reviewed the history of the other tower structures near the West Boulevard Historic District noting that no architectural consideration was given to the neighboring historic properties.

Senftner advised that he likes the structure's architectural design. Senftner noted that the 10% height guideline became effective in 1990.

In response to a question from Loeschke, Shafai indicated that the site has not been surveyed and it has not yet been determined if any other variances to City regulations will need to be obtained.

Kerst distributed photographs of projects in other areas designed by the RNL firm. Kerst suggested that brick be incorporated into the design noting that brick was incorporated into other designs created by the firm. Wuertz indicated that studies were done on the use of brick for this project noting that they are suggesting the use of stone in this case. Kerst indicated that many of the existing historic structures in Rapid City use a combination of limestone and brick noting that storefronts on the new building could be replicated using cast iron and brick. Wuertz advised that the design team can and will give consideration and study to the use of other materials. Nelson commented on the frequent use of limestone and brick combinations historically. Wuertz indicated that stone was used on the base of the Alex Johnson hotel up to the second story and the old Pennington County Court House is all stone. Baumann commented that the Neugebauer building is all stone.

Roseland spoke in support of the design as submitted noting that the structure works well with stone and compliments other historic properties in the area. Baumann indicated that the streetscape looks wonderful.

In response to a question from Kerst, Shafai indicated that public meetings would be held to discuss the project. Rich von Lührte of RNL requested that the Commission review the project in architectural terms and provide an endorsement or a rejection of the architectural concept or an endorsement of the architectural concept with modifications. Von Lührte indicated that an additional study of the issues raised can be made based on the Commission's findings and comments. In response to a question from J. Kessloff, von Lührte indicated that they are looking for a finding on the architecture and massing specifically related to the design of exterior features.

**J. Kessloff withdrew the motion to recommend a finding that the design architecture as proposed for the new construction to be located at the southeast corner of Sixth Street and Saint Joseph Street will have an adverse affect on historic property.**

**Nelson moved and Sogge seconded to recommend a finding that the architectural concept as submitted for the new construction, specifically excluding any consideration to the height of the structure, on the property at the southeast corner of Sixth Street and Saint Joseph Street will have no adverse affect on historic property.**

Nelson suggested that brick elements could be incorporated into the design. Baumann suggested that the design as submitted is acceptable. Discussion followed concerning the cost of stone versus brick and the ability for the Commission to provide suggestions and design assistance. Bulman recommended that the Commission provide suggestions on what changes need to be made in the concept as presented. Nelson clarified that the motion on the floor includes the architectural concept as presented.

**The motion carried to recommend a finding that the architectural concept as submitted for the new construction, specifically excluding any consideration to the height of the structure, on the property at the southeast corner of Sixth Street and Saint Joseph Street will have no adverse affect on historic property. (9-0-1 with Bender abstaining)**

**J. Kessloff moved and Nelson seconded to recommend a finding that the height of the proposed new structure to be located on the property at the southeast corner of Sixth Street and Saint Joseph Street will have an adverse affect on historic property.**

Nelson stated that the Commission is constrained to find an adverse impact by the Secretary of Interior guidelines. Loeschke emphasized that the Commission is to weigh all facts and make its own judgments. Discussion followed.

Bulman advised that the State Office of History is interested in the Commission's comments and encouraged each Commission member to make their own decision on the project. Shafai requested clarification from the Commission members concerning how they would feel about the project if the height guidelines were not an issue. Loeschke requested that the Commission members focus on what aspects of the project would have an adverse impact on the Historic District.

Nelson indicated that the stepped back levels on the top of the tower reduce the impact of the structure as opposed to a sheer 17 story wall noting that the stepped levels show sensitivity to the neighboring Alex Johnson Hotel.

Baumgartner noted that while he likes the concept design the 17 story tower will stand out from all the other structures Downtown.

Sogge indicated that the review guidelines are important and acknowledged that the financial issues are dictating the height of the structure.

Roseland spoke in support of the project noting that the impact of the facility on the Downtown revitalization must be considered in the larger picture.

Kerst stated that the law should be followed and expressed concern regarding the negative view shed that would be created by the structure.

Bauman indicated that it is difficult to visualize a 17 story building Downtown noting that he likes the concept.

