

Minutes of the July 19, 2013
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present: Jim Jackson, Jean Kessloff, Sally Shelton, Lance Rom and Shawn Krull

Members Absent: Bill Freytag and Heather Knox

Others Present: Katherine Palmer, Jeanne Nicholson, Patsy Horton, Carla Cushman, Michelle Dennis, Sam Papendick, Sam Coil, Dan Tribby, Eric Monroe and Brad Estes, City Council Liaison

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

Approval of Meeting Agenda

Krull requested to add funding sources for Historic Preservation Commission as Item 7 under New Business.

Jackson moved to approve the agenda with the noted addition. The motion was seconded by Rom and carried unanimously.

11.1 Reviews

502-508 Main Street (13CM010)

Monroe reviewed the request to add a walk in cooler in the southeast corner of the courtyard. He noted that the application was for an 8' by 14' cooler but would like to change the request to an 8' x 18' cooler for additional cooler space. He stated that the cooler will be a metal skin cooler, unattached, placed on pedestals, self-contained and will not be enclosed in a permanent wall. Monroe added that the cooler will sit below the canopy and that they are considering ways to soften the appearance of the cooler.

Jackson moved to recommend a finding that the addition of a cooler with the dimensions of 8' x 18' will have no adverse effect on the property located at 502-508 Main Street. The motion was seconded by Shelton.

In response to a question from Jackson, Monroe advised that the flooring is concrete pavers that sit above the drainage and that the cooler will be set on pedestals. He noted that there will be no alterations to the patio.

The motion to recommend a finding that the addition of a cooler with the dimensions of 8' x 18' will have no adverse effect on the property located at 502-508 Main Street carried unanimously.

Tribby informed the Commission that the City Council members and officials from Dickinson, North Dakota toured Main Street Square. He added that Dickinson is looking at restoring their downtown and were impressed with what Rapid City has done downtown. He added that he informed the Dickinson officials how the Historic Preservation Commission was involved in the Main Street Square project and recommended that they work with their Historic Preservation Commission. He added that they could be contacting some of the members of the Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission for advice and information.

201 Main Street (13CM011)

Papendick explained that they will be operating a brewery in the Fairmont Creamery. He noted that the only modifications to the exterior will be the widening of the side entrance to meet City

code and the replacement of the garage door. He added that the historic features of the structure will be preserved as much as possible. He briefly reviewed the modifications to the interior, which will include reducing and moving the loft, the installation of new plumbing and floor drains, and the addition of a bathroom and a bar.

Jackson moved to recommend a finding that the interior modifications and the exterior modifications to the side entrance and the garage door will have no adverse effect on the property located at 201 Main Street. The motion was seconded by Shelton.

In response to a question from Jackson, Papendick advised that the garage door will be replaced and that the existing framework will remain in place and be reused.

Krull expressed his opinion that the garage door does not appear to be original.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Coil explained that the garage door will be the same color but will be made of different materials.

Kessloff expressed concern with using different materials for the garage door and the garage door not blending in with the historic features of the building. She added that she would like to see the existing door repaired instead of being replaced.

Papendick added that the existing garage door is not adequate because of the insulation and its current condition.

In response to a question from Jackson, Papendick explained that the side entrance will be widened to meet City code.

Kessloff expressed additional concern with not refurbishing the existing garage door.

Papendick commented that he would visit with the owners about reusing the existing door.

Jackson stated that he understands the concept of reusing the garage door but stated that he concurs with the owners about replacing the door because it is not energy efficient and is not secure.

Krull inquired as to whether the owners and architect have considered replacing the garage door with a garage door that has historical features similar to the old garage door.

Jackson amended the motion to recommend a finding that the interior modifications and the exterior modifications to the side entrance and the garage door will have no adverse effect on the property located at 201 Main Street with the stipulation that the garage door resemble the historic features of the existing door as much as possible. The amended motion was seconded by Shelton.

Kessloff questioned whether the applicant should bring the new garage door selection back to the Commission for further review.

Papendick stated that they would not have a problem with bringing the new door selection back to the Commission but they would like to continue working on the rest of the project.

Jackson made a substitute motion to recommend a finding that the interior modifications and the side door entrance replacement will have no adverse effect on the property located at 201 Main Street and requested that the replacement garage door resemble the appearance and historical features of the existing door and be presented to the

Commission for further review prior to installation. The substitute motion was seconded by Shelton and carried unanimously.

915 Quincy Street (13RS020)

Young reviewed the request to replace the second story deck and noted that the front fascia on the front porch is rotted and needs to be replaced. He added that the deck joists are also rotten and need to be replaced. He advised that the historic features of the old deck will be retained throughout the project and that he is open to any ideas or suggestions from the Commission.

Jackson moved to recommend a finding that the replacement of the second story deck will have no adverse effect on the property located at 915 Quincy Street as long as the replacement of the deck flooring and railing stay with the time period of the home. The motion was seconded by Shelton.

In response to question from Jackson, Young explained that the joists will be green-treated wood and that Trex decking material will be used for the deck flooring. He added that he would like to use wood for the spindles and the railing.

In response to a question from Krull, Dennis stated that the house appears to be a colonial revival style home and stated that without photographs it would be hard to say what materials were used for the upper railing. She added that the support posts would have been round.

In response to a question from Krull regarding the structure under the deck, Young advised that it will be replaced so it matches the historic features of the house.

Kessloff thanked the owner for making improvements to the house and inquired as to what the owner's intent is for the brick steps.

Young explained that the brick steps will be retained with some minor repair.

Kessloff expressed her opinion that the motion needs to be clear about the changes the Commission is approving.

Discussion followed regarding railing and pillar features for colonial revival homes.

