

# APPENDIX “D”

Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission



## 2010 Meeting Minutes

MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
January 5, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scott Sogge, Pat Roseland, Jean Kessloff, Richard Grable, Tamara Pier, Shawn Krull, Cynthia Matson, Duane Baumgartner, John Wagner

OTHERS PRESENT: Danny Wegner, Sheryl Coley, Rich Dunkelberger, Kent Kennedy, Michelle Dennis, Alan Hanks, Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

Call To Order

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m. with each member providing a brief introduction.

Approval of Meeting Agenda

Kessloff requested the addition of Web Site and Education discussion items. **Baumgartner moved, Pier seconded and carried unanimously to approve the meeting agenda as amended.**

Grable entered the meeting at this time 7:35 a.m. and introduced himself.

530 6<sup>th</sup> Street (10CM001)

Wegner presented the request to demolish the existing interior restaurant, kitchen and restroom area at 530 6<sup>th</sup> Street. Wegner addressed the remodel of the interior area including new kitchen equipment and the addition of an exit door on the south façade of the building. Wegner clarified that the design of the new single access door would be identical to the existing double doors located to the east.

**Krull moved, Grable seconded and carried unanimously to open discussion on the 530 6<sup>th</sup> Street 11.1 Review.**

In response to a question from Krull, Wegner indicated that the existing drop ceiling will be removed noting that he anticipates the underlying ceiling material to be sheetrock. In response to a question from Krull, Wegner indicated that the entrance door to the adjoining business will be closed and covered to show no access.

Kessloff stated that a south façade exit door had been present in the original structure noting its location in a historic photograph. Wegner addressed the location of the new exit door noting that the door will be of the same design as the existing door to the east. In response to a question from Sogge, Wegner indicated that the second exit is required by the Fire Code.

Kessloff indicated that the structure is the best example of Chicago style architecture in the area. Krull encouraged the use of interior Chicago style lighting to complement the building architecture. Discussion followed regarding access requirements and the retention of the door to the adjoining business.

Elkins briefly addressed the Commission's responsibility regarding recommending a finding of non-adverse or adverse effect on historic property. Elkins indicated that the Commission's recommendation is then remitted to the State Historic Preservation Office for action.

**Matson moved to recommend a finding that the demolition and remodel of the interior area and the addition of a new exit door on the south façade on the property located at 530 6<sup>th</sup> Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. Sogge seconded the motion.**

In response to a request by Kessloff, Matson indicated that the door design is adequately addressed in the application materials and declined to modify the motion. Pier indicated that the minutes will reflect that the new door will be of the same design as the existing door to the east.

Elkins recommended that should the motion be amended, specific direction needs to be provided with regard to the door design.

**Kessloff moved a substitute motion to recommend a finding that the demolition and remodel of the interior area and the addition of a new exit door on the south façade on the property located at 530 6<sup>th</sup> Street will have no adverse effect on historic property with the stipulation that the design of the south façade exit door be sensitive to the Chicago style architecture.** There being no second to the motion, the motion failed.

**Wagner moved to amend the main motion to recommend a finding that the demolition and remodel of the interior area and the addition of a new exit door on the south façade on the property located at 530 6<sup>th</sup> Street will have no adverse effect on historic property with the stipulation that the design of the south façade exit door be sensitive to the Chicago style architecture.** There being no second to the motion, the motion failed.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the demolition and remodel of the interior area and the addition of a new exit door on the south façade on the property located at 530 6<sup>th</sup> Street will have no adverse effect on historic property carried with Kessloff voting No.**

#### 523 6<sup>th</sup> Street (10CM002)

Kennedy presented the request for an interior tenant improvement to the restaurant area. Kennedy indicated that the tenant has prepared the site plan noting that the new restaurant will utilize the same space with the only structural change being the addition of the Americans with Disabilities Act ramp to the upper level seating area. Kennedy stated that the gas fireplace exhaust vent will be the only exterior alteration.

**Kessloff moved to recommend a finding that the renovation of the former Landmark Restaurant area on the property located at 523 6<sup>th</sup> Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. Baumgartner seconded the motion.**

Kessloff requested that consideration be given to the restoration or retention of the original ceiling and cobblestone flooring that remains in the entryway from the lobby to the restaurant area. Discussion followed regarding the impact the main water service lines and duct work will have on the entryway area. In response to a question, Kennedy indicated that the second floor is concrete requiring all mechanical improvements to be installed under the first floor concrete beams. Discussion followed regarding the tenant design requirements and flooring materials for the restaurant area. Dennis recommended that if the entryway ceiling area cannot be left open that it be left undisturbed to allow future restoration if desired.

Krull questioned the historic quality of the proposed travertine tile flooring and suggested utilization of a terrazzo tile flooring for a more historic feel. Discussion followed regarding the flooring materials.

In response to a question from Wagner, Dunkelberger addressed the changes that are proposed for the awning signage.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Elkins suggested that the entryway finish be continued to the next meeting and that the balance of the project be approved at this time.

**Wagner moved to amend the main motion to recommend a finding that the renovation of the former Landmark Restaurant area on the property located at 523 6<sup>th</sup> Street will have no adverse effect on historic property with the exception to continue the finish of the lobby entrance area to the January 15, 2010 meeting to allow additional review and discussion.** There being no second to the motion, the motion failed.

**Kessloff withdrew the main motion to recommend a finding that the renovation of the former Landmark Restaurant area on the property located at 523 6<sup>th</sup> Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. Baumgartner concurred.**

Discussion followed regarding methods to protect and retain the historic fabric of the entryway. Dunkelberger indicated that the new travertine tile flooring will match the original tile. Discussion continued.

**Matson moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the renovation of the former Landmark Restaurant area including the exterior fireplace exhaust fan on the property located at 523 6<sup>th</sup> Street will have no adverse effect on historic property with the exception of the lobby entrance area which is continued to the January 15, 2010 meeting to allow the applicant to present options to preserve or protect the historic ceiling and tile in the entrance area.**

#### Approve Minutes

**Kessloff moved, Baumgartner seconded and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the December 18, 2009 meeting.**

#### Treasurer's Report

Mitchell presented the Treasurer's Report.

#### Slide Show Presentation

Wagner indicated that the State Historic Preservation Office slide show presentation would be beneficial as an orientation session for the new members.

Elkins suggested that staff work with the Commission regarding orientation topics and would provide the Commission with a proposed training schedule.

#### Individual Nomination Project

Roseland indicated that the recommendation is to nominate the alfalfa palace at the fairgrounds. Roseland indicated that the Pennington County Fairgrounds will be contacted regarding the nomination project.

#### Electronic Agenda Packets

In response to a request from Mitchell, the Commission agreed to eliminate the hard copy agenda packet to the Commission members with the exception of Baumgartner.

#### Timesheets

Roseland reminded the Commission members to turn their completed timesheets into staff monthly. Elkins addressed the items to be tracked on the monthly timesheets noting that the volunteer hours provided by the Commission are required for grant match purposes.

#### Web Site

In response to a question from Kessloff, Elkins indicated that the Growth Management pages have been updated to include a separate tab to the Historic Preservation home page. Kessloff requested that the links to the new Comprehensive Plan and the Secretary of Interior Standards be provided on the Historic Preservation home page.

Pier suggested that, given its tie to tourism, a direct link be provided from the City home page to the Historic Preservation home page. Discussion followed regarding the demands for links on the City home page, the Home Page use policy, update of the search results and providing links from other sources.

#### Election of Officers

Hanks briefly explained the nomination process.

**Matson moved, Grable seconded and carried unanimously to nominate Roseland for Chairperson. Kessloff moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to nominate Sogge for Vice Chairperson. Baumgartner moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to nominate Kessloff for Secretary.**

Hanks extended his thanks to the new members for volunteering to serve on the Historic Preservation Commission.

#### Adjourn

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:42 a.m.

MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
January 15, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Pat Roseland, Jean Kessloff, Richard Grable, Shawn Krull, Cynthia Matson, Duane Baumgartner

OTHERS PRESENT: Steve Colgan, Brad Mohler, Kent Kennedy, Michelle Dennis, David Viall, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

Call To Order

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:32 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Agenda

Bulman requested that the 2010 Home Show be added under New Business. Kessloff requested that Historic Preservation Month be added under New Business. **Baumgartner moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to approve the meeting agenda as amended.**

519 6<sup>th</sup> Street (09CM003)

Colgan presented the request to remove the dressing rooms to accommodate the new tenant use as a bicycle shop.

**Baumgartner moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the removal of the two existing dressing rooms on the property located at 519 6<sup>th</sup> Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

1011 Mt Rushmore Road (10CM004)

Mohler presented the request to remodel the exterior façade of the structure located at 1011 Mt Rushmore Road by removing the two south windows and the north single door and installing a double door at the main entrance. Mohler presented examples of various finish textures being considered for the drivit siding.

In response to a question from Krull, Mohler stated that the adjacent property to the west is the old hospital building. Krull recommended that the brick color of the adjacent property be considered when selecting the final color choice for the 1011 Mt Rushmore Road structure.

**Kessloff moved, Grable seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that filling and sealing of the two south windows and north door, adding double doors to the main entrance, replacing the existing windows with new, and residing and painting to match on the property located at 1011 Mt Rushmore Road will have no adverse effect on historic property, with the recommendation that the brick color of the adjacent west building be taken into consideration when selecting the final building color.**

523 6<sup>th</sup> Street (10CM002)

Kennedy indicated that the request is to install a drop ceiling in the entryway to conceal the exposed piping and to install travertine tile over the existing flooring using thin set. Kennedy indicated that there would be no additional openings placed in the ceiling area noting that the original ceiling and flooring materials would not be removed.

Kennedy briefly commented on the lobby side non-building permit alterations to remove or use sheetrock to cover over the brick surrounding the restaurant entrance doors and install a beam appliqué above the door. Kennedy indicated that these alterations would give the lobby décor a more cohesive appearance.

Krull complemented Kennedy noting that the proposal permits the future restoration of the historic materials should it be warranted. In response to a question from Kessloff, Kennedy indicated that the installation of the travertine tile will not further damage the original flooring. In response to a question from Kessloff, Kennedy stated that there would be no additional openings placed in the entryway ceiling.

**Krull moved, Baumgartner seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the installation of a drop ceiling in the entryway to conceal the existing exposed pipes and openings and the use of thin set to install travertine tile over the entryway flooring with the understanding that no further openings will be made to the ceiling area and the original flooring will remain under the new travertine to allow for future restoration of both historic elements on the property located at 523 6<sup>th</sup> Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

#### Treasurer's Report

Bulman requested authorization to purchase two notebooks for the Historic Preservation Commissioner manuals. **Baumgartner moved, Grable seconded and carried unanimously to approve the purchase of two notebooks for the Historic Preservation Commissioner manuals in an approximate amount of \$14.00.**

#### 2010 Home Show

Bulman reviewed the dates and times for the 2010 Home Show noting that the Commission members are responsible for continuously manning the booth during the show hours. Discussion followed regarding the various materials displayed in the booth. Krull volunteered to assist with the booth design and display materials. Kessloff commented on the items from the Court House renovation that were displayed during the 2009 Home Show.

#### Historic Preservation Month

Kessloff briefly addressed the activities and projects that have been utilized to promote Preservation Month. In response to a request from Kessloff, Krull volunteered to assist with the Preservation Month projects.

#### Individual Nomination Project

Discussion followed regarding the eligibility status of the alfalfa palace and the red barn located on the Pennington County Fairgrounds property. Dennis indicated that she has contacted the State Historic Preservation Office regarding the eligibility status of the alfalfa palace.

#### Photo Documentation Project

Kessloff indicated that she is continuing to photograph properties as the weather allows. In response to a question from Krull, Roseland indicated that the intent of the project is to provide a photographic history of the West Boulevard structures.

Other Business

Kessloff invited the members to attend the State Historic Preservation Office presentation by Chris Nelson to the West Boulevard Homeowners Association on January 25, 2010 noting that the topic would be the preservation of historic property.

Roseland suggested that the Commission consider submitting an application for 2012 funding with the funding being utilize to restore the facades of downtown historic properties. Krull and Kessloff voiced support for the funding request and recommended that an application be submitted for the current program. Discussion followed regarding the project elements that should be included in the application. Bulman encouraged the Commission to identify the economic benefit of the project in the application request. Discussion followed regarding the March 15, 2010 deadline and the possibility of creating a revolving fund for preservation projects.

Kessloff presented the Power of Main Street video airing on YouTube. Discussion followed regarding downtown improvement projects. Krull recommended that the City be encouraged to leave the tree Christmas lights up year around as they enhance the open and vibrant look of the downtown area. Discussion followed regarding retaining the tree Christmas lights up year around.

Adjourn

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:25 a.m.



MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
February 5, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scott Sogge, Pat Roseland, Jean Kessloff, Richard Grable, Tamara Pier, Duane Baumgartner, Michael Bender, John Wagner, Aaron Costello, Council Liaison

OTHERS PRESENT: Tom Bradsky, Brooke Bradsky, Miranda Bradsky, Eric Zimmer, Eric Abrahamson, Fred Thurston, Mike Wood, Michelle Dennis, David Viall, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

Call To Order

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:33 a.m.

Approval of Agenda

**Baumgartner moved, Sogge seconded and carried unanimously to approve the agenda as presented.**

610 St. Joseph Street (10CM005)

M. Bradsky addressed the proposed interior remodel to accommodate the salon and day spa. M. Bradsky addressed the bathroom upgrades noting that the new door to the adjacent Alex Johnson Mercantile would provide a more convenient access for the hotel guests.

T. Bradsky indicated that the remaining interior would remain unchanged noting that the bathroom upgrade is a necessity and the interior connection will benefit patrons. In response to a question from Baumgartner, T. Bradsky indicated that there would be only minor repairs to the building façade. In response to a question from Kessloff, T. Bradsky indicated that the carpeting has been removed and the hardwood floors restored.

**Baumgartner moved, Sogge seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the interior remodel, new electrical and plumbing, and new door to the mercantile on the property located at 610 St. Joseph Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

818 St. Joseph Street (10CM006)

Wood presented the request to return the west side of the building to its original design by removing the 12 windows and installing painted block to match the existing color.

**Pier moved, Bender seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the removal of the 12 windows on the west side of the building with the openings returned to block and painted to match the existing color on the property located at 818 St Joseph Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

McGullycuddy House Presentation

Abrahamson indicated that his Introduction to Public History class has adopted the McGullycuddy house as a class project. Zimmer addressed the class research into McGillycuddy and the history and use of the residence. Zimmer indicated that the class is working with a local architect to determine the original construction materials and develop plans for reconstruction of the structure. Zimmer indicated that a community forum will be held on March 21, 2010 to discuss the possible reconstruction and use of the McGillycuddy structure.

In response to a question from Pier, Abrahamson and Kessloff addressed the availability of historic interior photographs of the structure. In response to a question from Bender, Zimmer indicated that Fred Thurston has volunteered his assistance with the project. Zimmer indicated that the structure will be open to the general public two hours prior to the start of the March 21 forum noting that interested individuals were invited to tour the property at that time.

Abrahamson and Zimmer left the meeting at this time.

#### Approve Minutes

**Wagner moved, Baumgartner seconded and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the January 5, 2010 meeting. Wagner moved, Sogge seconded and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the January 15, 2010 meeting.**

#### Treasurer's Report

**Bender moved, Baumgartner seconded and carried unanimously to approve payment of the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions annual dues in the amount of \$130.00.**

#### Training Sessions

Roseland presented the proposed training session topics and possible meeting dates. In response to a question, Bulman recommended that all Commissioners attend the training sessions noting that the purpose is to provide the membership with an overview of the Commission's purpose, work and goals. Discussion followed.

The Commission selected the following training dates: Monday, February 15, 2010-Training Session #1, Tuesday, March 2, 2010-Training Session #2 and Wednesday, March 3, 2010-Training Session #3. Roseland indicated that the training sessions would be scheduled from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. each evening noting that staff would schedule the rooms and advise the Commission accordingly.

Thurston entered the meeting at this time.

#### Individual Nomination Project

Dennis indicated that photographs have been provided to the State Office of History for their evaluation regarding the eligibility of the Alfalfa Palace and the barn for individual nomination. Discussion followed regarding the history of the fairground structures.

In response to a question from Dennis, Bulman addressed the time required to process the Request for Proposal and final Consultant Contract noting that the City Council must approve the contract prior to any work beginning on the project. Dennis indicated that depending on the structure selected the nomination process can take from six months to one year to complete.