Senftner noted concerns related to the development and the impact on existing vacant storefronts in the Downtown area. Senftner indicated that the project could add more vitality and energy to the Downtown area and he expressed his support for the project.

J. Kessloff concurred that revitalization is needed in the Downtown area noting that she feels the structure is too tall and she restated concerns that the guidelines clearly prohibit any structures taller than a 10% increase over the average height.

In response to a question from Wuertz related to view shed, Kerst expressed concern that the tower would be the focal point of tourists and they would miss the existing historic structures. Wuertz discussed the visual impact of other tall structures in Rapid City, including the grain elevator, noting that towers look better with other towers.

Von Lührte advised that shadow studies on the structure were performed noting that the scale and context of the existing structures Downtown is definitely lower. Von Lührte indicated that the setbacks on the site and the stepbacks from the Alex Johnson helps make the scale of the building over the street less oppressive or dominant. Von Lührte added that visually the difference between a 17 story building and a 15 story building is not that noticeable noting that

the real issue is whether high-rise buildings are going to be permitted Downtown now and in the future.

Jim Shaw indicated his strong support of the revitalization of Downtown and he reviewed the history of the Request for Proposals for a public-private partnership and subsequent selection of Dream Design's concept for the multi-use parking facility. Shaw noted that he likes the whole concept and does not feel the 17 story structure will loom over or be detrimental to Downtown. Shaw added that the concept extends beyond parking, retail and offices, as it provides a means to get people to live Downtown. Shaw indicated that there are other buildings that could be converted to living spaces. Shaw discussed the portion of a ½ penny sales tax originally intended to construct a Downtown parking ramp on the property noting that the project was never completed. He added that this proposal provides the opportunity to complete that project. Shaw stated that he feels this is a good project.

Shafai related his observations on the mix of architectural styles on his recent visits to Scotland, England, New York and Pennsylvania noting that the goal of the project is not to corrupt the historic image Downtown, but to enhance the Downtown.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the height of the proposed new structure to be located on the property at the southeast corner of Sixth Street and Saint Joseph Street will have an adverse affect on historic property failed. (3-5-2 with Nelson, J. Kessloff and Kerst voting yes, with Senftner, Sogge, Roseland, Baumann, and Loeschke voting no and with Baumgartner and Bender abstaining)**

**Roseland moved, Sogge seconded and carried to recommend a finding that the height of the proposed new structure to be located on the property at the southeast corner of Sixth Street and Saint Joseph Street will have no adverse affect on historic property. (6-3-1 with Senftner, Baumgartner, Baumann, Sogge, Roseland and Loeschke voting yes, with Nelson, Kerst and J. Kessloff voting no and with Bender abstaining)**

Sogge, Senftner and J. Kessloff left the meeting at this time.

#### 11.1 Review - 201 Main Street – Fairmont Creamery Building (07CM034)

Gene Fennel discussed improvements previously approved by the Commission for Suites 3 and 5 in the structure. He reviewed the existing tenants and the areas where tenants are interested in leasing space noting the need to move forward with the renovations for the entire second floor. In response to a question from Bender, Fennel indicated that the portions of the interior being demolished are not original to the structure. Fennel advised that the cork ceiling in the refrigerated area was left in place and painted. Fennel reviewed how the back of the building was constructed and he discussed the proposal to remove the existing stairs from the elevator shaft. He advised that they are proposing to cut an opening through an original brick and concrete wall to construct a new stairway access so that an elevator can be installed in the elevator shaft. Discussion followed concerning the potential that the wall was originally accessed through an outside stairway. Fennel advised that he is aware that tax credits can be affected by some changes to historic properties listed on the National Register noting that he is working closely with the State Office of History.

**Baumgartner moved and Bender seconded to recommend a finding that the following improvements to the property located at 201 Main Street would have no adverse effect on historic property:**

**Request 1: Exterior remodel to remove and replace windows with thermal glass and aluminum windows for Suites 1, 2, 6, 201, 202 and 204, add new storefront glass and door for Suite 9 and Suite 203;**

**Request 2: Exterior alterations west side: remove concourse, regrade and replace with parking spaces, construct new handicap ramp and stairs, add stairs for access to Suite 7, and add opening for basement;**

**Request 3: Exterior alterations south side: Change door to "out" opening, remove and replace stairs, add handrail to stairs, add railing system around loading dock, and replace canopy roof;**