Jackson amended the motion to recommend that the replacement of the second story deck will have no adverse effect on the property located at 915 Quincy Street with the stipulations that round stylistic colonial revival pillars of wood material be used on the first level portion, that the railing from the first level to the second level keep with the style and time of colonial revival, that the use of metal is okay for the railing on the second level and that Trex decking be used for the second level floor. The motion was seconded by Shelton and carried unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

Shelton moved to approve the July 9, 2013 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Rom and carried unanimously.

Treasurer's Report

Palmer suggested that this item be continued to the next meeting. Horton recommended that Budget Information should be under this item on future agendas.

New Business

Attendance Requirement Changes - Ordinance

Palmer reviewed the proposed ordinance changes.

Cushman reminded the Commission that the Mayor's suggestion was to change the membership from ten to seven.

Horton explained that several of the City boards have seven members and two alternates. A brief discussion followed.

Palmer reminded the Commission that the Mayor was making a recommendation and that the Mayor has requested the Commission to make a determination on the membership. A brief discussion followed.

In response to a question from Jackson, Horton advised that attendance is addressed under Section 2.68.040 of the ordinance.

In response to a comment from Dennis regarding attendance in the ordinance, Horton advised that the bylaws can identify more specific requirements. Additional discussion followed.

Jackson moved to recommend that the proposed ordinance changes be forwarded to the City Council for their approval. The motion was seconded by Rom.

Dennis commented that the CLG Grant identifies different fields that the members should represent and inquired if the position will remain open until members from the specific fields are found.

Estes suggested that the wording could recommend all fields but state no more than three members could be from one field.

Shelton concurred but suggested that no more than two members could be from one field.

Krull suggested that staff bring back the recommended changes to the Commission for further review. Additional discussion followed.

Jackson moved to continue the Attendance Requirement Changes – Ordinance to the next meeting to allow staff to make the recommended changes to the ordinance. The motion was seconded by Shelton and carried unanimously.

Attendance Requirement Changes - Bylaws

Horton recommended that the changes to the bylaws be consistent with the changes to the ordinance. She suggested that the Commission review the absence section of the bylaws.

Dennis reminded the Commission that the bylaws state that the members cannot miss three consecutive meetings without justifiable cause.

Krull expressed concern about changing the absences to the 50% requirement but expressed his support for the three unexcused absences.

Cushman inquired as to who will determine if the absences are excused or unexcused. A brief discussion followed.

Horton suggested that the bylaws be amended to state that no member may have more than three unexcused absences in six months and that the Commission will make the determination whether the member should be removed from the Commission.

Shelton moved to continue the Attendance Requirement Changes – Bylaws to the next meeting to allow staff to make the recommended changes to the bylaws. The motion was seconded by Jackson and carried unanimously.

Updated Rotating Schedule for City Council

Krull advised that the schedule linked to the agenda is monthly and requested members to volunteer for the months that will work for them. Horton explained that if a member is scheduled for a particular meeting(s), they can contact another member to cover their meeting(s) if they cannot attend. A brief discussion followed.

State Tax Moratorium Document

Palmer briefly reviewed the State Historic Preservation Property Tax Moratorium Overview which is provided by the State and is given to the applicant at the time of their application. She added that no changes have been made to the document and the applicants are informed to read the document.

In response to a comment from Krull, Palmer advised that she has contacted the County Assessor's office to have the Assessor give a presentation at the Historic Preservation Commission meeting and was advised that the individual was on vacation. She added that she will contact them again to see if the Assessor can speak at the next meeting.

Kessloff suggested that the members put an example together for the Commission to review. Krull advised that he has an example that he can provide to the Commission as an informational item.

CLG Grant

Palmer informed the Commission that there is approximately \$18,000 of funding available that needs to be spent by August 20, 2013. She added that the amount will probably change after the Commission makes a decision on the contract for the Design Guidelines. She noted that she had been contacted by the State who had indicated that if the Commission does not use or need the \$18,000, the funds will be reallocated to another Historic Preservation Commission in the state. Palmer suggested that the Commission have a special meeting to discuss the CLG funding.

Krull suggested that the Commission discuss the Design Guidelines and then revisit this item.

Update on Design Guidelines

Palmer informed the Commission that the Design Guidelines Subcommittee feels that the proposed guidelines are not user-friendly or a good representation of what the Commission wants for its guidelines. She added that the consultant is ready to finalize the document and hold a public meeting for the final report. She noted that the subcommittee does not want a public meeting and does not want to approve the Design Guidelines. Palmer informed the Commission that the contract can be terminated and the City will be responsible to pay the consultant for the work that has been completed or the consultant be allowed to finish the Design Guidelines and have a public meeting for the report, noting that the report may not be approved by the Commission.

Horton added to this option that the consultant could finalize the document on their end and identify it as a draft report, then have a public meeting to allow the public to review the document and then finish the contract and close it out. She added that then the Commission can make changes as necessary and present it to the public as a final report. Horton expressed her opinion

that it will cost approximately \$10,000 for the work that has been completed to this point with \$2,000 to be used for travel costs.

Dennis expressed her opinion that it would not be a good idea to have a public meeting for the draft report as written.

Krull concurred and added that the consultant should be paid for the work completed. A brief discussion followed.

Shelton moved to authorize staff to terminate the contract with the consultant and to request a final invoice for the work completed. The motion was seconded by Rom and carried unanimously.

Palmer suggested that the Commission have a special meeting to discuss projects for the upcoming CLG Grant. She reminded the Commission about the State Historic Preservation Office training on July 25, 2013 at 11:00 a.m. in the Council Chambers. Krull suggested having the special meeting on Wednesday, July 24, 2013 at 5:30 p.m.

Kessloff moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:00 a.m. The motion was seconded by Rom and carried unanimously.