Roseland suggested scheduling a special meeting to finalize the nomination project once the State Office of History has ruled on the fairground structures. Dennis recommended that staff prepare the Request for Proposal with the structure identified as "to be determined" to allow the project to move forward. Bulman stated that staff recommends that the structure be identified and the property owner agrees to the nomination prior to preparation of the Request for Proposal.

Discussion followed regarding alternate structures that could be nominated should the State disallow the Pennington County Fairground structures.

In response to a question from Costello, Bulman indicated that the Commission applies for grant funding on an annual basis noting that the grant period extends from June 1 to May. Bulman indicated that the amount of the grant award is subject to the proposed projects noting that unexpended funds are returned to the State Office of History at the end of each grant period. Bulman indicated that future funding allocations are based on the ability of the Certified Local Government to complete its proposed projects during the grant period.

The Commission scheduled a special meeting for Friday, February 12, 2010 at 7:30 a.m. to finalize the structure selection for the individual nomination project.

#### Other Business

Costello complimented the Commission for moving to the electronic agenda and asked for comments regarding the process. Discussion followed regarding the advantages and disadvantages of the electronic agenda process. Costello voiced his appreciation for the Commission's utilization of the electronic agenda process noting the City's "green" efforts to reduce the amount of paper it utilizes.

#### Dakota Middle School

Baumgartner provided a brief update regarding the ongoing discussions for the use of the Dakota Middle School structure.

#### Salvaging of Historical Materials

Roseland recommended that any materials salvaged by the Commission be donated to the Habitat Warehouse noting that they have expressed an interest in the materials for utilization in their rehabilitation projects.

#### Windsor Block Award

Viall addressed the award to be presented to the Windsor Block on February 27, 2010 to recognizing the new windows utilized in the restoration project. Kessloff indicated that the new windows were approved by Washington D.C. and suggested that the Commission take this opportunity to educate the public that new windows are available that are historically acceptable.

#### McGullycuddy House Presentation (cont)

Thurston addressed the challenges of the project and the importance to the community to preserve the structure. Thurston clarified that this is a historic reconstruction project noting the need to identify substantial funding to support the project. Thurston further commented on the need to identify an appropriate use for the structure to insure its continued historical contribution to the community.

Thurston briefly addressed the "green" benefits associated with the rehabilitation and restoration of existing structures.

Discussion followed regarding the advantages of historic preservation to the City and the revitalization of the City's downtown.

#### Adjourn

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:27 a.m.

MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING  
February 15, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scott Sogge, Pat Roseland, Jean Kessloff, Richard Grable, Tamara Pier, Shawn Krull, Cynthia Matson, Michael Bender

OTHERS PRESENT: Bill Kessloff, Bill Groves, Michelle Dennis, Joel Landeen, Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

Call To Order

Roseland called the meeting to order at 5:37 p.m.

Purpose of the Commission and What is a CLG

Bulman reviewed the creation, composition and responsibilities of the Commission as established under Chapter 2.68 of the Rapid City Municipal Code noting the specific charge to promote and conduct educational and interpretive programs on historic properties within the City.

Bulman addressed the establishment of Rapid City as a Certified Local Government, the process by which federal funds are allocated to the eighteen state Certified Local Governments and the types of projects that can be funded under the grant program.

B. Kessloff indicated that the State Historic Preservation Office monitors the projects of each Certified Local Government for compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards. In response to a question from B. Kessloff, Bulman indicated that the Commission's survey responsibilities are to identify and survey areas or individual properties that would be worthy of nomination noting there is no requirement to resurvey existing districts.

Discussion followed regarding the requirement of the Certified Local Government to provide educational programs to the general public.

MOU and the 11.1 Review Process

Landeen outlined his legal responsibilities to the Commission on behalf of the City of Rapid City. Landeen addressed the 11.1 Review process as defined under Chapter 1-19A of South Dakota Codified Law noting that the Commission is a recommending body only in the 11.1 Review process. Landeen indicated that the City has adopted the Chapter 1-19A laws noting that Chapter 1-19B has not been adopted.

Elkins clarified that the Memorandum of Understanding establishes the Commission as a recommending body only noting that the final decisions on 11.1 Review applications are issued by the State Historic Preservation Office. Elkins indicated that the purpose of the Commission is to provide the initial review and assist the property owner through the 11.1 Request process.

Elkins briefly addressed the discussion with the State Historic Preservation Office regarding revision of the current 11.1 Review application.

B. Kessloff indicated that the Commission has the obligation as a Certified Local Government to determine if a proposed project meets the Secretary of Interior Standards. Elkins recommended that the interpretation of the Secretary of Interior Standards be discussed with Chris Nelson

from the State Historic Preservation Office at the March 2, 2010 session. Discussion followed regarding the Standards broad interpretation to permit their application on a nationwide basis.

Discussion continued regarding the need to provide public education on the purpose and value of historic preservation.

In response to a question from Bender, Landeen indicated that, prior to the issuance of a building permit, specific types of work on properties located within historic districts or individually listed properties must be addressed under the 11.1 Review process. In response to a question from Bender, Landeen reviewed the types of residential and commercial work that requires or is exempt from the 11.1 Review process. Landeen clarified that the State Historic Preservation Office has final review authority and can overturn a recommendation of the Commission.

In response to a question from Grable, Elkins addressed the criteria utilized to establish the contributing or non-contributing status of the properties in the West Boulevard and Downtown Historic Districts. Elkins indicated that the District boundaries, contributing or non-contributing status and façade covenants are identified on the City's RapidMap system. Dennis indicated that a structure's degree of integrity also impacts the classification.

Discussion followed regarding the possible dissolution of a district due to the loss of contributing structures as determined by a resurvey or individual request for reclassification. B. Kessloff briefly addressed the contributing/non-contributing percentage of the West Boulevard District structures noting that the intent of the proposed ordinance is to stop the deterioration.

Discussion followed regarding the contributing/non-contributing percentage of the Downtown District and the property owner's request to amend their status to non-contributing. Dennis addressed the National and State registers noting that it is difficult to dissolve an established district. Discussion followed regarding resurveying districts and expanding the period of significance.

Elkins indicated that under Section 1-19B-32 the City Council established a study committee to determine the interest, desire and need for a local ordinance. Elkins addressed the study committee membership, the process required to adopt a local ordinance and the items that would require review should a local ordinance be adopted.

Elkins indicated that the study committee is evaluating Section 1-19B-62 noting that adoption of this section of the law provides for more restricted review requirements. Elkins indicated that the committee anticipates presenting their interim report by April 2010. Discussion followed regarding the review requirements of Sections 1-19B and 1-19B-62.

B. Kessloff indicated that Landeen, Wagner and the State Historic Preservation Office are currently reviewing Section 1-19B-62 to determine if it would provide the flexibility to meet the needs of the local districts and allow the Commission to be consistent in their decision making.

Elkins stressed the need to establish public support for any proposed regulations through the use of public education prior to presenting an ordinance to the City Council.

Discussion followed regarding the interpretation of the Secretary of Interior Standards with regard to the West Boulevard Historic District. Roseland stated that the support of the district

property owners is critical to securing approval of any ordinance. Discussion followed regarding the public's perception of the Commission, the use of restrictive covenants by new subdivisions and the efforts by Greg Wick of Pennington Title Company to amend the Seller Disclosure document to require disclosure of a property's historic district status.

In response to a question from Krull, Landeen addressed the instances in which a member should abstain from voting on an 11.1 Review request due to a conflict of interest. Discussion followed regarding the conflict members can feel when requested to provide public assistance on projects that are in their employment field. Discussion continued regarding working with applicants and abstaining from voting when there is a conflict of interest. Bender recommended that each member determine to what extent they want to volunteer their specialized services to applicants.

Kessloff indicated that the ability of the City Council to bypass the recommendations contribute to the public's adverse perception of the Commission. Discussion followed regarding methods for building the community's confidence in the Commission. Grable recommended that there be improved communication between staff and the general public regarding all the requirements for historic property projects. Bender recommended that the education process clarify the impact of the 11.1 Review process and the timeframes for approval of projects should the local review process be eliminated.

#### Bylaws and Procedures/City Funding and State Grants

Elkins provided a brief review of the duties and responsibilities addressed in the Historic Preservation Commission's Bylaws.

Elkins advised that the Mayor has requested revisions to the Bylaws noting that the proposed revisions would be provided to the Commission for their review. Bender stressed that the purpose of historic preservation is the preservation of the community not an individual building or district noting that preservation must consider the affect on the Community's history as a whole. Elkins requested that the members review the bylaws and contact her regarding any additional issues they feel should be addressed when staff brings the draft forward.

Elkins addressed the City budgeting process noting the timeframe from submission to approval. Elkins commented on the direction from City Council regarding the amount of staff support to be provided to the Commission.

Bulman provided a review of the current Award of Allocation and the required in-kind match. Bulman addressed the funding categories noting that the products of the grant include the individual nomination and preservation ordinance. Bulman reviewed the remaining line item balances of the grant allocation.

Bulman stressed the need to initiate work on grant projects at the time funding is awarded to insure products are completed within the grant's one year timeframe. Bulman reviewed the timeframe required to final a project, process the invoice for City Council approval and submit the final project to the State Historic Preservation office for reimbursement. In response to a question, Bulman indicated that the grant applications require City Council approval.

J. Kessloff commented on the educational programs produced in conjunction with Preservation Month and the Home Show. In response to a question from Krull, Elkins recommended working

with staff to review funding possibilities for the creation of an educational magazine. Discussion followed regarding the process required to revise the grant products and amend the grant accordingly.

Elkins encouraged the members to bring recommendations for the FY 2010-2011 grant application as well as the Commission's priorities to Session Three for discussion.

#### Questions/Discussion

Elkins indicated that members of the West Boulevard Homeowners Association have expressed an interest in attending the Secretary of the Interior's Standards Slide Show on March 2, 2010 and recommended that the slide show presentation be available to the public. Discussion followed regarding the agenda and location for the March 2, 2010 meeting.

Elkins indicated that staff will provide some options for the slide show presentation at the Friday, February 19, 2010 Commission meeting.

#### Adjourn

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:12 p.m.

MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
February 19, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Pat Roseland, Jean Kessloff, Tamara Pier, Shawn Krull, Duane Baumgartner, John Wagner

OTHERS PRESENT: Bob Evans, Robert Martin, Randy Foss, Kristen Allgauer, Steve Achtien, David Lang, Cecilia Lang, Eileen Burkholder, David Viall, Bill Kessloff, Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

Call To Order

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:36 a.m.

710 Kansas City Street (10CM007)

Evans presented the request to replace the thirteen windows for energy efficiency purposes. Foss indicated that the existing steel casement windows would be replaced with double pane fiberglass noting that the mullion dividers are located between the glass panes. Foss indicated that the interior granite sills would not be disturbed.

**Baumgartner moved to recommend a finding that the replacement of thirteen windows in various locations with the new windows replicating the existing windows on the property located at 710 Kansas City Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. Pier seconded the motion.**

In response to a question from J. Kessloff, Foss indicated that a wood window style is required to achieve true divided lights noting the financial impact of the upgrade. J. Kessloff expressed concern with the loss of visual integrity resulting from the dividers placed between the glass panes. Discussion followed regarding the visual integrity of the divided light windows and the financial expense required to upgrade the window style.

Evans addressed the minimal impact the proposed window design will have on the visual integrity of the street view noting that the new windows will improve maintenance and energy efficiency issues. Evans stressed that the Church is a non-profit organization and must consider the financial expense.

Elkins stated that the structure is located in the environs of the Downtown Historic District noting that the focus of the 11.1 Review is the effect of the proposed changes on the surrounding historic district.

In response to a question from Krull, Foss indicated that the technology for external mullions is currently not available. In response to a question from Wagner, Viall commented on the available window designs and suggested approving the installation of one window to assist the Commission in determining the visual impact of the proposed window design.

Evans stated that the structure is in the environs noting that all the windows, with the exception of the stain glass windows, will be replaced. Evans stated that the proposed design will not be a radical change to the structure's physical appearance. Martin identified the adjacent business uses. Discussion followed regarding the visual impact and financial expense of the window project. Evans addressed the extensive research completed by the Trustee Board.

In response to a question, Viall indicated that external extrusions are not available at this time.



Discussion followed regarding the impact the window project will have on the character of the building and the neighborhood. Krull suggested that when the technology is available that the Church consider adding the external extrusions.

J. Kessloff complemented the Church for their efforts to upgrade and maintain the building noting her support for adding the external extrusions when they are available. In response to a question from J. Kessloff, Evans indicated that the financial expense would be a determining factor to the addition of external extrusions.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the replacement of thirteen windows in various locations with the new windows replicating the existing windows on the property located at 710 Kansas City Street will have no adverse effect on historic property carried unanimously.**

804 St. Joseph Street (10CM008)

Allgauer presented the request to repair the interior water damage to the walls and ceiling and to remove a wall between the interior spaces. Achtien indicated that the wall being removed is a non-load bearing partition which would allow 804 and 806 St. Joseph Street to be combined.

**Wagner moved to recommend a finding that the repair of the water damage to the walls and ceiling and removal of the wall partition between 804 and 806 St. Joseph Street on the property located at 804 St. Joseph Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. Krull seconded the motion.**

In response to a question from J. Kessloff, Achtien indicated that the partition wall is early 1970's vintage and contains no historic elements. In response to a question, Achtien identified the location of the partition wall to be removed.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the repair of the water damage to the walls and ceiling and removal of the wall partition between 804 and 806 St. Joseph Street on the property located at 804 St. Joseph Street will have no adverse effect on historic property carried unanimously.**

913 West Boulevard (10RS001)

D. Lang presented the request for exterior alterations to the property to facilitate the interior remodel of the kitchen and sunroom. D. Lang addressed the extent of the interior remodel noting that period materials, tiles and woods would be utilized. D. Lang addressed the relocation of several windows, the roofline realignment and the addition of a deck on the 1970's addition of the home.

D. Lang addressed the south elevation alterations noting that the deck materials will match the wood work on the rest of the home. D. Lang addressed the relocation of the existing two south elevation windows to better accommodate the interior kitchen design. D. Lang indicated that the home was remodeled into a duplex in the 1970's resulting in the current west elevations. D. Lang indicated that the proposed alterations would realign the roofline and replace the dormer window with a double hung window to match the rest of the home. D. Lang identified the northwest elevation windows that would be removed and replaced with more period style windows.

**Krull moved to recommend a finding that the relocation and replacement of five window openings related to the kitchen and laundry room areas, the back entry remodel, the**

**addition of a door and deck to the south elevation and roofline alterations on the property located at 913 West Boulevard will have no adverse effect on historic property. Baumgartner seconded the motion.**

D. Lang addressed the efforts being taken to restore the property as historically and aesthetically correct as possible. In response to a question from Krull, D. Lang indicated that the south and west elevation windows will be new Pella wood exterior historical windows.

Discussion followed regarding the alterations to the roofline. In response to a question from Wagner, D. Lang indicated that the original slope of the roof will not be altered.

Wagner expressed his concern with the visual impact of the side yard deck. Extensive discussion followed regarding alternative designs to the proposed deck.

Wagner indicated that moving the two south elevation windows together will alter the visual appearance of the property. J. Kessloff indicated that the paired window design is not standard for the architectural design of the home. J. Kessloff acknowledged the impact the interior design has on the exterior façade stressing the need to maintain the illusion of a historic façade.

J. Kessloff suggested moving the deck to the west elevation or replacing the deck with a stair/patio combination.

In response to a question from Krull, D. Lang indicated that they had not purchased any materials for the project. Discussion followed regarding the design of the south elevation, the decking materials and the obtrusive design of the second story deck on the adjacent property.

Elkins called attention to the Secretary of the Interior Standards with regard to the proposed alterations to the 1970 vintage addition. Elkins stressed that the Standards specify that additions complement, not replicate, the structure, that there be a distinction between the addition and the original structure and that the addition be removable. Elkins indicated that the applicant has done an excellent job of meeting the Secretary of the Interior Standards and encouraged approval of the request.

C. Lang addressed the alternative deck designs considered noting that a west elevation deck is not possible due to interior obstructions and that the patio/stair proposal is obtrusive and less functional. C. Lang addressed the efforts to balance function and aesthetics. C. Lang addressed the removal of landscaping and fencing that had previously blocked the view of the south elevation and indicated that fencing or landscaping could be installed if that was necessary to screen the deck from view from West Boulevard. Discussion followed regarding the application of the Secretary of the Interior Standards to the 913 West Boulevard request.

**Wagner moved to amend the motion to address the alterations to the historic structure and alterations to the 1970 addition in separate motions. J. Kessloff seconded the motion.**

D. Lang indicated that the roof line alteration is critical to the entire process and requested that the Commission act on this request individually.

