

Minutes of the October 3, 2014
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

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

Members Absent: Eric Monroe, Lance Rom and Sally Shelton

Others Present: Sarah Hanzel, Jeanne Nicholson, Patsy Horton, Michael Aman, Michelle Aman, Brian Sykora, Mario Rangel and Brad Estes, City Council Liaison

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

Approval of the Meeting Agenda

Freytag moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Kingsbury and carried unanimously.

11.1 Reviews

1118 Columbus Street (14RS020)

Hanzel reviewed the request and addressed the aerial map, photographs and drawings.

Mr. Aman informed the Commission that he was not aware that a building permit was needed and that the bump out is already finished. He added that the original wall and window are still intact behind the bump out.

In response to a question from Freytag, Hanzel explained that the applicant received a stop work order. She added that he did the work himself and was not aware that a permit was needed.

Freytag expressed his opinion that the biggest problem is the new vinyl windows that have been installed. He added that the applicant may have to replace them or submit an appeal to the City Council.

Speck entered the meeting at this time.

Kingsbury expressed his opinion that the bump out is not characteristic to the architecture of this house.

Ms. Aman advised that other houses in the neighborhood have similar features to them.

Mr. Aman stated that the planter below the bump out will have to either be removed or reconstructed.

In response to a question from Krull, Mr. Aman advised that there will be a roof over the bump out.

Estes entered the meeting at this time.

Kessloff commented that additions should not mimic the historic features of the house and recommended that the bump out have some different features than the original house.

Kessloff moved to recommend a finding that extending the window wall by 8'H 8'W 16"D to accommodate a window seat, that installing two new vinyl double hung windows and that

reusing original lap siding and 4” composite siding as needed will have an adverse effect on the historic property located at 1118 Columbus Street. The motion died due to a lack of a second.

In response to a question from Freytag about reusing the existing windows, Mr. Aman advised that the old windows are not energy efficient and he would prefer to use the new windows.

Freytag commented that rehabilitating the windows would be more suitable and added that the width of the trim should either be narrower or wider than the trim on the original windows. A brief discussion followed.

Kessloff expressed concern about using the combination of the old lap siding and the new composite siding.

In response to a question from Krull, Mr. Aman advised that the original siding is cedar and that the composite siding will be used as needed and is the closest match to the original siding.

In response to a comment from Mrs. Aman, Freytag suggested that the vinyl windows be replaced with wood replacement windows or by rehabilitating the original wood windows.

Freytag moved to recommend a finding that extending the window wall by 8’H 8’W 16”D to accommodate a window seat will have no adverse effect on the property located at 1118 Columbus Street with the stipulations that the original windows or two wood replacement windows be used, that the window trim on the bump out is differentiated from the trim on the existing windows of the house and that the original lap siding be reused with 4” composite siding being inserted as needed. The motion was seconded by Kingsbury and carried with Freytag, Krull, Kingsbury, Speck and Jones voting yes and Kessloff voting no.

1115 Saint Joseph Street (14RS021)

Hanzel reviewed the request and addressed the aerial map, window specifications and photographs.

In response to a question from Freytag, Sykora explained that 6 Pella aluminum clad windows were previously purchased and would be installed as pocket windows using the existing sashes.

In response to a question from Freytag, Sykora advised that some pocket windows were installed several years ago but not sure if they are aluminum clad or not.

Kessloff inquired as to why the windows are being replaced.

Sykora explained that the current windows are in poor condition and they are not energy or noise efficient. He added that the house has been reinsulated and that the house needs to be gutted and totally remodeled.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Sykora advised that there are aluminum combination storms for the windows except for the one on the west side that is not being replaced.

In regards to a question from Kessloff regarding insulation, Sykora stated that the house has been reinsulated but is not sure about the attic because there is no attic access.

Kessloff commented that the divided lights are a defining feature of the house.

Jones expressed his opinion that the windows need to mimic the original windows to preserve the historic character of the structure.

Kessloff added that the sashes are separate for each window.

Jones stated that weather stripping could be placed between the sashes and the storm windows to help with energy efficiency.

Sykora responded that foam could be placed into the cavities to help with energy efficiency.

In response to a question from Kingsbury, Sykora briefly reviewed the windows that will be replaced.

Freytag explained that the proposed replacement windows would not be pocket windows but would be retrofitted windows. He added there is more flexibility for retrofit windows because modern materials can be used. He stated that if the 6 windows were purchased prior to the requirement for the building permit, the applicant would be able to use this fact as an alternative in the appeal process. He noted that retrofit windows with the grills that look like the original windows would be acceptable.

Krull inquired as to whether the applicant has looked into purchasing high quality wood storm windows which would help in maintaining the original windows.

Sykora stated that one of the biggest problems with having storm windows is that renters don't take care of them and they would continually have to be replaced.

In response to a comment from Krull about commercial business being located in neighboring properties, Sykora advised he tried to rezone the property to commercial but the request was denied by the City.

