

Minutes of the October 17, 2014
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present: Sally Shelton, Shawn Krull, Clancy Kingsbury, Bill Freytag and Alternates Doug Jones and Jody Speck

Members Absent: Jean Kessloff, Eric Monroe and Lance Rom

Others Present: Sarah Hanzel, Jeanne Nicholson, Patsy Horton, Brett Limbaugh, Joel Landeen, Richard Bell, Carol Bell and Sam Chandler

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

Approval of the Meeting Agenda

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

11.1 Reviews

1206 Clark Street (14RS022)

Hanzel reviewed the request and addressed the application, design features for the siding and the façade, aerial map, photographs and drawings.

Carol Bell explained that they worked with an architect to determine the best location on the lot for the house.

Richard Bell advised that solar panels will be placed on the garage which will not be visible to the street. He added that the house will include historic features and will be built to the applicable time of the area. He stated that they wanted to work with the Commission on the preliminary plans. A brief discussion followed.

Krull thanked the applicants for the comprehensive application.

In response to a question from Kingsbury, Richard Bell advised that the driveway will be from Clark Street.

Carol Bell added that the existing approach will be used.

In response to a question from Freytag, Richard Bell advised that the solar panels will be on the garage which is on the south side and will cover approximately 1/2 to 2/3 of the structure.

Carol Bell added that the solar panels will not be visible to the surrounding property owners.

Kingsbury moved to recommend a finding that the construction of a residential home built in compliance with MDR Zoning requirements will have no adverse effect on the historic property located at 1206 Clark Street. The motion was seconded by Shelton and carried unanimously.

926 Quincy Street (14RS023)

Krull excused himself from the dais and handed the gavel to Freytag.

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

Krull reminded the Commission that this is one of the iconic houses on the boulevard. He added that the house extends 27 feet in the air and that the roof is destroyed. He explained that the current roof will be replaced with enviro-shingles which are very similar to the existing shingles. He noted that a built in gutter system will be added using the existing flashing. He further explained that the siding in the dormer areas will be removed so the flashing can be replaced. He added that new cedar siding with 3 inch reveal will be used to replace the old siding.

Jones moved to recommend a finding that removing the existing cedar shake roof and replacing it with enviro-shingle building products, removing the siding and flashing around the dormers and replacing with the same siding with 3 inch reveal and applying a hydrostop to the existing gutter system will have no adverse effect on the property located at 926 Quincy Street. The motion was seconded Kingsbury and carried unanimously.

Krull returned to the dais.

Approval of Minutes

Kingsbury moved to approve the October 3, 2014 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Shelton and carried unanimously.

Staff Items

Staff Memo & Jim Lehe's Report

Hanzel informed the Commission that Lehe Planning has submitted the Final Report for the Analysis of Rapid City's Historic Preservation Program and that it is very thorough. She summarized staff's memo and addressed the Memorandum of Joint Agreement, the creation of zoning overlay districts for Downtown and for West Boulevard, the division of the Historic Preservation Commission into two boards, one for each of the proposed zoning overlay districts, design guidelines, internal staff review and administrative approval, SHPO's process for determining if projects would have an adverse effect on historic property and the appeal process. She added that the report recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission shift their focus to an education outreach program for the public.

In response to a question from Freytag, Hanzel explained that the Final Report will be on the Planning Commission's October 23, 2014 agenda for their acknowledgement of the report. She added that the schedule for the public hearings for the Zoning Ordinance Updates has not been determined at this time but will keep the Commission informed of the upcoming public hearings.

In response to a question from Freytag, Hanzel advised that the Ordinance was prepared by Lehe Planning and is Appendix E of the Final Report.

Freytag expressed his opinion that the Commission needs to be kept in the loop about action on appeals.

In response to a comment from Freytag, Limbaugh stated that the same guidelines will be used but the determination process will be different.

Landeen commented that the State will still need to review the projects on historical property and that the design review on the zoning side still needs to be clarified.