**The motion to address the alterations to the historic structure and the alterations to the 1970 vintage addition in separate motions failed with J. Kessloff and Wagner voting Yes and Roseland, Pier, Krull and Baumgartner voting No. (Vote 2 to 4)**

**The motion to recommend a finding that the relocation and replacement of five window openings related to the kitchen and laundry room areas, the back entry remodel, the addition of a door and deck to the south elevation and roofline alterations on the property located at 913 West Boulevard will have no adverse effect on historic property carried with Roseland, Pier, Krull and Baumgartner voting Yes and J. Kessloff and Wagner voting No. (Vote 4 to 2)**

Approval of Agenda

The following items were added to the agenda

- McGillicuddy House Letter of Appreciation
- Training Session Update

**Baumgartner moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to approve the Agenda as amended.**

Approval of Minutes

**Baumgartner moved, Pier seconded and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the February 5, 2010 meeting.**

Treasurer's Report

Bulman reviewed the report noting that there have been no changes.

McGillicuddy House Letter of Appreciation

**Wagner moved, J. Kessloff seconded and carried unanimously to request that staff prepare a Letter of Appreciation to Abrahamson and his class for their work on the McGillicuddy House restoration.**

Training Session Update

Elkins provided a draft agenda for the March 2, 2010 Training Session noting that the Commission should meet with Dennis and Nelson prior to the 7:00 p.m. slide show presentation. Elkins recommended that the slide show be open to the general public noting that the notification mailing would include the owners of all of the historic properties and environs and a press release would be provided to all of the news media. In response to a question, Bulman addressed the funding available for the mailings.

**Krull moved, Pier seconded and carried unanimously to approve the expenditures for the March 2, 2010 slide show presentation mailings.**

Individual Nomination Project

Bulman indicated that the State Historic Preservation Office has advised Dennis that the Fairground barn would be eligible for nomination but that the Alfalfa Palace may not be eligible for nomination.

Bulman recommended transferring the National Register funding to the workshop line item to allow an educational speaker to be brought in for the May Preservation Month activities. Discussion followed regarding reallocation of the National Register funding and the request of funding for a National Register nomination project in the 2010-2011 grant application.

Bulman indicated that moving the National Register nomination project to the new grant application would provide the Commission with sufficient time to identify an appropriate property, secure the property owner's approval and present the request to the City Council for consideration.

**Krull moved, Pier seconded and carried unanimously to authorize staff to proceed with the reallocation of the National Register grant funding to the Workshop line item for the 2009-2010 Certified Local Government Grant and to request funding for a National Register nomination project in the 2010-2011 grant application.**

Dakota Middle School National Register Nomination

Elkins presented the Dakota Middle School official notification from the State Historic Preservation Office. Elkins reviewed the Report for Properties Nominated to the National Register noting that the Commission and the Chief Elected Official must complete and submit the report to the State Historic Preservation Office. Elkins suggested that the Commission schedule time during March to allow the property owner and the general public to comment on the nomination.

In response to a question from Roseland, Elkins indicated that she has not received any information on the Dakota Middle School Architecture Committee liaison appointments.

B. Kessloff addressed the numerous letters received in support of the nomination. Elkins indicated that the Commission is required to complete their portion of the Nomination Report, forward the report to the Mayor for completion of his portion and then submit the completed report to the State. Elkins indicated that if the Commission feels there has been adequate public input they can complete their portion of the report and forward it to the Mayor.

In response to a question from B. Kessloff, Bulman addressed the discussions at the State level that resulted in the Nomination Report process noting that the report is a State issue not a local issue. Bulman encouraged the Commission to discuss the nomination with the School Board.

Roseland recommended that the Commission meet with the School Board. Pier supported the recommendation to meet with the School Board and recommended that it be a facilitated meeting to allow for a structured constructive meeting for both parties. In response to a question, Elkins clarified that the State approval places the structure on the State Register noting that the nomination is then forwarded to the National level for action to include on the National Register.

Roseland recommended that the meeting be scheduled within the next few weeks. Baumgartner indicated that architectural plans are scheduled to be presented in March. Wagner requested that the Nomination Report be placed on the March 5, 2010 agenda for further discussion. Pier recommended researching the nomination process of other states.

In response to a question from B. Kessloff, Roseland indicated that members J. Kessloff and Baumgartner were put forward for liaison appointment to the Dakota Middle School Architecture Committee noting that as of yet the appointments have not been formalized.

Other Business

In response to a question from J. Kessloff, Elkins suggested that the cataloging of Oral Histories be addressed in the identification of the Commission's priorities at the March 3, 2010 training session.

Adjourn

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:04 a.m.

MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING  
March 2, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scott Sogge, Pat Roseland, Jean Kessloff, Richard Grable, Tamara Pier, Shawn Krull, Cynthia Matson, Duane Baumgartner, Michael Bender, John Wagner, Aaron Costello, Council Liaison

OTHERS PRESENT: Bill Kessloff, Bill Groves, Michelle Dennis, Chris Nelson, Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

Call To Order

Roseland called the meeting to order at 5:37 p.m.

Review of Adopted Preservation Plan

Dennis addressed the Commission's work in reviewing and updating the Comprehensive Preservation Plan for Rapid City. Dennis provided a brief review of the components of the Preservation Plan and their application by the Commission. Dennis indicated that the intent of the Preservation Plan was to provide a flexible tool that would allow the Commission to use in achieving their preservation goals for Rapid City.

In response to a question from Dennis, Elkins indicated that the Comprehensive Preservation Plan has been adopted as a component of the City's Comprehensive Plan by both the Rapid City Planning Commission and Rapid City Council. Elkins briefly addressed the numerous documents that comprise the City's Comprehensive Plan.

In response to a question from J. Kessloff, Dennis clarified the historical context and architectural context information that is utilized to evaluate a potential resource. Dennis addressed the importance of "context" in surveying and evaluating properties for nomination to the State and National registers.

Questions for State Staff

Chris Nelson, Historic Preservation Specialist, briefly reviewed his education and experience with the State Historic Preservation Office. Nelson addressed his work with the Certified Local Government program, the National Register program and processing reviews under State and Federal law.

Nelson clarified that a Certified Local Government consists of the Commission and the Chief elected official of a community. Nelson indicated that the 11.1 Review process is implemented when there is a project that has the potential to impact historic property and briefly reviewed the steps of the 11.1 Review process from inception to conclusion. Nelson indicated that when there is a finding of adverse effect the applicant is required to address all feasible and prudent alternatives before the City can approve the project.

Nelson indicated that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards encompass reconstruction, restoration, preservation and rehabilitation. Nelson indicated that rehabilitation is most widely utilized as it allows for the alteration of a structure to provide for a more compatible and contemporary use of the property.

In response to a question from Roseland, Nelson indicated that a sensitive rehabilitation completed within the guidelines of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards would not remove a building from the Historic Register. Nelson urged the Commission to be aware of the cumulative impact of numerous alterations to a structure. Nelson indicated that the quantity of original material remaining is critical in the evaluation of a structure's architectural integrity.

In response to a question, Nelson indicated that environs projects are evaluated for their potential impact on the District. Nelson indicated that an environs project must be highly out of character, such as a parking ramp located within not adjacent to a residential area, to result in a finding of adverse impact.

In response to a question, Nelson encouraged the Commission to work with owners of non-listed properties to use alternative methods to protect the historical integrity of a structure. Nelson addressed the State and Federal tax incentive programs available to individuals performing restoration projects. In response to a question, Nelson indicated that most property listings are originated by the property owner as they value their property and support the historic designation.

In response to a question from Pier, Nelson indicated that other communities actively promote preservation through education by providing speakers, sponsoring workshops and providing training sessions to staff and Commission members. Discussion followed regarding interpretation of the 11.1 Review process state wide and the adoption of Preservation Ordinances by individual communities.

In response to a question from Elkins, Nelson addressed methods to make preservation a positive aspect in the community including clearly marking the boundaries of a historic district on street signs and providing interesting educational speakers. Discussion followed regarding Commission sponsorship of speakers and workshops, the development of the Main Street program in South Dakota, the utilization of history as a tourism attraction and the education of area realtors.

In response to a question from Bender, Nelson addressed in-kind replacement with regard to deteriorated materials, replacement on the primary or secondary façade and attention to character defining features.

In response to a question from Sogge, Nelson indicated that some changes, such as egress windows, are accepted to achieve a contemporary use of the property noting that such changes can also be done in a sensitive manner. Discussion followed regarding preservation standards for the new siding and roofing materials.

In response to a question from Elkins, Nelson indicated that providing District boundary markers is an eligible cost. Discussion followed regarding communities with a façade program and the financing and easement requirements of a façade program.

In response to a question from Krull, Nelson addressed the problems of rehabilitating a property that has suffered years of neglect and deferred maintenance. Nelson indicated that educating the public on the advantages and processes for rehabilitating historic properties is an important element in turning this process around. Nelson indicated that good new infill properties and acceptable rehabilitated properties are elements of vibrant historic districts. He noted the need for allowing some change to historic properties to achieve contemporary use of the buildings.

In response to a question from J. Kessloff, Nelson indicated that the impact of vinyl siding on a District's historic status would require individual evaluation of each property in the district.

Bender recommended that the Commission be educated on the use of alternative siding materials to allow the Commission to provide intelligent assistance to applicants. Discussion followed regarding the harm resulting from the installation of vinyl siding on a historic property.

Meeting Recess

Roseland recessed the meeting at 6:48 p.m. to allow members to move to the First Floor Community Room for the slide show presentation.

MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING  
March 2, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scott Sogge, Pat Roseland, Jean Kessloff, Richard Grable, Tamara Pier, Shawn Krull, Cynthia Matson, Duane Baumgartner, Michael Bender, John Wagner, Aaron Costello, Council Liaison

OTHERS PRESENT: Bill Kessloff, Michelle Dennis, Chris Nelson, Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

PUBLIC PRESENT: Jeanette Deurloo, Bill Groves, Lorie Melone, Jomay Steen, Gavin Williams, Crystal Williams, Steve Colgan, Kurt Whitesell, Gary Kruse, Carol Merwin, Frank Gengler

Meeting Reconvened

Roseland reconvened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. in the First Floor Community Room.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards Slide Show

Chris Nelson, Historic Preservation Specialist with the State Historic Preservation Office presented the Secretary of the Interior's Standards slide show for the rehabilitation of historic structures. Nelson discussed the key character traits and elements of historic properties that are considered when proposing a rehabilitation project. Upon completion of the slide show presentation Nelson answered questions from those in attendance regarding siding materials, the honorary and monetary value of historic properties and districts and the 11.1 Review process.

Adjourn

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.



MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING  
March 3, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scott Sogge, Pat Roseland, Jean Kessloff, Tamara Pier, Shawn Krull, Cynthia Matson, John Wagner, Aaron Costello, Council Liaison

OTHERS PRESENT: Bill Kessloff, Bill Groves, Michelle Dennis, Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

Call to Order

Roseland called the meeting to order at 5:34 p.m.

Discussion of Priorities and Work Program

The Commission compiled the following list of the projects and or activities that they would like to see addressed:

- Public Relations
- Education
- Local Ordinance
- Researching Funding Options for Commission and Land Owners
- Speakers Bureau
- Commission Education
- Development Cultural Tourism Connection
- Disclosure Statements
- Repair Info Signs – Downtown
- Historic District Street Signs
- Way Finding Signs
- Liaison With Chamber Other Organizations: Youth, School, Downtown, Convention and Visitors Bureau, Green Cities
- Supplier Material Education
- Contractor Listing Specializing in Historic Preservation
- Contractor Training (continuing education credits)
- Real Estate Classes
- Revolving Loan Fund
- Façade Easement Program
- Educational Outreach to Historic Property Owners
- Build Stronger Relationship with City Council
- Review Procedures for 11.1 Review at Each Meeting
- Pamphlets for 11.1 Applicants
- Staffing for Historic Preservation (funding)
- Commission Members Shadow Staff
- Host Certified Local Government Conference
- Stronger Relationship With State Historic Preservation Office Staff
- Update 11.1 Review Application Form
  - Model Application Example
  - Encourage Applicants To Preview Meetings
- Develop Design Guidelines
- Develop Downtown “Main Street” Economic Connection

- Motto
- Develop Media Contacts (generate stories)
- Develop Sustainability Connection
- Public Forums
- Library Resources (DVD's)
- Seek Someone To Establish Historic Resources/Materials
- Historic Salvage Business
- Contractor/Student Training
- Volunteer Assistance to Property Owners in Historic Districts
- Survey/National Register Nominations
- Develop Historic Preservation Magazine

The Commission then identified their top projects and activities by vote as follows:

1. Historic District Street Signs (3)
2. Public Relations (3)
3. Local Ordinance (2)
4. Supplier Material Education (1)
5. Disclosure Statements (1)
6. Develop Historic Preservation Magazine (1)
7. Real Estate Classes (1)
8. Pamphlets for 11.1 Applicants (1)
9. Staffing for Historic Preservation (funding) (1)
10. Update 11.1 Review Application Form (1)
  - a. Model Application Example
  - b. Encourage Applicants To Preview Meetings
11. Façade Easement Program (1)

Discussion followed regarding the value of the prioritized projects, the history of the local ordinance development and the need for educational and outreach programs to build public support for preservation activities prior to presenting an ordinance for adoption.

Dennis encouraged consistency in the Commission's review of applications noting that a negative public image results when there is inconsistency in the process. Dennis addressed the work and education required in the design review process and encouraged the Commission to utilize the Historic Preservation 11.1 Review Process Guide when evaluating 11.1 Review applications. Discussion followed regarding the need for staffing to provide the review and recommendation on 11.1 Review applications.

Elkins addressed the funding available to the Commission through the Certified Local Government grant noting that the Commission must provide an in-kind match for the grant amount awarded. In response to a question, Elkins indicated that some of the identified projects will need to be completed by members willing to volunteer their time. Discussion followed regarding the deadline for submitting the grant application for the 2010-2011 funding year.

Krull addressed the work in progress on the Preservation magazine, the Wayfinding signage and contractor contacts. Discussion followed regarding the various elements of the public relations projects.

Wagner voiced his support for the Historic District street signs noting that they will give the District an element of distinction. Elkins stated that Nelson had indicated that this would be an eligible cost and can be included in the grant application.

J. Kessloff provided a summary of educational materials provided to the general public over the last four years through the West Boulevard Homeowners Association newsletter and Preservation Month activities. J. Kessloff acknowledged that public relations are important noting the difficulty of getting the public to participate and care. Discussion followed regarding the importance of creating positive experiences between the Commission and the public, the Preservation Month work in progress, funding for the historic district street signs and the level of competition for space on the tourism directional signs.

**Pier moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to request that the Chairperson appoint a Public Relations Subcommittee to review the Public Relations project options and the cost of the Historic District Street Signage with the Subcommittee to provide a recommendation to the Commission at the March 19, 2010 meeting.**

Roseland appointed Krull, Pier, Matson and Bulman to the Public Relations Subcommittee.

Krull indicated that historic district signage was an element in the Business Improvement District proposal.

Adjourn

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 6:53 p.m.

MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
March 5, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scott Sogge, Pat Roseland, Jean Kessloff, Richard Grable, Tamara Pier, Shawn Krull, Cynthia Matson, Duane Baumgartner, John Wagner

OTHERS PRESENT: Jason Koppmann, Les Odegaard, Frank Morrison, John Morrison, Bill Kessloff, Michelle Dennis, Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

Call To Order

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:32 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Agenda

The following item was added to the agenda:

- Green Cities Interface

**Sogge moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to approve the agenda as amended.**

413 Sixth Street (10CM009)

Koppmann presented the request to replace the front façade windows noting that the new windows would reflect the original window design. Koppmann indicated that the in-fill wood is deteriorated and would be removed and replaced with steel framed, bronze tinted glass windows. Koppmann stated that the second floor windows will be sliders noting that the first floor windows will be stationary for security purposes.

In response to a question from Wagner, Koppmann indicated that they have owned the building for 77 years noting that the color of the steel frame will match the original wood color. Koppman indicated that the first floor windows will have the top dividers but will be stationary for security purposes noting that the goal is to restore the look of the original windows.

J. Kessloff expressed concern with the utilization of a metal frame noting that it would not present the same frame width as a wood frame. Koppmann indicated that a wood frame is not financially feasible noting the various downtown buildings that utilize steel framed windows. Discussion followed regarding the framing design of the new windows.