Freytag explained that the Commission follows guidelines that have been established in approving 11.1 Reviews. He added that retrofit windows would be appropriate and would look similar to the ones you have already purchased. He stated that grids inside the glass are affordable.

Sykora stated he would prefer mounted wood grids on the windows instead of grids between the glass panes.

Freytag advised that the wood grids would be acceptable and recommended that the applicant purchase windows that look similar to the existing windows.

Speck departed the meeting at this time.

Krull handed the gavel to Kessloff.

Krull moved to recommend a finding that replacing (10) single and grouped windows using (6) Pella Pro-Line Aluminum Clad wood finished interior double hung windows to match existing openings and using (8) windows of Crestline Windows using existing openings would have an adverse effect on the historic property located at 1115 Saint Joseph Street. The motion died due to a lack of a second.

Kessloff explained that the Secretary of Interior Standards state that prudent and feasible alternatives need to be furnished by the applicant. She added that the Standards also state the windows should be repaired if at all possible or replaced with in-kind windows. She noted that the fact that the structure is a rental property should not be considered in the Commission's decision on the 11.1 Review.

Freytag moved to recommend a finding that the use of retrofit windows made of modern materials with removable wood grids will have no adverse effect on the historic property located

at 1115 Saint Joseph Street. The motion was seconded by Kingsbury and failed with Krull, Kessloff and Jones voting no and Freytag and Kingsbury voting yes.

Freytag recommended that the applicant try to preserve as much as possible on the structure and that the applicant revisit changing the property to commercial. He added that this would generate income to use in rehabilitating the property.

In response to a question from Jones regarding the Pella windows, Sykora advised that the Pella windows would not be pocket windows but would be installed as such.

Jones added that grids can be purchased for the Pella windows.

In response to a comment from Jones, Sykora stated that he will purchase the grids for the six Pella windows that he has and noted that the exterior trim will remain the same. He added that he will look at other options for the remaining windows and will submit a new application at a later time. Additional discussion followed.

Freytag moved to recommend a finding that installing 6 pre-purchased Pella Pro-Line Aluminum Clad wood interior double hung windows to match the original window openings and divided light pattern will have no adverse effect on the historic property located at 1115 Saint Joseph Street. The motion was seconded by Kingsbury and carried with Freytag, Krull, Kingsbury and Jones voting yes and Kessloff voting no.

918 5th Street (14CM017)

Hanzel reviewed the request and addressed the photographs and product specifications.

Rangel explained that the primary reason for the application to install new windows is because of the water infiltration in the basement. He reviewed the different types of windows that will be installed, the location of the windows and the installation process for the different types of windows.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Rangel advised that the windows appear to be original and are made of wood. He added that it appears that the windows were set within the stone wall and that the storm windows were installed on the face of the wall.

Jones reviewed the different styles and frames for the proposed windows. He expressed his opinion that consideration needs to be given to the profile of the windows to ensure that the new windows don't negatively affect the appearance of the church.

Freytag suggested that the applicant bring back a new plan that better identifies the windows that will be used. He added that the new windows should duplicate the old windows as much as possible and still be functional in preventing the water infiltration into the basement of the church.

Jones stated that he would be willing to visit with the applicant and the church to review the different window options that are available. Additional discussion followed.

Appeals

Case Report: 1725 9th Street – 14RS004

Property Owner: Chad McDonald

Motion Requested: Agree with the findings of the case report; Disagree with the findings or the case report; or decline to comment on the Case Report that the City has documented all relevant factors to minimize the harm to historic property.

Kessloff suggested that the minutes for the March 21, 2014 Historic Preservation Commission meeting and the additional photographs of the original siding on the house be included in the case report.

In response to a question from Krull, Hanzel advised that other building code violations, if any, are not part of this process so they are not included in the case report.

Kingsbury moved to agree with the findings of the case report and that the March 21, 2014 Historic Preservation Commission meeting minutes and the photographs of the siding that was removed prior to the 11.1 Review be included in the case report. The motion was seconded by Kessloff and carried unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

Freytag moved to approve the September 19, 2014 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Kessloff and carried unanimously.

Staff Items

1. 2014-2015 Grant Budget Summary

Hanzel advised that staff has received the registration for the 2015 Home Show and inquired as to whether or not the Commission wishes to participate again. She added that this item can be discussed at the next meeting.

Freytag moved to continue the remaining agenda items, New Business and Subcommittee Updates, to the next meeting. The motion was seconded by Kingsbury and carried unanimously.

SHPO Summary Report – SHPO concurred with the findings of the 9/5/2014 HPC meeting. They did not request a case report for 14RS018 (821 St. James) since alternatives were included in the application and discussed at the 9/19/2014 HPC meeting. The appeal is on the agenda for the 10/1/2014 Legal Finance Committee meeting for recommendation to City Council on October 6, 2014.

Hanzel informed the Commission that Legal and Finance recommended approval of the appeal.

Freytag moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:55 a.m. The motion was seconded by Kingsbury and carried unanimously.