

Bulman Karen

From: ChrisB.Nelson@state.sd.us
Sent: Wednesday, September 22, 2010 8:30 AM
To: Bulman Karen; Elkins Marcia
Subject: 11.1 Reviews

Karen, this follows up with our conversation this AM.

The state concurs with the commission's findings for Main Street Square, 1701 Mt. Rushmore, and 622 Main. Also, 622 Main has submitted Federal Tax Credit and State Property Tax Moratorium applications - so once they are approved future work will also meet the Standards.

The state does not concur with the commission's findings for 516 Sixth Street. After looking at the photo evidence, talking with a stained glass artisan, and getting information from a former owner, it appears that the window dates from the historic period.

The photo submitted by the applicant does not shed any light on the window - there is not enough detail to show anything. The stained glass artisan (see paragraph inserted below) feels the window is circa 1917. Steve McCarthy said that when he removed the 1950s facade when he owned the building that the window was as it looks now. Also, it does not make sense that this would be added as a conjectural feature outside the period of significance. An undertaking like this would be rare.

The Standards for Rehabilitation say,

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
If the stained glass was not original, then it appears from the evidence that it was added during the historic period and has acquired significance. Its removal is an adverse effect.

PARAGRAPH PAUL/CHRISTIE DISCUSSION (In my discussion with Christie Jensen, stained glass artisan, I was able to understand through her explanation and photographic documentation what was going on with the stained glass window in the transom at the Van Nuys Gallery in Rapid City. The panel dates to the historic period of the building (construction date 1917) as evidenced by the deterioration of the lead coming between the glass panels. What has happened over time is the lead coming has dried out and become very brittle. This has caused breaks in several areas of the glass framing as evidenced by sagging and buckled panels. The original design of the stained glass window did not have the proper vertical bracing to keep the window stable, and subsequent repairs have further weakened the panels. At present the vent on the front of the building and the air gaps in the window are what have kept it from collapsing due to wind pressure. To remove the window for repair will be a major undertaking. Since the coming is deteriorated throughout the window, it is not feasible to try to repair it in place. To get it out, scaffolding will have to be erected in front of the store for the full width of the stained glass panel. Then framed boards will have to be placed on the exterior and the interior of the stained glass panel to effectively sandwich the window. Then the moldings on the exterior that hold the panel in place will have to be removed and in a synchronized effort, the glass panel will have to be rotated out of the opening and removed down to the street level. Accomplishing this without warping or bending the panel will be critical to avoid glass breakage. This in short will require an extensive crew to do this task, which will drive the labor costs up considerably. Therefore, the cost of this undertaking may be more than the property owner can afford on their own or with the assistance of grant funding. The removal of this window for another type of window in its place would be an adverse effect, but there isn't a feasible or prudent alternative, as the deteriorated window is creating a safety hazard for the public should the window give way and rain down shards of glass on the sidewalk. A possible mitigation measure would be to photograph the window using the National Park Service photographic standards, and to write up a history of the window/artisan who created it.

Cheers,

Paul)

Paul and Christie have both worked with stained glass, so their opinions carry some weight. Given the deterioration, repair costs will be high. The two options I see are:

1. Repairing it now
2. Stabilizing or encapsulating it to repair later

Given the costs, I doubt the feasibility of these. Karen, if in conversations with the owner this is not possible, then I don't think there are any other alternatives the city has to look at. Also, if it truly is an eminent safety hazard, then that should be dealt with appropriately by the city regardless of the historic implications.

Thanks,
Chris