**Request 4: Interior remodel: Suite 6 – remove section of aluminum window and construct interior vestibule; Suite 9 - remove interior partitions, ceiling and overhead door and frame in new interior walls and stairs to loft; Suite 201 – demolish partitions and construct new partitions, including electrical; Suite 202 – remove ceilings; Suite 203 – remove partitions and cork ceiling and construct new partitions, drop ceiling and related electrical; Suite 204 – remove partitions and construct new partitions and fire proofing; Suite 205 – remove partitions and restrooms and construct new restrooms including related electrical, plumbing and ventilation through roof; Corridor – remove and replace ceiling; Stairway – remove stairs and reroute stairs through existing brick/concrete wall; Elevator – add elevator to existing shaft; and,**

**Request 5: Include all related electrical, plumbing and mechanical improvements.**

Bender requested clarification concerning the removal of the masonry windows and masonry infill panels. Fennel indicated that during a remodel in the 1970s, glass block was installed and portions of the window openings were in-filled with a newer brick. Fennel stated that the in-fill brick would be removed so that the new windows, consisting of aluminum glaze with internal grids, would fit in the original window openings. Fennel suggested that the new windows would resemble the windows as shown in historical photographs of the structure. Fennel added that the windows would not be operable. In response to a question from Bender, Fennel indicated that in photograph four on the west side of the building, the infill would be removed and a window resembling the window shown to the right would be installed in the original opening. Fennel added that the windows on the south side of the building would be replaced in the resized original window openings. Roseland left the meeting at this time.

In response to a question from Nelson, Fennel indicated that the windows as shown in photograph nine are original and will be left in place. In response to a question from Loeschke, Fennel confirmed that the only original materials to be disturbed during the remodel would be related to the stairway in the elevator shaft. Discussion followed concerning the numerous additions to the building over the years.

**The motion unanimously carried to recommend a finding that the following improvements to the property located at 201 Main Street would have no adverse effect on historic property:**

**Request 1: Exterior remodel to remove and replace windows with thermal glass and aluminum windows for Suites 1, 2, 6, 201, 202 and 204, add new storefront glass and door for Suite 9 and Suite 203;**

**Request 2: Exterior alterations west side: remove concourse, regrade and replace with parking spaces, construct new handicap ramp and stairs, add stairs for access to Suite 7, and add opening for basement;**

**Request 3: Exterior alterations south side: Change door to "out" opening, remove and replace stairs, add handrail to stairs, add railing system around loading dock, and replace canopy roof;**

**Request 4: Interior remodel: Suite 6 – remove section of aluminum window and construct interior vestibule; Suite 9 - remove interior partitions, ceiling and overhead door and frame in new interior walls and stairs to loft; Suite 201 – demolish partitions and construct new partitions, including electrical; Suite 202 – remove ceilings; Suite 203 – remove partitions and cork ceiling and construct new partitions, drop ceiling and related electrical; Suite 204 – remove partitions and construct new partitions and fire proofing; Suite 205 – remove partitions and restrooms and construct new restrooms including related electrical, plumbing and ventilation through roof; Corridor – remove and replace ceiling; Stairway – remove stairs and reroute stairs through existing brick/concrete wall; Elevator – add elevator to existing shaft; and,**

**Request 5: Include all related electrical, plumbing and mechanical improvements.**

#### Minutes

**Bender moved, Nelson seconded and unanimously carried to approve the August 3, 2007 and August 17, 2007 minutes.**

#### Treasurer's Report

Bulman provided a brief review of the treasurer's report. Bulman advised that the original quote for the Adobe Elements software was \$70, but that the actual cost for the software is \$82.98. She asked the Commission if they wanted to renew the membership with the National Trust for Historic Preservation noting that a statement was received for dues in the amount of \$20.

**Nelson moved, Baumgartner seconded and unanimously carried to authorize payment in the amount of \$82.98 for Adobe Elements Software and in the amount of \$20 for payment of membership dues to the National Trust for Historic Preservation.**

Bill Kessloff entered the meeting at this time.

#### Other Business

Ken Loeschke requested that the Commission confirm the members of the Historic District Ordinance subcommittee to include Bill Kessloff, Senftner, and Loeschke. Loeschke indicated that the next stage will include time consuming presentations of the ordinance to the public, the City Council and City staff. Bender recommended that Kerst be added to the subcommittee. Kerst expressed her desire to serve on the subcommittee noting that her work schedule may preclude participation in some activities. Discussion followed. B. Kessloff requested that Kerst be added to the subcommittee.