In response to a question from J. Kessloff, Koppmann indicated that the steel framing was selected for its durability noting that wood was not financially feasible. J. Kessloff presented information on the Deadwood grant and the Federal tax moratorium programs.

Discussion followed regarding the original window design as depicted in the Rapid City Historic Downtown Architecture book. Koppmann indicated that the design of the windows will replicate the window design depicted in the photograph. J. Kessloff encouraged Koppmann to inspect the Winsor Block windows and investigate the availability of Deadwood grant funding.

**Wagner moved to recommend a finding that the replacement of the front façade windows with a 2 over 2 design as reflected in the photograph in the Rapid City Historic Downtown Architecture on the property located at 413 Sixth Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. Matson seconded the motion.**

Elkins clarified that the motion as stated does not correspond with the window design materials presented with the application.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the replacement of the front façade windows with a 2 over 2 design as reflected in the photograph in the Rapid City Historic Downtown Architecture on the property located at 413 Sixth Street will have no adverse effect on historic property carried with Sogge, Roseland, Grable, Pier, Krull, Matson, Baumgartner, Wagner voting Yes and J. Kessloff voting No.**

In response to a question from Wagner, Koppmann indicated that the window air conditioners would be removed with the window replacement project noting that the air conditioning needs would be addressed at a future date. Koppmann stated that he would clarify the 2 over 2 window design with Hagen Glass and provide revised design drawings.

1011 St Joseph Street (10RS002)

Odegaard presented the request to demolish the shed structure located at the rear of the property. Odegaard addressed the dilapidated and damaged condition of the structure noting it lacked a proper foundation. Odegaard indicated that the City Building Inspector has determined the structure to have inadequate support. Odegaard stated he has been advised by an independent contractor that the structure is not repairable and would require reconstruction from the ground up.

In response to a question from Sogge, Odegaard indicated that there are no plans at this time to replace the structure.

In response to a question from Roseland, Baumgartner indicated that the demolition of a contributing structure requires a finding of adverse effect noting that the Commission can also find that the applicant has pursued all feasible and prudent alternatives to the demolition.

Wagner expressed concern with the loss of a contributing structure and encouraged the applicant to further research the rehabilitation of the structure. In response to a question from Krull, Odegaard identified his three rental properties. J. Kessloff indicated that the structure is an element of the historic streetscape.

Sogge indicated that the structure has met its life span noting that by design the structure was not intended to be permanent. Sogge stated that the removal of the structure will benefit the neighborhood. J. Kessloff indicated that this is an example of demolition by neglect.

**J. Kessloff moved to recommend a finding of adverse effect. Wagner seconded the motion.**

In response to a question from Roseland, Elkins clarified that the Commission must make a finding of adverse effect for a demolition request noting that the Commission can include comments or recommendations to their finding for the State review.

Roseland encouraged the applicant to provide the City inspection report and the independent contractor report regarding the potential to rehabilitate the structure.

**Baumgartner moved a substitute motion to recommend a finding that the demolition of the contributing shed structure located at 710 Kansas City Street will have an adverse**

**effect on historic property with the understanding that the applicant has explored all feasible and prudent alternatives to the demolition. Grable seconded the motion.**

Bulman recommended that the applicant submit the inspections and contractor reports to provide evidence to the State Historic Preservation Office of due diligence.

J. Kessloff stated that she could not support a feasible and prudent recommendation without having the reports presented for review. Discussion followed regarding the cost to demolish or rehabilitate the structure.

**The substitute motion to recommend a finding that the demolition of the contributing shed structure located at 710 Kansas City Street will have an adverse effect on historic property with the understanding that the applicant has explored all feasible and prudent alternatives to the demolition carried with Sogge, Roseland, Grable, Pier, Krull, Matson, Baumgartner voting Yes and J. Kessloff, Pier, Wagner voting No.**

Odegaard indicated that he would provide the inspector and contractor reports.

819 Main Street (10CM010)

F. Morrison presented the request to develop an outdoor garden dining area in the vacant lot adjacent to the west of the building. F. Morrison reviewed the design of the dining area noting that landscaping will be included to give it a more park like open air design.

In response to a question from Sogge, F. Morrison indicated that the area has been used for outdoor seating noting that the proposed design will provide a more aesthetic and enjoyable dining area. F. Morrison indicated that the asphalt will be removed and replaced with brick pavers. Discussion followed regarding the historical use of the property.

**Krull moved to recommend a finding that the construction of an outdoor garden dining area on the property located at 710 Kansas City Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. Sogge seconded the motion.**

In response to a question from Roseland, F. Morrison addressed the alterations to the single door entrance to provide a double door entrance noting the alterations required to the interior landing area.

**Krull moved to amend the main motion to recommend a finding that the construction of an outdoor garden dining area and the expansion of the single door entrance to a double door entrance from the building interior to the garden dining area with the interior landing constructed in compliance with City code on the property located at 710 Kansas City Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. Sogge seconded the amended motion.**

J. Kessloff voiced concern with the Commission voting on the double door request without the applicant having provided the required design materials. Elkins indicated that the property classification is environs, non-contributing.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the construction of an outdoor garden dining area and the expansion of the single door entrance to a double door entrance from the building interior to the garden dining area with the interior landing constructed in**

**compliance with City code on the property located at 710 Kansas City Street will have no adverse effect on historic property carried with Wagner abstaining.**

Approve Minutes

**Baumgartner moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the February 15, 2010 meeting.**

**Baumgartner moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the February 19, 2010 meeting.**

Treasurer's Report

Bulman briefly reviewed the current status of the 2009-2010 grant funds. Bulman addressed the proposed reallocation of the Nomination project funds to the Workshop project noting the available funding in the Downtown Sign maintenance fund.

Amendment of the 2009-2010 Award of Allocation

Elkins addressed the reallocation of the Nomination funding to the Workshop line item and recommended that the Commission consider reallocation of the Ordinance funding due to the lack of progress on the project.

In response to a question from Krull, Elkins indicated that the line item can be amended to Public Education to insure that the funding is available for promotional events as well as speakers and workshops. In response to a question from Matson, Bulman indicated that the Ordinance funding allocation is \$2,500. Matson recommended that these funds also be reallocated to the Public Education line item.

**Krull moved to reallocate the National Register project funding in the amount of \$4,000 and the Ordinance project funding in the amount of \$2,500 to the Public Education line item. Pier seconded the motion.**

In response to a request from Dennis, Baumgartner indicated that he would contact the Pennington County Fair Board and advise them that due to the lack of time the nomination project would not be addressed at this time.

**The motion to reallocate the National Register project funding in the amount of \$4,000 and the Ordinance project funding in the amount of \$2,500 to the Public Education line item carried unanimously.**

Dakota Middle School Nomination Report

Elkins recommended that the Commission determine their process for accepting public input as provided for in the Nomination Report. Pier recommended placing a public notice advertisement requesting comments from the general public on the nomination action. Grable expressed concern that a public notice advertisement would not provide sufficient effort in securing the public comment required for this important nomination. Discussion followed regarding the advantages of the public notice advertisement and public meeting options.

J. Kessloff commented on the number of signatures she has already received in support of the nomination. Elkins suggested that public comment could be taken during the Home Show event.

**Krull moved to accept public comment on the Dakota Middle School nomination using a public notice advertisement and providing comment forms at the Home Show event. Grable seconded the motion.**

Baumgartner requested that the public notice advertisement clarify that the Dakota Middle School was originally known as the Rapid City High School.

**The motion to accept public comment on the Rapid City High School (Dakota Middle School) nomination using a public notice advertisement and providing comment forms at the Home Show event carried unanimously.**

#### Census Speaker presentation schedule

Bulman presented the request by Pat Wright to speak to the Commission regarding the link between the census and genealogy noting that Wright would be available for the March 19, 2010 or April 6, 2010 meetings. J. Kessloff addressed the historical information available through the census records.

**Matson moved, J. Kessloff seconded and carried unanimously to place the Census-Genealogy presentation by Wright on the April 6, 2010 agenda.**

#### Historic Preservation Commission Bylaws

Elkins presented the proposed amendments to the bylaws noting that action will be taken at the meeting following presentation of the proposed amendments.

Discussion followed regarding the proposed amendments to the Commission process for handling nominations and the nomination process as outlined by the South Dakota Certified Local Governments Procedures document.

**Pier moved to have formal introduction of the Bylaw Amendments presented at the March 19, 2010 meeting with the formal action on the Bylaw Amendments taken at the April 6, 2010 meeting. Krull seconded the motion.**

Wagner encouraged the members to review the Commission requirements outlined in the South Dakota Certified Local Governments Procedures before taking formal action on the bylaw amendments.

**The motion to have formal introduction of the Bylaw Amendments presented at the March 19, 2010 meeting with the formal action on the Bylaw Amendments taken at the April 6, 2010 meeting carried unanimously.**

#### Green Cities Commission

Matson presented the Green Cities events scheduled for March 20, 2010 at the Dahl and the April 21, 2010 Earth Day event at Western Dakota VoTech and requested participation and involvement by the Commission.

**Krull moved to forward the Green Cities Commission request to the Public Relations Subcommittee meeting on Wednesday, March 10, 2010 for review with a recommendation to be presented at the March 19, 2010 meeting. Pier seconded the motion.**

Discussion followed regarding the Green Cities programs.



**The motion to forward the Green Cities Commission request to the Public Relations Subcommittee meeting on Wednesday, March 10, 2010 for review with a recommendation to be presented at the March 19, 2010 meeting carried unanimously.**

Acknowledge Abrahamson Letter of Appreciation.

Wagner complemented staff on the content of the letter of appreciation. **Wagner moved, Pier seconded and carried unanimously to authorize the Chairperson to sign the Abrahamson Letter of Appreciation.**

Education Speaker Presentation

Bulman presented the Bob Yapp information regarding the topics, costs and scheduling for review and consideration. Elkins indicated that Costello strongly encouraged the Commission to schedule the presentation for a Saturday. Discussion followed regarding the scheduling of the educational event.

**Krull moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to forward the Educational Speaker Presentation request to the Public Relations Subcommittee meeting on Wednesday, March 10, 2010 for review with a recommendation to be presented at the March 19, 2010 meeting.**

Adjourn

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:02 a.m.

MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
March 19, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scott Sogge, Pat Roseland, Jean Kessloff, Richard Grable, Tamara Pier, Shawn Krull, Cynthia Matson, Duane Baumgartner, John Wagner

OTHERS PRESENT: Holly Ringo, Barb Klinkel, Kevin Jensen, Mike Wolff, John Wolff, Lyle Henriksen, Alan Hanks, Jason Green, Michelle Dennis, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

Call To Order

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:31 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Agenda

The following items were added to the agenda:

- Move Formal Introduction of the Historic Preservation Commission Bylaws Amendments to first on the agenda
- Add Home Show Expenditures under Treasurer's Report
- Add Handout of Draft 2009 Annual Report under New Business

**Sogge moved, Wagner seconded and carried unanimously to approve the Meeting Agenda as amended.**

Formal Introduction of the Historic Preservation Commission Bylaws Amendments

Hanks indicated that the amendment to Article I is proposed to insure that the concurrence of the property owner or the City Council is received prior to moving forward with a nomination proposal. Hanks indicated that the amendments to Article II are proposed to insure their consistency with existing State Law. Hanks clarified that no City committee has the authority to appoint ex-officio members noting that the Commission can create and appoint outside individuals to serve on subcommittees.

Green indicated that Article II of the Bylaws is contained in South Dakota Codified Law and the proposed amendments will insure that they are consistent, not conflicting, with that law. In response to a question from Pier, Green addressed the manner in which State Law addresses committee appointments. In response to a question from Wagner, Green indicated that he would provide copies of the specific sections of State Law addressing the committee appointments.

816 South Street (10CM011)

Ringo presented the request to install house type awnings on the second floor of the property noting they will lessen with the impact of the southern sun exposure on the interior of the property.

In response to a question from Krull, Ringo indicated that the structure was constructed in the 1920's noting that the awning colors were selected to complement the existing business signage. Discussion followed regarding the color selection for repainting the building.

**Wagner moved, Sogge seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the installation of two new second floor house awnings on the property located at 816 South Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

530 Sixth Street (10CM012)

Klinkel presented the request to install plumbing to the basement area to allow for a vegetable prep kitchen and a hand washing station and to extend the room divider walls to ceiling height. Mitchell clarified that the request to extend the divider walls to ceiling height was not included in the initial application.

**Matson moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the installation of plumbing to support the construction of a basement prep kitchen and basement hand washing station and the extension of the basement divider walls to ceiling height on the property located at 530 Sixth Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

Wagner advised the applicant of the State Historic Preservation Office approval timeframe.

1720 West Boulevard (10RS003)

Jensen presented the request to repair and stabilize the foundation on the northeast wall of the structure. Jensen indicated that the foundation failure is a result of improper diversion of water away from the structure. In response to a question from Wagner, Jensen indicated that the foundation will be raised approximately 1.5 inches. Jensen indicated that all work will be done in the back yard noting that the yard will be fully restored.

In response to a question, Jensen indicated that the home was constructed in 1953. Kessloff indicated that the structure is non-contributing as it did not meet the age requirement when the District was surveyed.

**Wagner moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the repair and stabilization of the foundation on the property located at 1720 West Boulevard will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

Bulman indicated that the applicant would be contacted upon receipt of the State Historic Preservation Office findings noting that the State has three working days to respond. Kessloff briefly addressed the advantage of and process to secure a "contributing" status for the structure.

1123 Kansas City Street (10CM013)

Henriksen presented the request to convert the property to a daycare facility noting that the existing drive through garage doors will be removed and infilled with CanExel siding, casement windows and one door. Henriksen indicated that the exterior appearance would not be altered with the exception of fencing that will be installed to comply with daycare requirements.

In response to a question from Wagner, Henriksen indicated that the front windows are not original, noting that the original windows are steel framed, casement style, single pane windows. Henriksen indicated that the glass block windows would be replaced with a casement style window.

In response to a question from Sogge, Henriksen indicated that CanExel siding will be used to infill the two garage door areas. Discussion followed regarding the design and color of the infill siding. In response to a question from Kessloff, Henriksen indicated that the mansard roof is not original to the structure.

Krull recommended that the siding color match the brick color as close as possible. Bulman indicated that the hearing application indicates that the siding color will be Yellowstone.

**Baumgartner moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the infill of the two garage doors with CanExel siding, casement windows and one door on the property located at 1123 Kansas City Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

Approval of Minutes

**Pier moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the March 2, 2010 meeting.**

**Krull moved, Pier seconded and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the March 3, 2010 meeting.**

**Krull moved, Wagner seconded and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the March 5, 2010 meeting.**

Treasurer's Report

Bulman provided a brief review of the projected expenditures and grant balance.

**Matson moved, Wagner seconded and carried unanimously to approve the United Rental expenditure of \$130.50 for the Home Show tables and chairs.**

Kessloff requested approval of a \$525 expenditure to enlarge and mount nine interior and exterior photographs of the McGillicuddy house. Kessloff indicated that the photographs would be on display at both the March 21, 2010 Public Forum and the Home Show booth. **Wagner moved, Pier seconded and carried unanimously to approve the expenditure of \$525 to enlarge and mount nine interior and exterior photographs of the McGillicuddy house for display at the March 21, 2010 Public Forum and the Home Show booth.**

Krull requested approval of a \$250 expenditure to enlarge a photograph of a downtown building to a four foot by six foot size for display in the Home Show booth. **Pier moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to approve the expenditure of \$250 to enlarge a photograph of a downtown building to a four foot by six foot size for display in the Home Show booth.**

Dakota Middle School Report for Properties Nominated to the National Register

Bulman requested that the Commission authorize the Chairperson to sign the Report for Properties Nominated to the National Register. Bulman indicated that the State Historic Preservation Office requires submission of the form by March 28, 2010 noting that does not provide sufficient time for the proposed public comment period.

**Wagner moved to authorize the Chairperson to sign the Report for Properties Nominated to the National Register. Baumgartner seconded the motion.**

In response to a question, Bulman indicated that the State Historic Preservation Office will not extend the submission deadline past the March 28, 2010 date. Discussion followed regarding the timeframe allowed the Commission to submit the Report.

In response to a question, Bulman indicated that the Rapid City Schools have been given formal notification of the nomination request by the State Historic Preservation Office. In response to a question from Grable, Bulman provided a brief history of the nomination process noting the concerns expressed by the Rapid City Schools regarding the impact the nomination could have on the pending remodel plans.

Discussion followed regarding the numerous letters that have been received and submitted to the State in support of the nomination request. In response to a question, Bulman indicated that the Report form was developed by the State Historic Preservation Office to insure compliance with the required nomination procedures.

