

Minutes of the April 4, 2014
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present: Jean Kessloff, Sally Shelton, Shawn Krull, Bill Freytag, Clancy Kingsbury and Alternate Doug Jones

Members Absent: Eric Monroe, Lance Rom and Alternate Jody Speck

Others Present: Sarah Hanzel, Jeanne Nicholson, Patsy Horton, Barb Rowenhorst, Ali Demersseman, Jeremy Briggs, Dan Senftner, Bob Brandt, Gary Renner, Don Gustin and Kristol McKie

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

Approval of the Meeting Agenda

Krull requested that an item, Wildland Urban Interface, be added under New Business.

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

Kingsbury entered the meeting at this time.

11.1 Reviews

616 Sixth Street (14CM002)

Hanzel briefly reviewed the request and noted that the applicant is working with the insurance company to approve another style of shingles. She added that the Fire Department approved the DaVinci shingle but not new cedar shakes.

Renner advised that the historical features of the structure will be retained. He added that he is trying to get quotes from a roofer for the polymer roofing tiles and for the asphalt shingles.

Kessloff explained the difference between cedar shakes and shingles. She expressed her opinion that the shingles would look better.

In response to a question from Freytag, Renner advised that the cost of the asphalt shingles would be lower and that he wants to maintain the historic appearance of the structure.

Freytag moved to recommend a finding that replacing the existing cedar shingle shakes with asphalt singles will have no adverse effect on the historic property located at 616 Sixth Street. The motion was seconded by Kingsbury.

Estes entered the meeting at this time.

Krull recommended that the ornamental features of the structure be retained and reapplied.

Renner asked if the chimney can be removed because it leaks and is causing problems with the rest of the structure.

In response to a question from Freytag, Renner advised that the chimney is not functional.

Freytag amended the motion to add “that the ornamental features be retained and reapplied on the structure”.

The amended motion to recommend a finding that replacing the existing cedar shingle shakes with asphalt singles will have no adverse effect on the historic property located at 616 Sixth Street and that all ornamental features be retained and reapplied on the structure carried unanimously.

Freytag recommended that the applicant come back to the Commission to further discuss the chimney after the new roof has been installed.

629 St. Joseph Street (14CM003)

Hanzel briefly reviewed the request for the demolition of the non-load bearing walls.

Senftner informed the Commission that the interior has been renovated quite a few times and that the goal is to get the structure back to what it was in the 1950's. He added that the demolition of the walls will open the entire store from the front to the back which would allow more display space.

Kessloff advised that she would abstain from voting on this 11.1 Review.

Freytag moved to recommend a finding that the demolition of the non-load bearing walls will have no adverse effect on the historic property located at 629 St. Joseph Street. The motion was seconded by Shelton and carried with Freytag, Shelton, Krull, Kingsbury and Jones voting yes and Kessloff abstaining.

1013 West Boulevard (14RS009)

Hanzel reminded the Commission that she emailed the window specifications to each of you. She provided a copy to the Commission for review.

Brandt explained that the windows and the doors in the addition are all different and that the owner is trying to make them the same as those in the original house. He added that the trim for the addition windows and doors will be the same as the trim on the original house. He advised that the apartment is being remodeled into a bedroom and that the owners will be replacing the existing door with one to match the door on the lower level of the addition. He informed the Commission that Lincoln wood windows will be used and briefly reviewed the installation of the windows and trim. He noted that the garage will be converted into a family room and that the existing garage door will be retained but will not be operable.

In response to a question from Freytag, Brandt explained that a wall will be framed on the inside over the garage door and that the exterior door will be retained and will not be operable.

In response to a question from Jones, Brandt advised the window trim will be made of wood and will be painted white to match the trim on the original structure.

Kessloff asked if there should be two different motions.

Krull recommended that there be two separate motions for this 11.1 Review.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Brandt reviewed the type, size and location of the proposed windows.

Shelton moved to have one motion for the window and door replacements in the addition and one motion for the approval to replace the remaining original windows in the house. The motion was seconded by Freytag and carried unanimously.