**Nelson moved, Bender seconded and unanimously carried to designate Loeschke, Bill Kessloff, Senftner and Kerst as members of the Historic District Ordinance subcommittee.**

Loeschke advised that he attended a meeting at the Sioux San Medical Complex noting that the primary focus of the discussions was related to staffing needs and new areas of service.



Loeschke indicated that the buildings on the property were mentioned briefly. He added that the current plan proposes the demolition of all buildings on the site with the exception of the main building. Loeschke stated that only \$500,000 is identified in the budget for restoration of the main building. Loeschke indicated that this project was started in 1992 and it is anticipated to take place in approximately 10 years.

Loeschke advised that he and J. Kessloff met with a lady from Poland and discussed the function of the Historic Preservation Commission noting that a site visit was made to the Clock Shop to demonstrate an example of a historic restoration project in process.

#### Sweeney House Emergency 11.1 Review

Bulman advised that an 11.1 Review request was received for emergency repairs to the basement of the Sweeney house. Bulman noted that the walls in the basement were crumbling and needed to be shored and repaired. She indicated that the State Office of History approved the request for emergency repairs noting that the repaired area is not visible from the outside of the house.

#### Proposal to move 'Pap' Madison Cabin

Ray Summers, Director of The Journey Museum, advised that he and Reid Riner have appeared before the Historic Preservation Commission on several occasions to discuss the relocation of the 'Pap' Madison Cabin from Halley Park to The Journey Museum. Summers advised that the cabin is owned and maintained by the Parks Department. He added that the Parks Department endorses the plan to move the cabin. Summers stated that Hani Shafai has agreed to submit the SDCL 11-6-19 review application for processing through the Growth Management Department. Summers requested feedback from the Commission on the proposed moving of the cabin.

Reid Riner, Minnilusa Pioneer Museum, provided a review of the history of the cabin. Riner indicated that moving the cabin to The Journey Museum will provide an opportunity to use the structure for more than what it is being used as now. Riner noted that plans include the removal of the paint and preservation of the original surface of the logs. Riner added that they would also like to remove the cement and apply chink to the structure to be reflective of the appropriate materials used on cabins. Riner discussed how moving the cabin would provide the opportunity to enhance exposure to information about early Rapid City.

In response to a question from Loeschke, Summers advised that the cabin would be placed in front of the museum, facing to the west, in the grass area located to the south of the bus parking and to the north of the flag pole. Summers advised that a variance to the setbacks must be obtained as the museum property is still platted as a residential area. Summers noted that additional lighting will be provided to add security and illumination for the cabin.

Nelson stated that he is excited about the idea noting that at its current location the cabin is almost inaccessible. Nelson noted that his only concern is that the cabin will no longer be eligible to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places if it is moved.

Bender indicated that the cabin has been located at Halley Park for over 50 years, noting that historic preservation is not only about preserving structures, but is also about preserving history. Discussion followed concerning the value of using the cabin for living history opportunities as compared to the value of leaving the structure at the current location.

Bulman advised that Chris Nelson at the State Office of History indicated that because of the historic significance of the cabin, it could potentially be nominated to the National Register at its current location and potentially remain on the National Register, even if it is moved. Bulman noted that the process of nominating the cabin to the National Register would take six to nine months to complete. Discussion followed concerning the timing of moving the cabin to accommodate the 2008 tourist season versus waiting to accommodate the structure's listing on the National Register and subsequent amendments to the listing.

**Nelson moved and Bender seconded to request the City Council to proceed with nominating the cabin to the National Register as quickly as possible.**

Summers reviewed the numerous changes that have been made to the structure that may impact eligibility for listing to the National Register. Discussion followed. Kerst noted that the process of nominating the cabin to the National Register could be used as an educational tool. Discussion followed concerning the educational benefits of using the cabin as a living history exhibit and the potential benefits of listing the cabin on the National Register. Bender noted the opportunity to use the rehabilitation of the cabin as an educational tool.

**The motion unanimously carried to request the City Council to proceed with nominating the cabin to the National Register as quickly as possible.**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:56 a.m.