Matson indicated her understanding of a property owner's concerns should a property be placed on the National Register without their prior knowledge or consent. Kessloff addressed the nomination requirements for public and private properties.

Dennis briefly addressed the Commission's efforts to work with the Rapid City Schools prior to the submission of the nomination application noting that the State has developed the Report form to insure that applications follow the Federal Law requirements. Discussion continued regarding the process for the nomination of public properties and the objections raised by the Rapid City Schools to the nomination request.

**The motion to authorize the Chairperson to sign the Report for Properties Nominated to the National Register carried with Sogge, Roseland, Kessloff, Pier, Krull, Baumgartner and Wagner voting Yes and Grable and Matson voting No.**

#### Formal Introduction of the Historic Preservation Commission Bylaws Amendments (cont)

Pier indicated that she would research the proposed amendments to the Bylaws for discussion at the April 6, 2010 meeting.

#### Education Subcommittee Report

Bulman reviewed the Bob Yapp speaker proposal for May 21-22, 2010 noting that the two days, six workshops proposal would cost \$5,000. Bulman indicated that Yapp will provide all the necessary publicity materials.

Bulman addressed the proposal to utilize \$1,500 for advertising in the new magazine being developed by Krull noting that Chris Nelson is researching the advertising guidelines to determine if this expenditure would be reimbursable. Bulman suggested advertising the workshops by utilizing a direct mailing to the Historic District and Individually Listed property owners, area contractors and area architects; place a display ad in the newspaper; and develop a Public Service Announcement. Bulman indicated that staff would create a flyer on the workshops that can be distributed at the Home Show booth. In response to a question from Pier, Bulman indicated that Nelson is aware that the advertisement would be more educational in nature noting that he was still concerned with and researching the allowable advertising threshold. In response to a question, Bulman indicated that the location of the Yapp workshops has not yet been determined.

Krull addressed the change in focus of the proposed magazine and encouraged the Commission to fund projects in partnership with other community groups.

**Matson moved to approve the Yapp Educational Speaker two days, six workshops proposal in the amount of \$5,000. Grable seconded the motion.**

Dennis suggested inviting other area Certified Local Governments to attend the Friday workshops.

**The motion to approve the Yapp Educational Speaker two days, six workshops proposal in the amount of \$5,000 carried unanimously.**

#### Green Cities Commission

**Krull moved, Kessloff seconded and carried unanimously to approve development of a poster to be utilized at the Green Cities Commission at the Dahl Fine Arts Center on Saturday, March 20, 2010 in an amount not to exceed \$100.**

The Commission requested that staff provide flyers for handout at the March 20, 2010 event regarding the Yapp Workshops and develop a web page focused on the Preservation Month activities.

#### 2010-2011 Certified Local Government Grant Application

Bulman presented the projects recommended by the Education Subcommittee for the 2010-2011 Certified Local Government grant application noting an estimated total cost of \$18,000. Krull encouraged the Commission to consider creating partnerships with other area organizations to help fund the various projects. Discussion followed regarding the one to one match requirement of the grant program and the importance of the Commissioners individual timesheets in meeting the match requirement.

Dennis suggested that the Commission investigate partnering with the Downtown Business Owners Association and the West Boulevard Homeowners Association on the Historic District Street Signage project.

Krull recommended that the 2010-2011 Certified Local Government Grant application be continued to the April 6, 2010 meeting to allow the Education Subcommittee to review the projects and estimated costs.

#### Email Contact Protocol

Mitchell indicated that contacting the entire Commission in one email constitutes a meeting quorum noting that email correspondence should be sent to no more than five members at a time. Mitchell indicated that Outlook distribution lists have been created and can be distributed to the members for their use.

#### Home Show Signup and Organization

Grable and Matson volunteered for the open times on Saturday and Sunday. Mitchell advised the members that wristbands can be picked up starting Thursday, March 25<sup>th</sup> at the Civic Center noting that the bands are not to be removed as they allow access to all three days of the show. Discussion followed regarding the materials that City staff would deliver to the booth.

Kessloff indicated that she is uncertain of the student work schedule and requested that the members assist them in answering questions from the public and not leave them unattended in the booth.

11.1 Review Update

Bulman indicated that the State Historic Preservation Office has concurred with the demolition action on the 1011 St. Joseph Street property noting that the request will be moved forward to the City Council for final approval.

Handout of Draft 2009 Annual Report

Mitchell presented the draft 2009 Annual Report noting that the Report will be placed on the April 6, 2010 agenda for discussion and final action. Mitchell requested that the members review the report and provide any corrections, changes or additions at the April 6, 2010 meeting.

Adjourn

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:11 a.m.

MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
April 6, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scott Sogge, Pat Roseland, Jean Kessloff, Richard Grable, Shawn Krull, Cynthia Matson, Duane Baumgartner, John Wagner

OTHERS PRESENT: Richard Knecht, Max Wetz, Alan Hanks, David Viall, Michelle Dennis, Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

Call To Order

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:31 a.m.

Approval of Agenda

**Sogge moved, Baumgartner seconded and carried unanimously to approve the meeting agenda.**

1518 West Boulevard (10RS004)

Knecht stated that in his opinion the structure is a visual detriment to the neighborhood noting his intent to demolish and rebuild a more complementary 1930-1945 era residential structure. In response to a question, Knecht indicated that he would purchase the property only if approval for the demolition of the existing structure and reconstruction of the new infill structure is approved.

Roseland indicated that the structure is classified as a contributing structure and therefore requires an automatic recommendation of adverse effect. Wagner indicated that the Commission's recommendation will be sent to the State Historic Preservation Office for formal action.

Knecht requested that the Commission provide their comments on the proposal to demolish the structure. Wagner indicated that the West Boulevard Historic District developed over time noting that the structures within the District represent those different development periods. Wagner stated that the demolition of a contributing structure is an adverse effect on the entire District.

In response to a question from Roseland, Knecht addressed the preservation requirements of Aspen, CO which allow retention of a single wall portion of the original structure when constructing new infill. In response to a question from Sogge, Knecht indicated that the proposed infill structure would extend the full length of the lot. In response to a question from Krull, Knecht indicated that it appears the property has always been owner occupied. In response to a question from Roseland, Knecht stated that his only interest in the property is to demolish and rebuild noting that rehabilitation of the structure is not an option.

Matson expressed concern with the request to demolish a contributing structure. Sogge indicated that the structure has not been adequately maintained; however he expressed his opinion that the structure it can be rehabilitated. Dennis indicated that it would be unfortunate to lose a contributing structure.

**Wagner moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the demolition of the existing contributing residential structure and the shed on the property located at 1518 West Boulevard will have an adverse effect on historic property.**



Approve Minutes

**Kessloff moved, Baumgartner seconded and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the March 19, 2010 meeting.**

Treasurer's Report

**Krull moved, Baumgartner seconded and carried unanimously to approve the Home Show expenditures: \$20.00-Black Hills Home Builders wristbands, \$20.67-Cynthia Matson poster, and \$510.68-Jean Kessloff McGillycuddy photographs.**

Census-Genealogy Presentation

Wetz requested assistance from the Commission in encouraging the general public to complete the census forms. Wetz indicated that the census creates a historical record of the community noting that the US Census web site provides links to genealogy and past census records. Wetz indicated that the census information is confidential for 72 years after which time the information is sent to the national archives and is available to the general public. Wetz indicated that the closest national archive is Denver, CO.

In response to a question, Wetz indicated that the first census was taken in 1790. Kessloff indicated that by researching the census information she was able to determine that the upstairs of the Windsor Block was utilized as a rooming house if the Commission wishes to take action.

Formal Action on Historic Preservation Commission Bylaws

Elkins advised that all changes to the Bylaws were presented at the March 19, 2010 meeting noting that final action on those changes can be taken today.

Hanks briefly reviewed the proposed changes to the Bylaws including the elimination of the ex officio members and the change to the attendance procedures.

Wagner presented the Commission with his written comments regarding the proposed changes to the Bylaws. Discussion followed regarding Wagner's comments. Wagner recommended that action on the Bylaws be continued to the next meeting to allow the Commission to review his comments. Hanks suggested that the City Attorney's Office also review Wagner's comments.

**Wagner moved to continue Formal Action on Historic Preservation Commission Bylaws to the April 16, 2010 Historic Preservation Commission meeting.**

Matson encouraged the members to review all information provided on the Bylaws to allow action to be finalized at the April 16, 2010 meeting.

In response to a question from Elkins, the Commission concurred that the Wagner comments are considered to be presented in writing at this time allowing formal action to be taken at the April 16, 2010 meeting.

Wagner commented on the need to clarify the language utilized in the Bylaws prior to taking final action.

**The motion to continue Formal Action on Historic Preservation Commission Bylaws to the April 16, 2010 Historic Preservation Commission meeting carried unanimously.**

Kessloff and Viall left the meeting at this time 8:09 a.m.

2010-2011 Certified Local Government Grant Application

Bulman presented the revised grant application in the amount of \$10,000 and reviewed the proposed projects. Bulman indicated that action by the Commission is required at this time to insure that the grant application is submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office by the end of April.

Discussion followed regarding the Street Sign project and the utilization of cooperative efforts with the West Boulevard Homeowners Association, the Downtown Business Owners Association and the Mt. Rushmore Road Group to fully fund the project.

In response to a question, Bulman indicated that the grant application amount was reduced to more accurately reflect the match hours generated by the Commission.

**Baumgartner moved, Wagner seconded and carried unanimously to approve the 2010-2011 Certified Local Government Grant Application in the amount of \$10,000.**

Approve 2009 Annual Report

**Baumgartner moved, Wagner seconded and carried unanimously to approve the 2009 Annual Report.**

Commissioner Timesheet Report

Bulman reviewed the report and encouraged the members to complete and submit their monthly timesheets noting that these hours provide the match required to support the annual grant.

Adjourn

There being no further business to come before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 8:21 a.m.

MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
April 16, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scott Sogge, Pat Roseland, Jean Kessloff, Richard Grable, Shawn Krull, Cynthia Matson, Duane Baumgartner, Michael Bender

OTHERS PRESENT: Alan Hanks, Jason Green, Dan Senftner, John Brewer, Eirik Heikes, Peter Anderson, Jodi Purdy, Ed Harvey, Jerry, Wright, Michelle Dennis, Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

Call To Order

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

Approval of Agenda

The following items were added to the agenda:

- New Business – Preservation Month Train Car Display

**Bender moved, Sogge seconded and carried unanimously to approve the meeting agenda as amended.**

Formal Action on Historic Preservation Bylaws

Hanks reviewed the current amendments to the Bylaws including the elimination of certain membership items as they are addressed by Chapter 2.68 of the Municipal Code.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Hanks indicated that the appointment of ex officio members has been eliminated to bring the Commission's authority into compliance with all other City committees and commissions. In response to a question from Kessloff, Hanks indicated that with the adoption of the Bylaws all current ex officio members would be removed from the Commission. Discussion followed regarding the Commission's authority to appoint subcommittees and the function of those subcommittees.

In response to a question from Dennis, Hanks clarified that a public building would be any City, County, State or School building. Elkins indicated that the State Historic Preservation Office staff will not nominate a public property without the owner's concurrence.

Elkins advised that the Commission must acknowledge the written presentation of the revised Bylaws in order for formal action to be taken at the May 7, 2010 meeting. **Matson moved, Grable seconded and carried unanimously to acknowledge the written presentation of the revised Historic Preservation Commission Bylaws.**

606 Main Street (10CM014)

Brewer presented the request to place two new information kiosks in the downtown area by the Creamery Building and the Turnak Towers. In response to a question, Brewer indicated that the Parking Enforcement Department has noted a reduction in information requests resulting from the installation of the information kiosks.

Brewer indicated that Destination Rapid City is responsible for the maintenance and update of the information kiosks. Brewer indicated that the current Memorandum of Agreement with City of Rapid City will be amended to address the two new sites.

In response to a question from Roseland, Brewer addressed the schedule for updating the information provided by the kiosks noting the inclusion of the downtown presidential statutes in the information. Brewer stated that the kiosks have fulfilled the projected expectations noting that one kiosk has been placed at the Civic Center.

Bender suggested that with future updates the distances and walking times be provided on the kiosks to assist visitors unfamiliar with the City. Discussion followed regarding the quality of the material utilized for the information posters.

**Baumgartner moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the addition of two new information kiosks located at the corners of St. Joseph Street/Ninth Street and Main Street/Second Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

510 Main Street (10CM015)

Anderson presented the request to demolish the interior of the building including removal of the wood framed suspended ceiling and carpet. Anderson indicated that the property owner is concentrating on the interior cleanup and is undecided regarding the interior rebuild. In response to a question, Anderson indicated that there is no exterior work planned at this time. In response to a question, Anderson indicated that no historic interior walls remain.

**Bender moved, Sogge seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the demolition of the building interior located at 510 Main Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

Treasurer's Report

Bulman presented the newspaper advertisement prepared by staff for the Yapp workshops noting the costs for color versus black/white and weekday versus weekend. Bulman indicated that staff is looking at various methods to get the workshop information out to the general public. Mitchell indicated that the workshop information has been or will be available on the City web site, The Journey Museum web site and the State Historic Preservation newsletter and that handouts are available at the information desk. Mitchell identified the entities targeted to receive the mailer noting the mailing labels staff has and the mailing labels staff needs assistance in securing. Mitchell requested that the members volunteer for the work items listed on the volunteer worksheet.

Krull recommended that color be used for any type of advertising. Roseland suggested utilizing the electronic billboards to advertise the seminar. Discussion followed regarding establishing a target audience, clarification of who "Bob Yapp" is, advertising dates and locations within the paper and the value of the advertisement in relationship to the cost. Roseland indicated that the submission date has passed for the Faces and Art of the Hills magazines. Bender suggested looking into an on-line advertisement with the Rapid City Journal.

**Krull moved, Baumgartner seconded and carried unanimously to eliminate the hard copy advertisement from the Rapid City Journal.**

1103 West Boulevard (10RS005)

Harvey reviewed the proposal to remove the existing breezeway and construction a new 20 foot by 20 foot addition noting that the addition and garage rooflines will match. Harvey indicated that the addition would be vinyl sided to match the house siding noting the design of the

windows and French doors. Harvey reviewed the visual presentation of the addition from the West Boulevard view noting that the existing landscaping and fencing will obscure the addition with the exception of the roofline. In response to a question, Harvey indicated that the existing window grid system will be duplicated in the new windows. In response to a question, Harvey indicated that the siding, shingles and trim work will match the existing house.

Discussion followed regarding the style of the vinyl siding on the house, the color match to the new vinyl siding, the condition of the existing vinyl siding and the impact the addition will have on the existing siding.

In response to a question from Krull, Purdy indicated that they were unaware of the possibility of utilizing a different siding material to distinguish the addition from the original house. Discussion followed regarding the utilization of different siding materials to make the addition compatible but distinguishable from the original structure as required by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Krull volunteered to assist the applicant in reviewing alternative siding materials for the addition. Discussion followed regarding the prep work required prior to starting construction of the addition.

Grable left the meeting at this time 8:32 a.m.

**Krull moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the demolition of the existing 11 foot by 12 foot addition and the construction of a new 20 foot by 21.4 foot addition on the property located at 1103 West Boulevard will have no adverse effect on historic property with the understanding that the applicant may submit a new application for a change to the siding materials to be utilized on the new addition.**

#### Main Street Square

Senftner stated that Destination Downtown intends to update the Commission on the Main Street Square project as the project moves forward. Heikes provided a project update noting the various elements that will be included in the Square. Discussion followed regarding the site elements and the parking availability.

In response to a question, Heikes indicated that the Sixth Street and Main Street Square design teams are working together. Bender addressed the concept of the Main Street Square and its fit with the Downtown historic structures. Discussion followed regarding the Sixth Street development.

Heikes addressed the design of the Square noting the incorporation of regional geological influences and sculptor elements. Senftner indicated that requests for use of the Square are already being submitted noting the intent to have events scheduled for one year at a time.

In response to a request from Bender, the Main Street Square Subcommittee was established for the purpose of attending the Design meetings and providing input on the project. Bender, Krull and Matson volunteered to serve on the Subcommittee.

#### Preservation Month – Yapp Seminar

In response to a request from Bulman, Dennis volunteered to assist with the Yapp mailings.

Preservation Month - Train Car Display

Wright presented the Railroad Dining Car project noting that a walking history tour will be provided, photographs of the railroad area will be displayed in the lobby of the City/School Administration building and the School of Mines Catering will provide the meals to be served in the two dining cars. Discussion followed regarding the sale of tickets to the dining car event.