In response to a question from Krull, Brandt advised that there will be two vertical panels and one horizontal panel on the top of the new doors. He added that the doors will be painted white.

Shelton moved to have one motion for the windows and one motion for the doors on the addition. The motion was seconded by Kingsbury and carried with Shelton, Kingsbury, Krull, Kessloff and Jones voting yes and Freytag voting no.

Freytag moved to recommend a finding that the replacement of the two exterior doors will have no adverse effect on the historic property located at 1013 West Boulevard. The motion was seconded Shelton and carried unanimously.

In response to a question from Krull, Brandt reviewed the type and location of the eleven replacements windows for the addition.

Freytag moved to recommend a finding that the replacement of the eleven windows in the addition will have no adverse effect on the historic property located at 1013 West Boulevard. The motion was seconded by Kingsbury and carried unanimously.

Brandt explained that the 11.1 Review includes the future replacement of the windows in the original structure. He added that the current windows will be replaced with Lincoln wood windows and will be replaced as money becomes available to the applicants.

Freytag briefly explained the building permit process and inquired as to when the windows on the original structure will be replaced.

Horton added that if the Commission approves the window replacement on the original structure, the applicant will not have to come back and get Commission approval again for any future building permits for windows. Additional discussion followed.

Kessloff commented that the windows in the original structure are different types that have been well maintained and have original storms that are also in good condition. She expressed concern with replacing the windows on the original structure and inquired if the applicants have considered restoring them instead.

Brandt informed the Commission that the house has been in the family for three generations and they want to retain the historical features of the house. He added that the applicants are considering replacing the windows because of the restoration costs and because the original windows are not energy efficient.

In response to a question from Freytag, Brandt advised that the windows will be custom built Lincoln wood windows.

Freytag stated that he could support approving the new windows in the original structure as long as they match the current windows.

Jones stated that inserts can be placed into existing frames without changing the outside trim.

Brandt concurred and stated that the windows would be inserts.

In response to a question from Krull regarding the bay window, Brandt advised that would be the last window to be replaced and it could be several years down the road before the applicants replace the windows because of the cost.

Kessloff briefly reviewed the Secretary of Interior Standards for window replacement and restoration. Discussion followed.

Brandt withdrew the request for the replacement of the remaining original windows in the original structure.

Krull recommended that when the applicants apply for an 11.1 Review to replace the windows in the original house that they provide pictures of the windows and have documentation about the functionality of the windows.

1123 9th Street (14RS008)

Hanzel briefly reviewed the request to remove the existing brick chimney vent and to remove and replace existing non-historic windows and door in the kitchen addition.

Demersseman further explained that the cedar roof will be replaced with a new cedar roof and that part of the request is to remove the abandoned chimney. She added that the kitchen is an addition to the original structure and the windows will be replaced with matching historical windows as they relate to material, size and pattern. She noted that a non-original window on the back of the addition will be replaced with a bay window that matches the bay window on the original structure.

Krull suggested that the Commission make a motion to separate the 11.1 Review into two separate motions, one for the chimney and one for the windows and door.

Shelton moved to recommend that there be a separate motion for the removal of the chimney vent and another motion for the windows and the door in the kitchen addition. The motion was seconded by Kessloff and carried unanimously.

Demersseman advised that the chimney runs through the middle of the foyer and not along a wall. She added that there is leakage around the chimney that is causing interior damage in the house. She added that a new furnace has been installed and the chimney has been abandoned.

Kessloff stated that she could support the removal of the chimney if it is causing interior damage to the house.

Kessloff moved to recommend a finding that the removal of the brick chimney vent from the top of the roof will have no adverse effect on the historic property located at 1123 9th Street. The motion was seconded by Shelton and carried unanimously.

In response to a question from Jones, Demersseman advised that the exterior window trim will be made of wood.

Freytag asked if the applicant wants a second choice for different shingles. Demersseman advised that they will come back before the Commission if the current cedar roof cannot be replaced with a new cedar roof. She added that the gutters will be replaced and will match the historic appearance of the structure.

