

Minutes of the August 7, 2015
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present: Jody Speck, Sally Shelton, Jean Kessloff, Shawn Krull and Clancy Kingsbury

Members Absent: Bill Freytag and Lance Rom

Others Present: Sarah Hanzel, Patsy Horton, Jeanne Nicholson, Daniel Miller and Ritchie Nordstrom, City Council Liaison

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

Approval of Meeting Agenda

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

Hanzel introduced Ritchie Nordstrom as the new City Council liaison.

11.1 Reviews – Case Report

703 11th Street (15RS009)

Applicant: Daniel Miller

District: West Boulevard Historic District - Contributing

Action Requested: Determine whether or not the Commission agrees with the findings of the abbreviated case report and include any additional comments to the City Council regarding the proposed project.

Hanzel briefly reviewed the 11.1 Review and Case Report for an appeal to replace siding that went to the City Council last year. She informed the Commission that the applicant is now requesting to replace the original siding with a composite siding with the same reveal. She reviewed the staff memo, case report, photographs and SHPO finding letter.

Miller explained that a copy of a 1943 plumbing inspection was found in the basement. He noted that the structure was built by Robbins and Stearns who primarily used pine for their projects. He expressed his opinion that the wood is probably pine.

Hanzel advised that the case report states the siding is cedar and noted that she will change the case report to reflect pine instead of cedar.

Miller stated that the siding is in poor condition and that his intent is to replace it with siding that is in compliance with City code.

Krull stated that his comments in his email about the lead abatement should be helpful for future projects. He inquired as to whether the estimates for painting versus siding replacement include labor.

Miller advised that the estimate for painting does include paint and labor but the estimate for the siding replacement is for the siding only because he would be doing the installation.

In response to a question from Krull, Miller stated that he would use either Hardy or LP Smart siding and that he would retain the characteristic features of the structure.

Hanzel reminded the Commission that their motion should be to agree or disagree with the case report and that the Commission could stipulate that changes be made to the case report and/or add recommendations.

In response to comments from Krull, Miller advised that the reveal will be the same that is currently on the structure.

Kingsbury inquired as to what changes have been made to the case report.

Hanzel explained that the original case report included the replacement of the original door which the applicant has removed from the request. She added that the case report also included replacing the siding with vinyl siding. She noted that the applicant modified the request to replace the existing siding with Hardy or LP Smart siding.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Miller stated that the gable vents will be retained and refinished.

In response to a question from Kessloff regarding the finish of the siding, Miller commented that he would have to do more research about the finish of the siding. He added that he is willing to install whatever the City determines is best for the structure.

Kessloff explained that if a structure is prepped, primed and painted properly, a paint job should last 10 to 15 years.

Miller responded that the property has been neglected and to the best of his knowledge, it has been at least seven years since the structure was painted.

Krull requested that the features of the entry, the windows and the gable vents be preserved.

A brief discussion followed regarding the lead abatement.

Krull recommended that the existing siding be removed prior to installing the new siding.

Miller responded that the old siding would be removed because if not, the placement of new siding over the old would void the warranty.

Krull passed the gavel to Kessloff.

Krull moved to disagree with the findings of the case report based on the email from Shawn Krull and that the case report needs to be corrected to reflect that the existing siding is pine, not cedar. The motion was seconded by Kingsbury and carried unanimously.

Krull moved to recommend that the request to replace the existing siding with a composite siding be approved with the following stipulations:

- 1. That the existing siding be removed.**
- 2. That the new composite siding has a smooth finish.**
- 3. That the composite siding matches the reveal of the existing siding (5 – 6”).**
- 4. That the aluminum corner pieces be replaced in kind.**
- 5. That the windows be trimmed with the composite siding to match the profile of the existing rim and drip cap.**
- 6. That the entry pieces be replaced in kind, or repaired with an epoxy product.**
- 7. That the existing gable vents be maintained and reused.**

The motion was seconded by Kingsbury and carried unanimously.

Kessloff explained that there is a product on the market that is great for repairing rotted out siding and other wood pieces. She added that it is called Abatron. She noted that it is a stabilizer to the wood and is a putty like substance.

Approval of Minutes

Kingsbury moved to approve the June 19, 2015 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Shelton and carried unanimously.

Treasurer's Report

Hanzel explained that the information provided in the Treasurer's Report is through the end of June. She added that a partial payment has been made to the consultant for the resurvey and that the payment will be reflected in the July report. She advised that the surveys that have been completed by the consultant have been submitted to SHPO for their review. She added that once SHPO approves the surveys, the consultant will be able to move onto the next phase which will be funded by next year's CLG Grant. She noted that the current CLG Grant expires August 15, 2015.

Old Business

Historic Preservation Commission Bylaws/attendance policy

Krull suggested that this be tabled until after the new Ordinance is effective.

Kingsbury moved to table the Historic Preservation Commission Bylaws and Attendance Policy. The motion was seconded by Speck and carried unanimously.

Subcommittee Updates

No updates were reported.

Staff Items

Historic Preservation Commission Ordinance Update

Hanzel advised that the Ordinance was approved at the 1st reading at the August 3, 2015 City Council meeting. She reviewed the timeline for the 2nd reading and noted that the Ordinance will be effective September 8, 2015 if approved at the August 17, 2015 City Council meeting.

Draft Historic Preservation Commission application

Hanzel requested the Commission to forward any comments about the proposed application to her. She explained that the application will be used for recruiting and reappointing individuals to be members of the Commission.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Hanzel informed the Commission that the current members will need to submit an application for membership once the new Ordinance becomes effective.

Krull expressed his support for the proposed application.

Acknowledge Tower Submission Packet for a proposed 100' monopole tower at 350 North Lacrosse Street

Acknowledge Tower Submission Packet for a Proposed monopole 110' monopole at 1565 North Haines Street

Hanzel reminded the Commission that Commissioner Rom's employer, Quality Services, reviews the communication tower requests. She noted that the Commission may submit comments about the towers to be located at 350 North Lacrosse Street and 1565 North Haines Street to her. She noted that the Commission should acknowledge that they have reviewed the tower requests.

Staff/SHPO Summary Report

Hanzel advised that the report includes the reviews that have been done since January 1, 2015.

In response to a question from Kessloff regarding the window replacement project on St. James, Hanzel advised that she has visited with the owner and informed him that he needs to submit an application for the window replacement project. She added that the window replacement will have an adverse effect on the structure. She noted that a Stop Work Order is in effect and that the owner has not submitted the application as of this time.

Kingsbury moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:03 a.m. The motion was seconded by Shelton and carried unanimously.