Adjourn

Due to loss of quorum the meeting was adjourned at 9:04 a.m.

MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
May 7, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scott Sogge, Pat Roseland, Jean Kessloff, Richard Grable, Tamara Pier, Cynthia Matson, Duane Baumgartner, John Wagner

OTHERS PRESENT: Tom Poloncic, Troy Erickson, Rodney Johansen, David Ziebarth, Tim Linde, Carrie Linde, Michelle Dennis, Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

Call To Order

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:33 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Agenda

The following items were added to the agenda:

- New Business - Downtown Historic Information Signs
- New Business - Peter Schmidt Window

**Sogge moved, Baumgartner seconded and carried unanimously to approve the meeting agenda as amended.**

Formal Action on Historic Preservation Commission Bylaws

Wagner voiced his objection to the elimination of the ex officio members and proposed amending the language to clarify that the position is "non-voting". Wagner stated that the ex officio positions are not inappropriate and should be maintained.

Baumgartner stated that the past ex officio position have been non-voting. In response to a question, Elkins indicated that the Commission has appointed Kessloff, Thurston and Swedlund as ex officio members. Discussion followed regarding the manner in which subcommittees can be utilized to obtain expert advice from non-members.

Pier addressed her experience with ex officio positions noting that the current policy does not identify the standards and term expected of the position. Discussion continued.

**Matson moved, Grable seconded and carried with Sogge, Roseland, Grable, Pier, Matson, Baumgartner voting Yes and Kessloff and Wagner voting No.**

Elkins advised that the Bylaws will be forwarded to the June 2, 2010 Legal and Finance Committee and the June 7, 2010 City Council for final approval.

623 St Joseph Street (10CM016)

Poloncic presented the request to repair the rear stairs utilizing the same footprint and wood materials. Poloncic indicated that the repair proposal has been amended due to the cost to install metal stairs.

Kessloff indicated that she would abstain from the vote due to a conflict of interest.

In response to a question from Wagner, Poloncic indicated that repairing the stairs utilizing the same footprint and materials is termed maintenance and does not require an upgrade to the current Code requirements.

**Baumgartner moved, Sogge seconded and carried with Kessloff abstaining to recommend a finding that the repair of the existing stairs utilizing the same footprint and materials on the building located at 623 St Joseph Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

1002 West Main Street (10CM017)

Erickson presented the request to demolish the gas station building noting the deteriorated status of the building. Erickson indicated that the billboard will also be removed to accommodate changes in the business conducted at the site.

Kessloff addressed the style and design of the structure noting that porcelain enamel steel plates were normally utilized during this time period. Kessloff indicated that the structure represents an element of the City's history and recommended a finding of adverse effect. In response to a question from Matson, Kessloff indicated that the structure is unclassified due to its location within the environs of an individually listed property.

In response to a question from Matson, Elkins stated that the Memorandum of Joint Powers Agreement stipulates that demolition of an historic property or contributing structure requires a finding of adverse effect.

**Wagner moved to recommend a finding of adverse effect. Duane seconded the motion.**

In response to a question from Erickson, Elkins briefly reviewed the process involved in a finding of adverse effect. Discussion followed regarding the extent of the environs boundary on the subject property. Kessloff stated that old buildings can be rehabilitated into a viable new use.

In response to a question from Pier, Erickson indicated that if the demolition is permitted he would allow any historic elements of the structure to be salvaged.

Baumgartner offered a friendly amendment to the motion to require that should the demolition be permitted the applicant provide a photographic documentation of the structure and allow the structure to be inspected for historic elements for salvage. Wagner accepted the friendly amendment.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the demolition of the gas station structure located at 1002 West Main Street will have an adverse effect on historic property with the understanding that the applicant will provide photographic documentation of the structure and allow salvage of any porcelain enamel panels carried unanimously.**

1515 West Boulevard (10RS007)

Ziebarth presented the request to repair the flooring, railings, stairs and columns of the rear deck noting the existing damage and deterioration of the structure. Ziebarth indicated that the rear deck was added to the property after 1996. Ziebarth indicated that Trex material will be utilized to repair and replicate the back porch.

**Sogge moved to recommend a finding that the repair and replication of the back porch flooring, railings, stairs and columns on the property located at 1515 West Boulevard will have no adverse effect on historic property. Matson seconded the motion.**



Kessloff encouraged the use of wood materials noting her concern for the use of Trex materials on an historic home. Discussion followed regarding the appearance of Trex and the utilization of Trex on the original City Hall building. In response to a question from Wagner, Sogge indicated that Trex can be cut like wood.

Kessloff requested that a physical sample of the materials to be used be included in future applications.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the repair and replication of the back porch flooring, railings, stairs and columns on the property located at 1515 West Boulevard will have no adverse effect on historic property carried with Kessloff voting No.**

820 South Street (10RS006)

C. Linde presented the request to demolish the “chicken coop” structure noting that this is a non-contributing structure added to the Carriage House. T. Linde addressed the work being performed on the two contributing structures noting that the “chicken coop” was moved onto the property at a later date. T. Linde indicated that contractors have declined to work on the structure due to its deteriorated condition. T. Linde indicated that removal of the structure would benefit the restoration of the Carriage House.

T. Linde indicated that Chris Nelson has inspected the structure noting that according to Nelson the “chicken coop” is not identified on the nomination survey. T. Linde indicated that the “chicken coop” needs to be removed to permit completion of the Carriage House residing, noting that the opening from the Carriage House to the “chicken coop” will be closed. T. Linde commented on the need to focus their financial resources on the contributing structures.

Kessloff indicated that the 1923 Sandborn maps reflect the “chicken coop” and recommended a finding of adverse effect. Discussion followed regarding the design of the structure and the ongoing erosion of the dirt floor as a result of improper drainage.

In response to a question from Wagner, T. Linde addressed the impact the drainage issue is having on both the “chicken coop” and Carriage House foundations noting the landscaping alterations that will be utilized to correct the problem.

**Sogge moved, Wagner seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the demolition of the ““chicken coop”” structure located at 820 South Street will have an adverse effect on historic property with the understanding that the applicant has explored all feasible and prudent alternatives to the demolition.**

820 South Street (10RS007)

T. Linde presented the request to rebuild the front porch and replace the second floor balcony. T. Linde clarified the work performed to date noting that for stability purposes the deck flooring will be a two inch tongue and groove. T. Linde indicated that the porch columns have been taken down for repainting and repair of the crowns and bases. T. Linde indicated that the second floor balcony will be replaced to its original size and design.

T. Linde addressed the use of concrete for the front steps for maintenance purposes and the addition of the light columns at the base of the stairs.

Kessloff suggested that the light fixtures would introduce a non-original element. In response to a question from Kessloff, Dennis indicated that she understood the reason for the concrete stairs noting that there are examples of concrete stairs from this period. Dennis voiced support for the wider decking noting that it would provide better stability. Dennis indicated that the stair railing design is acceptable and suggested looking at alternatives to the lighted columns.

Sogge indicated that a wood riser could be installed on the concrete stairs to give a wood appearance from the street view. Discussion followed regarding alternatives to the lighted column design and the existing lighting available on the porch.

In response to a question, T. Linde indicated that the columns would be fabricated from concrete and colored to match the sandstone. Dennis indicated that the fabricated stone would be an acceptable material.

Grable left the meeting at this time 8:40 a.m.

Discussion followed regarding allowing the applicant to resubmit the stair and lighted column design at a later date.

**Wagner moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the addition of the second floor balcony and repair of the front porch on the property located at 820 South Street will have no adverse effect on historic property with the understanding that the applicant has withdrawn the front porch stairway and lighting proposal.**

#### Approval of Minutes

**Matson moved, Pier seconded and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the April 6, 2010 meeting.**

**Matson moved, Pier seconded and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the April 16, 2010 meeting.**

#### Treasurer's Report

**Matson moved, Sogge seconded and carried unanimously to approve the Rapid City Journal billing in the amount of \$60.00 for the on-line advertisement.**

**Pier moved, Baumgartner seconded and carried unanimously to approve the Jean Kessloff reimbursement in the amount of \$102.11 for Preservation Month expenditures.**

#### Yapp Workshops

Bulman addressed the need for additional volunteers to assist with the Yapp Workshops. Dennis recommended that the Commissioners volunteer to provide transportation for Yapp to meals and to provide the introduction at the start of each workshop.

Kessloff indicated that B. Kessloff will assist with the transportation to and from the Journey Museum.

**Kessloff moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to purchase a Dining Car ticket in the amount of \$15.00 for Yapp.**

Sogge and Pier volunteered to assist with the Friday workshop introductions. Matson volunteered to assist with the Saturday workshop introductions.

In response to a question, Kessloff indicated that the Dining Car event is already half sold.

#### Downtown Historic Information Signs

Kessloff indicated that Destination Rapid City has volunteered to clean, paint and straighten the Downtown Historic Information Signs. Kessloff indicated that Destination Rapid City has requested that the Historic Preservation Commission provide the funding to replace the Plexiglas covers.

**Baumgartner moved, Pier seconded and carried unanimously to purchase new Plexiglas for the Downtown Historic Information signs utilizing the maintenance fund account in an amount not to exceed \$1,200.00**

In response to a request from Kessloff, the Commission requested that a letter of thanks be sent to Destination Rapid City for their work on the Downtown Historic Information signs.

#### Peter Schmidt Window

**Matson moved, Baumgartner seconded and carried unanimously to request that staff submit the Schmidt Window for surplus action and research the possibility of donating the window to Habitat for Humanity.**

#### Other Business

In response to a question from Dennis, Baumgartner indicated that the Pennington County Fair Board has been advised that the nomination project has been postponed.

**Pier moved, Baumgartner seconded and carried unanimously to send a letter of thanks to Bill Kessloff for his work as an ex officio member and encourage him to consider seeking appointment to the Commission.**

Wagner recommended that the 11.1 Review process be explained at the start of each meeting to insure that all applicants receive a clear understanding of the process.

#### Adjourn

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:58 a.m.

MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
May 21, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scott Sogge, Pat Roseland, Jean Kessloff, Tamara Pier, Shawn Krull, Duane Baumgartner, John Wagner

OTHERS PRESENT: Fred Thurston, Patri Riker, Aaron Costello, Michelle Dennis, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

Call To Order

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:32 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Agenda

The following items were added to the agenda:

- New Business – Rapid City High School Nomination letter by Hanks
- New Business – Liaison update from the Rapid City High School Committee

**Baumgartner moved, Sogge seconded and carried unanimously to approve the meeting agenda as amended.**

1021 Quincy Street (10RS009)

Thurston presented the request to reconstruct of the front porch to the design identified by the 1909 Sanborn map and to modify the southwest corner of the structure to permit the adaptive reuse of the home to modern standards. Thurston indicated that all reasonably intact and historic spaces would be restored or replaced with like materials. Thurston indicated that based on the foundation, the original structure was a four-square design with the exterior bays being later additions. Thurston indicated that restoration of the structure will be to the 1909 period and would include structural improvements to the first floor lean-to addition; removal of the second floor porch roof; and alterations to the kitchen layout.

Thurston requested that a Commission member be assigned to the 1021 Quincy Street project to review and approve minor project modifications on-site to allow the project to continually move forward. Thurston indicated that major project modifications would be submitted to the full Commission under the 11.1 Review process. Discussion followed regarding the current condition of the structure and the proposed interior alterations.

Baumgartner indicated that the demolition of the front porch is an automatic adverse effect and must be sent to the State Historic Preservation Office noting that the motion could include language clarifying and supporting the requested demolition.

Thurston indicated that the front porch would be demolished and rebuilt to the 1909 dimensions. Discussion followed regarding construction of the front porch and the April 2009 approval that would allow demolition and reconstruction of the front porch provided that the porch is an accurate restoration of the 1909 configuration as shown on the 1909 Sanborn map. Discussion continued regarding the porch configurations reflected on the 1909 and 1914 Sanborn maps.

Dennis indicated that photographic documentation is available for the 1914 porch configuration noting the Commission's requirement to apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards when reviewing the application. Discussion followed regarding the 1909 and 1914 porch configuration and the impact the porch design would have on the structure's bay windows.

Costello left the meeting at this time 7:56 a.m.

In response to a question, Thurston clarified that the rear addition will be structurally fortified, not demolished. Thurston indicated that based on the floor design the second floor porch was originally uncovered. Thurston indicated that the current roof will be removed and the porch restored. Thurston addressed the photographic evidence supporting the restoration of the front bay eyebrow. Thurston indicated that the front porch design will be determined as demolition of the structure uncovers the original foundation.

Pier stated that the information provided is insufficient for the Commission to render an informed decision. Pier recommended that the item be continued to allow the applicant to provide additional documentation noting that a special meeting could be scheduled to assist in keeping the project moving forward. Pier indicated that the 11.1 Review decisions are a responsibility of the Commission as a whole and cannot be delegated to any one individual.

Thurston addressed the incorporation of the 1914 porch decorative features that will be incorporated into the 1909 front porch design. Kessloff stated that the mixing of decorative features from different eras is inappropriate. Discussion followed regarding the utilization of details from different eras in the porch design.

Wagner recommended that the meeting be adjourned or that a special meeting be scheduled at the site noting that this would allow the applicant to provide the additional information required to assist the Commission in making an informed decision.

Discussion followed regarding the proposed decorative features of the porch. Dennis indicated that the design presented reflects the 1914 porch noting that additional information is required to make an accurate decision. Dennis addressed the inappropriateness of creating a hybrid feature for appearance sake. Discussion followed regarding differences in the porch configurations as reflected on the 1909 and 1914 Sanborn maps and the impact the 1914 porch design would have on the visual appearance of the two story bay windows.

Mitchell left the meeting at this time 8:10 a.m.

Baumgartner commented on the importance of the Sweeny house and cautioned against compromising the elements of the restoration. Pier indicated that she felt the information provided was insufficient to make an informed decision and recommended continuing the application to a future meeting.

Discussion followed regarding the restoration project, the application of the Secretary of the Interior Standards and the action authorized by the April 2009 action with regard to the front porch design.

Thurston left the meeting at this time 8:15 a.m.

Discussion followed regarding the alterations to the rear of the property and the need to provide a clear delineation between the existing structures and proposed alterations.

**Krull moved, Pier seconded and carried unanimously to recommend that the requested modifications to the southwest corner of the house at 1021 Quincy Street to:**

1. **Expand the southwest corner of the second floor to permit expansion of the bathroom;**
2. **Modify the enclosed porch to create a second floor bathroom;**
3. **Extend the roof line to enclose the expanded area, including the enclosed porch; and,**
4. **Remove the large picture windows on the porch and add two double hung windows in the bathroom**

**will have no adverse effect on historic property with the provision that a distinct delineation between the 1914 structure and the 2010 additions be provided including the roof line of the new addition and that the reinstalled windows are extruded and true to the character of the house or reused from the original structure.**

Discussion followed regarding the requested modifications to the front porch. In response to a question, Dennis indicated that the structure contains additions from different eras noting that the design and decorative features used to restore those additions need to be representative of that specific era.

Discussion followed regarding the scheduling of an on-site visit. Pier cautioned the Commission to schedule their on-site visits noting that six or more members on-site at one time would constitute a quorum and require notification of a special meeting.

**Wagner moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to continue the 11.1 Review for the front porch modifications at 1021 Quincy Street to the June 4, 2010 meeting.**

#### Approval of Minutes

**Baumgartner moved, Wagner seconded and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the May 7, 2010 meeting.**

#### Treasurer's Report

**Pier moved, Kessloff seconded and carried unanimously to approve the Rapid City Window and Glass quote of \$1,175.00 for the new Downtown Signs Plexiglas covers to be paid from the non-grant fund account.**

**Wagner moved, Pier seconded and carried unanimously to approve the expenditure of \$60.00 for the rental of glassware for the Dinner in the Dining Car event to be paid from the non-grant fund account.**

**Baumgartner moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to approve expenditures for the Preservation Month and Dinner in the Dining Car events as follows:**

1. **\$4,700.00 to Preservation Resources for Bop Yapp;**
2. **\$4.91 to the Rapid City Journal for the on-line business card advertisement;**
3. **\$218.01 to Dakota Business for copier charges for the Yapp mailers;**
4. **\$78.87 to Western Stationers for copy paper for the Yapp mailers;**
5. **\$18.44 to Jean Kessloff for copy paper for the Railroad Walking Tour flyers; and,**
6. **Reimbursement to Jean Kessloff in an amount not to exceed \$80.00 for ink cartridges.**

**Pier moved, Baumgartner moved and carried unanimously to approve the Office Max expenditure of \$59.59 for postcards for the West Boulevard Study Committee mailing.**

Proposed changes to the Memorandum of Joint Powers Agreement

Roseland requested that this item be continued to the June 4, 2010 meeting. Bulman reviewed the recommendation from the State Historic Preservation Office regarding changes to the Memorandum. **Pier moved, Baumgartner seconded and carried unanimously to continue the Memorandum of Joint Powers Agreement to the June 4, 2010 meeting.**

Rapid City High School Nomination Letter

Kessloff indicated that she would provide a copy of the Hanks letter to the Commission and staff for discussion at the June 4, 2010 meeting.