Freytag expressed concern about the zoning overlay districts and asked how will the Historic Preservation Commission be involved in the review process.

Landeem explained that if the State determines that a project will have an adverse effect on historic property, they will request comments from the Historic Preservation Commission.

In response to a question from Freytag, Landeem advised that the Memorandum of Joint Agreement gives the Commission power to make recommendations on 11.1 Reviews.

Freytag expressed concern about the appeal process and the proposed ordinance.

Jones expressed his opinion that the reason Historic Preservation Commission gets the negative publicity is because of the people and/or contractors that try to get away with not following the regulations. He also expressed his opinion that the City employees will take the brunt of the property owner's frustration because of the proposed changes.

Hanzel commented that the design guidelines will be used to determine if projects will have an adverse effect on the historic property. She added that if there is no adverse effect, staff will be in a position to administratively approve the permits.

Freytag expressed his opinion that debate between the Commission members is good and that the public appreciates the input from the Commission. He expressed concern with staff administratively approving permits.

In response to a question from Kingsbury about the function of the Commission per the Final Report, Hanzel explained that one of the main roles would be to educate the community about historic preservation and another role would be the involvement in survey projects.

In response to a question from Kingsbury, Hanzel stated that the sign permits would be approved by the commercial board and staff.

In response to a question from Krull, Hanzel advised that design guidelines are used in other South Dakota communities and that the reorganization of the Commission into a commercial board and a residential board is a new concept.

Jones commented that it will be vital that the public is informed about who they should contact when they see violations occurring in the Historic District.

Freytag expressed his opinion that the Commission has reduced the number of appeals that go before the City Council.

Krull expressed his appreciation for everything that Hanzel does for the Commission. He added that the appeals that go before the City Council are complete which makes it easier for the City Council to make a determination on the appeal. He inquired as to whether the same consultant was used for this report that was used for the reorganization of the Growth Management Department several years ago.

Jones expressed his opinion that homeowners and contractors should have been interviewed along with government employees for this report.

Freytag informed the Commission that it took two years to finalize the reorganization of the Growth Management Department.

Kingsbury expressed his opinion that the Commission should have some authority in design review. He expressed his support for combining both this Commission and the Historic Sign Review Committee into two boards, one for commercial properties and one for residential properties. He expressed his support for the City Council reviewing the appeals instead of having the appeals going to court.

Speck stated that this Commission may do two to three 11.1 Reviews a meeting which is not excessive. He added that the members are volunteers who have been appointed to this Commission because of their experience. He expressed his opinion that staff should not be put in the position to deal with unhappy property owners and contractors.

Landeem commented that staff reviews permits all the time. He added that the intent of this report is to establish guidelines in making a determination about whether projects will have an adverse effect on historic property.

Freytag expressed his opinion that staff could approve permits for non-contributing properties. He added that he has concern with who will be making the determination if all feasible, reasonable and prudent alternatives have been considered when reviewing the improvements to historic properties.

Landeem briefly reviewed the State statute and the Memorandum of Joint Agreement as they relate to exterior and interior design.

Freytag stated that he does not want staff to determine if all feasible, reasonable and prudent alternatives have been considered. He stated he wants the State and/or governing body to make that determination.

In response to a comment from Krull, Hanzel explained that staff would work with the State when determining if all feasible, reasonable and prudent alternatives have been considered. She added that the Final Report recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission's focus should be on an outreach education program. She requested that the Commission draft a formal response to the Lehe Planning Final Report which would be included in the public hearing process.

Freytag expressed his opinion that the guidelines that were used for the reorganization of the second floor be mimicked in reviewing this report.

Krull acknowledged the Lehe Planning Final Report and requested that the item be brought back to the next meeting for a formal response. He suggested that a special work session be scheduled to further discuss the Final Report.

Shelton moved to continue the Lehe Planning's Analysis of Rapid City's Historic Preservation Program to the next meeting. The motion was seconded by Freytag and carried unanimously.

Freytag moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:44 a.m. The motion was seconded by Kingsbury and carried unanimously.