Freytag moved to recommend a finding that the removal and the replacement of the existing non-historic windows and door in the existing kitchen addition with new windows to match the historical wood windows in material, proportional size, and fenestration pattern will have no

adverse effect on the historic property located at 1123 9th Street. The motion was seconded by Shelton and carried unanimously.

Demersseman advised that the existing cedar roof will be replaced with a new cedar roof and if that cannot happen, we will come back to the Commission for approval for different roof materials.

Krull commented that the architectural and historical details should be retained and reapplied if at all possible.

406 5th Street - Aby's Feed and Seed (14CM004)

Hanzel briefly reviewed the aerial map, the site plans and the photographs for the 11.1 Review.

Briggs reviewed the renovations for View A which consisted of replacing the existing entrance door, overhead door and window with garage doors with glass panels and adding a steel and cable railing along front loading dock. He noted that for View B, the block window will be expanded to allow for more light in the building. He further explained that in View C, the existing window and door in framed structure will be replaced and that a ramp will be installed for ADA access to the building. He further explained that in View D, the four windows will be replaced with 2 foot x 8 foot windows, the door will be replaced and a railing will be installed.

In response to a question from Freytag, Briggs stated that a meeting is scheduled for April 24, 2014 to discuss parking requirements.

Krull asked the Commission for their input about whether action on the 11.1 Review should be divided into several motions.

Kessloff expressed her support for the project and for keeping the warehouse appearance.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Briggs reviewed the location for the new door and window openings.

In response to a question from Jones, Briggs stated that the windows will be clear glass.

In response to a question from Estes, Briggs advised that the material for the doors and windows would be consistent with what is currently in the structure.

Freytag expressed his opinion that improvements to the structure would be better than demolishing it.

Briggs added that it would be helpful if the structure was occupied instead of being empty.

Kessloff expressed concern about a blanket approval of the project without having more information of the materials that will be used for the windows and doors.

Estes suggested the Commission could approve the proposed openings for the doors and windows at this time so the project can move forward. He added that the applicant could come back with another 11.1 Review when the materials for the windows and doors have been determined.

Kessloff concurred with Estes' suggestion.

Estes suggested that the Commission take separate action on the existing openings for each view.

Kessloff moved to recommend a finding that expanding the glass block window opening, replacing the garage door with glass panels, replacing the existing entrance door and adding

the railing, all in View A, will have no adverse effect on the historic property located at 406 5th Street. The motion was seconded by Kingsbury and carried unanimously.

Kessloff moved to recommend a finding that creating an 8 x 8 rough opening in View B will have no adverse effect on the historic property located at 406 5th Street. The motion was seconded by Shelton and carried unanimously.

Kessloff moved to recommend a finding that creating an 8 x 8 window opening, creating three window openings, replacing the current door with window and adding a ramp and a railing, all in View C, will have no adverse effect on the historic property located at 406 5th Street. The motion was seconded by Freytag.

Jones commented that 8 x 8 wood frame windows are not available so it will probably have to be two windows side by side.

The motion to recommend a finding that replacing the 8 x 8 window opening, replacing the three window openings, replacing the current door with window and adding a ramp and a railing, all in View C, will have no adverse effect on the historic property located at 406 5th Street carried unanimously.

Kessloff moved to recommend a finding that installing a 8 x 8 window opening in the brick portion, replacing the door opening, elongating the 4 window openings and adding a railing, all in View D, will have no adverse effect on the historic property located at 406 5th Street. The motion was seconded by Shelton.

In response to a question from Freytag, Briggs advised that the door will be in the storage area and will not be used by the public.

Freytag recommended that a railing be installed as a safety precaution.

The motion to recommend a finding that installing a 8 x 8 window opening in the brick portion, replacing the door opening, elongating the 4 window openings and adding a railing, all in View D, will have no adverse effect on the historic property located at 406 5th Street carried unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

Shelton moved to approve the March 21, 2014 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Freytag and carried unanimously.

Kessloff moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:56 a.m. The motion was seconded by Shelton and carried unanimously.