Liaison update from the Rapid City High School Committee

Roseland requested that this item be continued to the June 4, 2010 meeting.

Adjourn

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 a.m.

MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
June 4, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scott Sogge, Pat Roseland, Jean Kessloff, Tamara Pier, Shawn Krull, Cynthia Matson, Duane Baumgartner, Michael Bender

OTHERS PRESENT: Jim Headid, Ed Eixenberger, Bob Fuchs, Neal Schlottman, Erich Orris, Bob Brandt, James Adams, Beth Young, Michelle Dennis, Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

Call To Order

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

Approval of Meeting Agenda

The following item was added to the agenda:

- Treasurer's Report – Approve Journey Museum rental \$250

**Baumgartner moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to approve the meeting agenda as amended.**

513-521 Main Street (10CM018)835

Headid presented the request to reroof the buildings at 513, 515, 517, 519 and 521 Main Street. Headid presented photographs documenting the condition of the roofs and the buildings that have line of sight to the new roofs. Headid addressed the materials to be removed and the manner in which leaking areas will be addressed. Headid provided material samples of the insulation and membrane that will be utilized in the roofing project.

**Baumgartner moved, Sogge seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the reroofing of 513-521 Main Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

1316 West Boulevard (10RS011)

Bulman indicated that the application has been resubmitted as the porch was not completed in accordance with the stipulations of approval. Elkins indicated that drain opening were not installed and the top cap dimensions do not comply with the stipulations of approval and require the Commission's review.

Eixenberger indicated that he was unaware that drain sleeves were required noting that the spacing in the deck flooring provides sufficient drainage. Eixenberger indicated that the deck railing top cap is  $\frac{3}{4}$  inch narrower than the specified dimension. Elkins indicated that staff has no objections to the alterations.

**Matson moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the modifications including the modification of the drainage openings and the installation of a top cap  $\frac{3}{4}$  inch less in width on the property location at 1316 West Boulevard will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

Sogge complemented the changes noting that the porch appearance is more complementary to the structure. Eixenberger indicated that the porch on the adjacent property was utilized as a guide in rebuilding this porch.



610 Main Street (10CM021)

Fuchs presented the request to install an outside walk-in freezer on the rear of the property. Fuchs indicated that the 6 foot by 8 foot freezer unit will be placed on a concrete pad noting that electrical service will be provided to the unit directly through the rear wall. Fuchs indicated that the structure will not exceed the roof line and will be rubber roofed. In response to a question, Fuchs indicated that the compressor will be installed to the back side of the unit.

**Bender moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the installation of a standalone freezer at the back of the building, including electrical service, on the property at 610 Main Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

520 7<sup>th</sup> Street (10CM019)

Schlottman presented the request to install an interior door opening between the 518 and 520 tenant spaces. Kessloff indicated that the historic fabric removed to create the door opening is not a character defining feature of the building.

**Baumgartner moved, Sogge seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the installation of an interior door opening between the 518 and 520 tenant spaces on the property at 520 7<sup>th</sup> Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

518 7<sup>th</sup> Street (10CM020)

Orris addressed the interior improvements and changes proposed for the tenant space at 518 7<sup>th</sup> Street to allow for the creation of a cigar lounge. Orris addressed the electrical, mechanical and plumbing improvements required to provide the ADA bathrooms, bar and walk-in cooler. In response to a question Orris indicated that an air scrubber is utilized at the facility noting the efforts taken to seal the lounge area off from other public spaces.

In response to a question from Baumgartner, Orris indicated that no exterior changes, other than signage, are anticipated at this time.

**Baumgartner moved, Pier seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the remodel of the existing lavatory, addition of a second lavatory, removal of non-load bearing walls and addition of a non-load bearing wall including all plumbing, mechanical and electrical upgrades on the property at 518 7<sup>th</sup> Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

1103 West Boulevard (10RS010)

Brandt presented the request to modify the original application to permit demolition of the existing addition, to permit the new addition to be connected to the garage, to permit construction of a covered patio and to permit demolition of the top floor porch.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Brandt indicated that the top floor porch door will be replaced with a window noting the manner in which the roofline of the new addition would impact the window placement. Kessloff indicated that the lack of elevation drawings make the determination of "effect" difficult.

In response to a question from Sogge, Brandt indicated that the garage roofline height will be extended across the addition, eliminating the varying height rooflines. Discussion followed regarding the design of the roofline over the addition. In response to a question, Dennis

indicated that dropping the addition roofline under the garage roofline would provide the required delineation. Discussion followed regarding lowering the roofline of the addition and the resulting impact on the dormer window, house window and covered patio design.

In response to a question from Roseland, Brandt indicated that wood Marvin windows with top divided lights will be installed. In response to a question from Bender, Brandt indicated that the original elevations incorrectly reflect the location of the kitchen windows, noting that they will be the same height as the house windows.

Discussion followed regarding the impact of the addition roofline and materials to be used to side the addition. In response to a question, Brandt indicated that the covered patio will not be attached to the house or garage.

**Krull moved to recommend that a minimum 18 inch drop between the garage and addition rooflines be provided for delineation, that the pitch of the addition roofline match the pitch of the garage, that the kitchen windows be the same top height as existing windows, that a taller window be provided in the dormer and that the trim on the 6 foot by 6 foot covered patio posts be painted. Bender seconded the motion.**

Kessloff and Pier indicated that due to the lack of elevation drawings there is insufficient information to accurately address the request.

Discussion followed regarding alterations to the covered patio design resulting from the required height reduction to the addition roofline and the need for elevation drawings to accurately determine the roofline impact on the dormer window, house window and covered patio.

**Krull withdrew the motion, Bender concurred.**

**Bender moved, Sogge seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the demolition of the existing addition, authorization of the connection of the new addition to the garage subject to the approval of a variance and to permit the footing and foundation permit for the new addition on the property at 1103 West Boulevard will have no adverse effect on historic property with the elevation drawings addressing the roofline details, the window details, the covered patio details and the dormer window details to be continued to the June 18, 2010 meeting to allow the applicant to provide additional information.**

#### 913 St James Street (10RS012)

Young addressed the privacy concerns prompting the request to reduce the size of two windows and remove one window from the bathroom area. Elkins clarified that the structure is classified as non-contributing. Baumgartner indicated that the window alterations would not be an adverse effect due to the non-contributing status.

Kessloff indicated that the consideration should also be given to the impact the window alterations will have on the house and neighborhood. Adams indicated that the replacement windows will be multi-pane wood construction. In response to a question from Bender, Adams indicated that the windows are original to the house noting that the rear of the house is steel sided and the remainder of the house is a composite siding.

Sogge indicated that the window alterations will have minimal impact on the property's primary facade. In response to a question from Sogge, Adams indicated that in the early 1970's two rooms were combined to enlarge the bathroom area.

Kessloff suggested retaining the windows and using interior shutters for privacy. Discussion followed regarding the current code requirements for windows installed above tubs and the design of the divided lights in the new windows. In response to a question from Krull, Adams indicated that the replacement siding will match the existing siding.

**Krull moved to recommended a finding that the removal of a rear window, the size reduction of one window on the rear and one window on the east side with the stipulation that the windows include inside and outside divided light extrusions and adhere to current code requirements and that the replacement siding match the existing siding on the property at 913 St James Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. Sogge seconded the motion.**

Bender addressed the State Historic Preservation Office discussion on "cumulative changes" noting that the window alterations are not on the primary façade and do not constitute a massive change.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Adams indicated that the remainder of a wall, removed to enlarge the bathroom, will be completely removed.

**The motion to recommended a finding that the removal of a rear window, the size reduction of one window on the rear and one window on the east side with the stipulation that the windows include inside and outside divided light extrusions and adhere to current code requirements and that the replacement siding match the existing siding on the property at 913 St James Street will have no adverse effect on historic property carried with Kessloff voting No.**

#### 1021 Quincy Street (10RS009)

**Krull moved, Sogge seconded and carried unanimously to recommended that the application for 1021 Quincy Street be continued to the June 18, 2010 meeting to allow the applicant to provide additional information.**

#### Approval of Minutes

**Krull moved, Baumgartner seconded and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the May 21, 2010 meeting.**

#### Treasurer's Report

**Kessloff moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to approve the following expenditures: \$230-Ramkota Lodging for Yapp Seminar; \$40-Rapid City Window & Glass for shipping of Plexiglas; and \$250-Journey Museum for theatre rental.**

#### Proposed changes to the Memorandum of Joint Powers Agreement

Matson suggested amending the Memorandum to forward all demolition of contributing structures directly to the State Historic Preservation Office. Matson suggested that directing this specific activity to Pierre may help to improve the public perception of the Commission.

Elkins presented the language change to Item 6A of the Memorandum noting that the change has been reviewed with the State Historic Preservation Office. Elkins indicated that this language change will give the Commission the ability to recommend a finding of “no adverse effect” on the demolition of non-contributing buildings or buildings located in the environs. Discussion followed regarding the proposed language change.

**Krull moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to recommend that the proposed language change to Section III, Item 6A, of the Memorandum of Joint Powers Agreement be adopted:**

**MEMORANDUM OF JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT**

**Section III. GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES**

**6. The Parties recognize and agree that the Projects listed below will potentially have Adverse Effects on Historic Properties, are not subject to Section III (5) of this Agreement, and must be submitted to the Office for review under SDCL 1-19A-11.1, after the Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission has reviewed and commented on the Projects.**

- A. The issuance of demolition permits for Projects on Individually Listed Historic Properties or contributing buildings in the historic districts. This does not include non-contributing buildings or buildings located in the environs. “Demolition” for this subsection is defined as the complete removal of the building.**

City of Rapid City and Property Owner Letters on Rapid City High School Nomination

Kessloff indicated that the letters were provided to the Commission for information purposes.

Rapid City High School Committee Liaison Report

Krull indicated that the proposed changes to the auditorium interior will not adversely affect the auditorium acoustics. Discussion followed regarding the need for the Liaison Committee Commission members to be actively involved with the architect meetings. Roseland, Krull and Baumgartner briefly addressed the project presentations they have participated in.

Dennis indicated that there are several individuals from the general public who are interested in attending the Historic Preservation meeting when the architect plans are presented for review.

Discussion followed regarding the level of contact between the architect and the Commission liaisons. Elkins indicated that if additional meetings are required to contact her or the School so meetings can be scheduled. Discussion followed regarding the changes to the auditorium seating and the HVAC system.

In response to a question, Elkins indicated that she would work with the School to arrange a presentation on the auditorium design for the Commission.

Commission Vacancy

Bulman advised the Commission that John Wagner resigned his position effective June 1, 2010. Bulman suggested that the members advise individuals interested in serving on the Commission to submit a Citizen Interest application with the Mayor’s Office.

Commissioners Timesheet Report

Elkins encouraged the members to submit their monthly timesheets noting that attendance at the Legal & Finance Committee meetings, the Yapp seminars and the West Boulevard Historic District open house are qualifying activities.

New Business – West Boulevard Historic District Open House

Kessloff addressed the public comments received at the meeting noting the issues voiced against the Commission. Elkins indicated that there appeared to be confusion between the West Boulevard Homeowners Association and the Historic Preservation Commission. Elkins addressed the need to provide a distinction between the two entities and the need to continue positive public outreach programs such as the Yapp seminars. Discussion continued regarding the information presented at the open house and the need to develop design guidelines. In response to a question from Roseland, Elkins indicated that, with the approval of the new grant, the Commission could hire a consultant to develop design guidelines. Discussion followed.

Other Business

Kessloff commented on the need for more involvement and support from the Commission members with the activities scheduled for Preservation Month.

In response to a request from Kessloff, **Baumgartner moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to recommend that Destination Rapid City be publicly recognized for their volunteer work on the Downtown Historic Signs.**

Adjourn

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:24 a.m.

MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
June 18, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scott Sogge, Pat Roseland, Jean Kessloff, Richard Grable, Tamara Pier, Cynthia Matson, Duane Baumgartner, Michael Bender

OTHERS PRESENT: Lee Geiger, Saun Jones, Crystal Jones, Bob Brandt, Fred Thurston, Steve Jastrom, Kris Bjerke, Ron Reed, Michael Kenton, Alan Hanks, Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

Call To Order

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:32 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Agenda

**Baumgartner moved, Sogge seconded and carried unanimously to approve the Meeting Agenda as presented.**

333 Sixth Street (10CM022)

Geiger presented the request to revise the traffic and pedestrian flows with the installation of a passenger transfer island. Geiger indicated that a free standing canopy would be installed over the transfer island. In response to a question, Geiger addressed the redesign of the adjacent parking areas.

**Bender moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the revision of transit traffic flows, installation of a passenger transfer island with raised canopy and redesign of the adjacent parking areas on the property at 333 Sixth Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

1323 9<sup>th</sup> Street (10RS013)

S. Jones presented the request to replace the front porch roof noting the instability of the current roof. Kessloff indicated that the front porch roof provides the only avenue to move furniture in and out of the upper floor noting that the instability of the current roof is a safety issue and does require replacement.

In response to a question, S. Jones indicated that the bead board porch ceiling will be replaced noting that the porch deck is in good repair and does not require replacement. In response to a question from Bender, S. Jones indicated that the current 4/12 roof pitch will be retained.

In response to a recommendation from Kessloff, S. Jones indicated that it would be possible to reinstall the original bead board ceiling.

**Baumgartner moved, Pier seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the reconstruction of the front porch roof on the property at 333 Sixth Street will have no adverse effect on historic property with the stipulation that the original bead board porch ceiling be reinstalled.**

1103 West Boulevard (10RS010)

Brandt presented the revised elevations for the new addition noting that string lines have been installed on-site to reflect the location and impact of the new roof lines on the existing house and garage. Brandt indicated that the addition roof line will be fourteen inches lower than the garage

roof line. In response to a question, Brandt addressed the size and location of the window that will replace the top floor porch door. Brandt indicated that the existing window to be removed is located in the original butler's pantry, noting that windows were not normally provided in this area. Brandt indicated that two new windows would be installed in the new addition.

**Matson moved, Pier seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that:**

- 1. That the construction of a 20 foot by 20 foot 10 inch addition with an additional 6 foot by 10 foot side extension connected to the garage;**
- 2. That the addition be delineated by a roofline 14 inches lower than the garage roofline;**
- 3. That the demolition of the top floor porch and replacement of the porch door with a window;**
- 4. That the removal of the window from the butler pantry; and,**
- 5. That the construction of a covered patio**

**on the property at 1103 West Boulevard will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

#### Dakota Middle School Theater Project

Jastrom presented information regarding the theater project noting the inability to locate the original building blueprints. Jastrom assured the members that the interior character of the building would be retained noting that the ticket windows, main entrance and lobby ceilings would be restored.

Jastrom indicated that the stage façade will be restored and retained, noting that the stage will be extended further into the audience area. Jastrom indicated that the southeast corner addition will provide support services for the auditorium including scenery, rehearsal, dressing and equipment rooms noting that the new addition connecting the main building and vocational school will house the new mechanical equipment.

Jastrom indicated that the project will be completed in phases noting that the auditorium remodel will be phase one of the project. Jastrom addressed the new ventilation design, seating, theatre lighting, control room and the integration of the HVAC system to all facilities including the alternative High School. Jastrom indicated that the air conditioning system will be presented at the next subcommittee review meeting.

In response to a question from Baumgartner, Jastrom indicated that the missing and broken plaster decorative features will be replaced. Jastrom indicated that a sprinkler system will be installed noting that recessed heads will be used to conceal the system.

Hanks expressed his appreciation for all interested parties working together on the project noting that the community will benefit from the project.

In response to a question, Jastrom addressed the remodel and upgrade of the first and second floor public use restrooms noting that the remodeled facilities would meet ADA standards.

In response to a question, Jastrom addressed the accent features that will be incorporated in the design of the new addition. Discussion followed regarding conversion of the playground to a parking lot to provide adequate parking for the theatre. Jastrom addressed the creation of a pedestrian plaza to connect the parking lot and High School to the 6<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor. In response to a question, Bender indicated his comfort with the direction of the project.

Kessloff recommended that copies of the National Register Nomination be provided to the project architect. In response to a question from Jastrom, Kessloff indicated that the structure has been placed on the State register and that the application has been forwarded to Washington D.C. for review and placement on the National register.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Kenton indicated that all school storage areas have been researched noting that the original blueprints have not been located.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Jastrom indicated that while the control box will obstruct the center door access to the auditorium, the doors will be retained and will be visible from the lobby interior.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Jastrom indicated that the construction documents would be completed by the end of August and would be presented to the School, City and Commission for review prior to the project being let for bid.

Baumgartner suggested that a plaque be placed on the building to acknowledge the National Register status and its use as a Summer White House. Discussion followed regarding the theatre seating. Baumgartner thanked Jastrom for the work to preserve the historic nature of the auditorium.

#### 1021 Quincy Street (10RS009)

Thurston thanked Kessloff for the 1919 Holiday Greetings photograph as it assisted the owner in determining to restore the structure to the 1919-1920 era. Thurston addressed the materials that had been revealed during demolition of the front porch that would assist in the restoration of the 1919 era porch. Thurston indicated that the bead board ceiling of the first floor porch would be restored utilizing materials from the original ceiling and the rear porch ceiling. Thurston indicated that the second floor porch roof would be removed and the handrail extended around the deck as reflected in the Holiday Greetings photograph. Thurston indicated that the second floor north bay eyebrow and haunches would be reinstalled similar to the west bay window.

Discussion followed regarding the stain glass windows located in the second floor bay windows and the extent of the west side porch.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Thurston indicated that the front porch columns will be reconstructed based on the existing materials noting the column bases that had been uncovered during demolition. In response to a question from Kessloff, Thurston indicated that the trim will be restored to the 1919 style noting that all newer era trim will be removed.

Discussion followed regarding the code requirements dictating the height of the second floor deck railing and the visual relief offered by the height and location of the railing. Kessloff indicated that while the rail height is required by code, it will obscure the character defining features of the west façade.

**Bender moved to recommend a finding that the restoration of the front porch to be consistent with the 1919-1920 "Holiday Greetings" photograph and the removal of the second floor porch roof with the installation of a 36 inch handrail to comply with current Code requirements and the installation of the eyebrow and haunches over the second floor north bay window similar in design to the west bay window on the property at 1021**



**Quincy Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. Sogge seconded the motion.**

In response to a question from Bender, Thurston indicated that there will be a difference in the design of the two second floor railings. Bender recommended that the higher rail be a simpler design to differentiate between the old and new. Discussion followed regarding the second floor railing and its impact on the character defining features. Bender indicated that the new railing would be placed on a secondary façade. Thurston indicated that a space will be retained between the two railings to provide additional differentiation. Kessloff expressed concern with focus being placed on retention of only the primary facades while allowing the side and rear facades to be altered on structures.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the restoration of the front porch to be consistent with the 1919-1920 "Holiday Greetings" photograph and the removal of the second floor porch roof with the installation of a 36 inch handrail to comply with current Code requirements and the installation of the eyebrow and haunches over the second floor north bay window similar in design to the west bay window on the property at 1021 Quincy Street will have no adverse effect on historic property carried with Kessloff voting No.**

Baumgartner recommended that an article be placed in the Rapid City Journal regarding the restoration of the Sweeney house given its importance to the West Boulevard Historic District.

#### Approval of Minutes

**Baumgartner moved, Sogge seconded and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the June 4, 2010 meeting.**

#### Treasurer's Report

Bulman addressed the balance remaining in the non-grant funds noting that the 2009-2010 CLG grant has been closed out and the final draw submitted for payments. Bulman indicated that the current year grant has been received and will be presented to the City Council for final approval.

**Baumgartner moved, Grable seconded and carried unanimously to approve the Treasurer's Report.**

#### Other Business

Baumgartner requested that staff contact the new owners of the former Bully Blends building regarding the need for building permits.

Kessloff encouraged the members to read the Dakota Middle School nomination application to familiarize themselves with the building's historic fabric. Bender indicated that the architectural firm heading the project is one of the State's best historic architectural firms.

#### Subcommittees

Bender indicated that he has provided historic photographs of downtown Rapid City to the Main Street Square design group noting the effort to tie the City's history to the Square as opposed to the use of regional influences. Bender indicated that a meeting with the project designers has been scheduled for next week. Discussion followed regarding the focus of historic district plazas in other cities.

Salvaging of Historic Materials

Kessloff reminded the Commission of their request to salvage any of the enamel panels from the 1002 West Main Street gas station. Discussion followed regarding the Commission's inability to provide storage for historic materials that are donated or salvaged.

Adjourn

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:52 a.m.

MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
July 2, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jean Kessloff, Richard Grable, Tamara Pier, Shawn Krull, Duane Baumgartner

OTHERS PRESENT: David Ziebarth, Pam Lang, Brian Winckel, Michelle Dennis, Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

Call To Order

Kessloff called the meeting to order at 7:35 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Agenda

**Baumgartner moved, Pier seconded and carried unanimously to approve the Meeting Agenda as presented.**

1515 West Boulevard (10RS013)

Ziebarth presented the request to modify the front porch design to construct a single stairway with double wrought iron railings. Ziebarth indicated that during demolition of the existing porch it was discovered that the porch had been expanded by an additional two feet of concrete. Ziebarth indicated that the contractor has expressed concern that removal of the additional two feet of concrete could result in damage to the foundation. Ziebarth indicated that the wraparound design on the current concrete base would require removal of the sidewalk and a tree. Lang expressed concern that a wraparound porch utilizing the current concrete base would be oversized in relationship to the house.

In response to a question from Krull, Ziebarth addressed the age of the existing porch noting that a storage room is located in the area impacted by the front porch.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Lang indicated that the flower box proposal has been withdrawn as it would be out of scale with the house. Lang voiced her concern that there may be possible damage to the foundation with the removal of the additional concrete.

**Krull moved, Grable seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the modified front porch design with a single front stairway and double wrought iron railings as presented on the property at 1515 West Boulevard will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

Krull recommended that the applicant have a structural concrete firm inspect the porch to determine if the additional two feet could be removed without damaging the foundation. Discussion followed regarding the need to review any further changes to the front porch design.

**Krull moved, Grable seconded and carried unanimously to reconsider the motion for 1515 West Boulevard.**

**Krull moved, Grable seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the modified porch design with a single front stairway and double wrought iron railings as presented on the property at 1515 West Boulevard will have no adverse effect on historic property with the understanding that the application can proceed without further review**

**should it be feasible to remove the additional two feet of concrete without damage to the foundation to allow restoration of the 1960 wraparound porch design.**

725 St. Joseph Street (10CM023)

Winckel thanked the Commission for accepting the late submittal allowing his project to remain on schedule. Winckel indicated that he has submitted a Sidewalk Café request noting the intent to utilize a wrought iron barrier instead of the portable stanchions and chains.

In response to a question from Krull, Winckel indicated that the wrought iron barrier would be installed using anchors in the sidewalk noting that the barrier will be removable and will not be attached to the building.

In response to a question from Krull, Winckel indicated there would be a seven foot clearance from the curb to the barrier to allow for a pedestrian walkway and vehicle overhang.

Discussion followed regarding utilizing building design elements in the railing design, the adjacent buildings, the adjacent parking lots and the railing anchor design.

**Krull moved, Grable seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the installation of a wrought iron railing for the patio café area on the property at 725 St Joseph Street will have no adverse effect on historic property with the stipulation that the wrought iron railing be removable.**

Approval of Minutes

**Baumgartner moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the June 18, 2010 meeting.**

Treasurer's Report

Bulman identified the copier charges and presented the South Dakota State Historical Society Membership. **Baumgartner moved, Pier seconded and carried unanimously to approve payment of the \$45 membership fee to the South Dakota State Historical Society.**

Timesheet Report

Bulman indicated that the report is provided monthly and encouraged the members to submit their monthly timesheets as the volunteer hours are the in-kind match for the grant.

Dakota Middle School Liaison Subcommittee

Baumgartner indicated that the subcommittee members would be contacted when the final plans are ready for review. Elkins indicated that the plans should be ready in late August or early September.

Main Street Square Subcommittee

Krull indicated that he has met with the landscape architect and lead project architect noting their need for design input now. Krull outlined his research for guidelines on the construction of a new town square within a historic district noting that most of the information located addressed town squares that were in existence at the time the Districts were approved.

Krull addressed his concern with the placement of the large spires in the visual view shed of the Downtown Historic District noting that he would recommend that they be located behind the front setback of the building facades. Krull stated that he did not feel that the size of the

badlands sculpture would be adverse. Krull indicated that he recommended that design elements such as stone tapestry and bronze statues be added to tie the Square into the historic district. Krull indicated that he feels the placement stone spires interrupt the atmosphere of the downtown facades and would be an adverse impact.

In response to a question from Baumgartner, Krull indicated that the property owner's approval is required to move forward with the storefronts in the Sears Building.

Krull indicated that he has seen all the construction drawings and has requested that the stage elevations be provided to the Commission for review.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Dennis indicated that the Main Street Square would be addressed under the design standards for the development of open spaces. Dennis concurred that the view shed is a character defining feature of the Downtown Historic District noting that size, scale, mass and materials are also addressed under the design standards. Dennis addressed the need for continuity to tie the project to the Downtown Historic District. Dennis supported the presentation of the stage elevations to the Commission to allow evaluation of the visual impact of the spires and landscape plantings on the downtown facades. Dennis indicated that she would research the open spaces design standards and provide the information to the Commission.

Elkins recommended that the Commission provide the design team with photographs of what was originally located on the site to assist in clarifying the visual impact concerns. Dennis concurred and indicated that all buildings in the Downtown Historic District have a standard setback. Krull addressed the urgent need to provide input as the project is moving forward.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Elkins indicated that the subcommittee members are responsible for providing the input and direction to the design groups on behalf of the Commission. Elkins stated that the subcommittee members need to communicate the view shed concerns now to permit that concern to be addressed during the design stage.

Elkins indicated that she would contact Destination Downtown regarding presentation of a preliminary project review similar to the recent presentation made on the Rapid City High School Theater project. Discussion followed regarding the location, size and placement of the fountain and spires design elements.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Elkins recommended that concerns with the Main Street Square and Dakota Middle School projects be given to the subcommittee members to present to the project design teams. Discussion followed regarding the best way to provide input to the project design teams.

#### Buildings in Peril

Baumgartner indicated that the Aby's Feed and Seed building is again listed for sale. Discussion followed regarding the ownership of the building.

#### Salvaging of Historical Materials

Kessloff indicated that Erickson is working with her regarding the salvaging of the enamel panels from the structure at 1002 West Main Street. Kessloff indicated that she has been provided a South Dakota contact that can possibly salvage the panels and also assist in relocating the panels for reuse.

Other Business - Lincoln Academy Roof Replacement

Bulman addressed the roof failure at the Lincoln Academy noting that the property is a non-listed property in the environs of an individually listed property. Bulman indicated that the application for roof repair has been approved by the State Historic Preservation Office based on the emergency repair and the structure classification.

Adjourn

**There being no further business, Baumgartner moved, Pier seconded and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 8:32 a.m.**

MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
July 16, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Pat Roseland, Jean Kessloff, Richard Grable, Tamara Pier, Shawn Krull, Cynthia Matson, Duane Baumgartner, Michael Bender

OTHERS PRESENT: Vanessa Wood, Leslie Riss, Holly Ringo, Peter Anderson, Brad Burns, Dale Tech, Todd Peckosh, Steve Bareis, Erich Orris, Dan Senftner, Eirik Heikes, Dale Lamphere, Michelle Dennis, Alan Hanks, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

Call To Order

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:31 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Agenda

**Pier moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to approve the Meeting Agenda as presented.**

907 Clark Street (10RS015)

Wood presented the request to install an air conditioning unit on the front façade in a mirror location to the air conditioning unit of the adjoining unit noting that this location would provide symmetry to the duplex façade. In response to a question from Krull, Wood reviewed the alternate side and rear locations noting the site concerns with those locations.

**Bender moved to recommend a finding that the installation of the HVAC unit, including the required mechanical upgrades, to the front façade location identified by Option "A" on the property located at 907 Clark Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. Matson seconded the motion.**

Kessloff referred to the Secretary of Interior's Standards for the installation of new mechanical equipment on historic properties and recommended that the air conditioning unit not be located on the front façade. Wood indicated that she had no objection to locating the air conditioning unit in the rear yard.

In response to a question, Bulman indicated that per the State Historic Preservation Office the Commission recommendation will be made on the current "non-contributing" status of the property. Discussion followed regarding the possible misclassification of the structure and the physical issues associated with the side and rear optional locations for the placement of the air conditioning unit.

Kessloff encouraged the Commission to follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards with regard to the request.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the installation of the HVAC unit, including the required mechanical upgrades, to the front façade location identified by Option "A" on the property located at 907 Clark Street will have no adverse effect on historic property carried with Roseland, Grable, Matson, Baumgartner and Bender voting Yes and Kessloff, Pier and Krull voting No (5 to 3).**

1404 Mt Rushmore Road (10CM025)

Riss presented the application to demolish the existing pitched roof noting that the present structure consists of an existing house surrounded by an office front. Riss indicated that the new roof design will be pitched membrane to address the leaking issues of the existing roof. Riss indicated that the removal of the current pitched roof will expose the air conditioning unit noting that the unit will not be visible from the street elevation. In response to a question, Riss stated that the existing fascia will be replaced with a 16/12 pitch asphalt shingled new front fascia.

**Krull moved, Grable seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the removal of the existing pitched roof and that the construction of a pitched membrane roof with a 16/12 pitch asphalt shingled fascia on the property located at 1404 Mt Rushmore Road will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

816 South Street (10CM026)

Ringo presented the request to install a freestanding pergola in the front yard area of the property. Ringo indicated that a pea gravel base will be utilized beneath the cedar wood pergola.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Ringo indicated that the intent of the project is to provide a more inviting front entrance to the business. Kessloff addressed the impact of the structure on the front façade noting that historically these structures were located in the side and rear yards.

In response to a question from Krull, Ringo indicated that the structure would have a natural finish. In response to a question from Bender, Ringo indicated that the structure would be placed on concrete footings.

**Kessloff moved to recommend a finding of adverse effect on historic property. The motion failed for lack of a second.**

**Matson moved to recommend a finding that the placement of a free standing pergola in the front yard area on the property located at 816 South Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. Baumgartner seconded the motion.**

In response to a question from Bender, Kessloff stated that while the structure will be free standing it introduces an incompatible element to the front façade and setting of the structure. Discussion followed regarding actions that would constitute an adverse effect.

Dennis addressed the architectural incompatibility of the house and proposed pergola. In response to a question from Pier, Dennis outlined landscape elements that would be compatible with the architectural style of the house.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the placement of a free standing pergola in the front yard area on the property located at 816 South Street will have no adverse effect on historic property carried with Roseland, Grable, Matson, Baumgartner and Bender voting Yes and Kessloff, Pier and Krull voting No (5 to 3).**



510 Main Street (10CM027)

Anderson presented the request to demolish the front nine feet, seven inches of the existing storefront to restore the façade to the recessed storefront as reflected by the photograph of the structure prior to the construction of front and rear additions. Anderson briefly addressed the proposed design for the front and rear façades noting that the rear façade windows will be removed and replaced to complement the front façade. In response to a question, Anderson clarified that there will be no alteration to the size of the rear façade door and window openings.

Burns presented samples of the materials and colors that will be used on the building and awning noting that the window and panel trim will be painted wood. In response to a question from Roseland, Anderson indicated that windows will have simulated divided lights with mullions on both the inside and outside of the windows. Discussion followed regarding the lighting provided by the front façade sconces and the possible extension of the wrought iron railing into the existing walkway.

Bender recommended that the Commission address the front and rear facades independently.

Kessloff provided photographs documenting the natural progression of the front façade to the current 1950 façade noting that if the District were to be resurveyed the structure would be contributing. Kessloff expressed her concern with the loss of the 1950 façade. Anderson thanked Kessloff for her photographic contributions of the building.

In response to a question from Krull, Anderson indicated that the owner prefers the look of the recessed façade noting that it will bring a new interest element to the downtown area. In response to a question from Krull, Burns indicated that the awning will extend out approximately eight feet.

Bulman addressed the concerns of the State Historic Preservation Office with the current “contributing” classification of the structure noting that they are considering submitting the structure for review and possible reclassification to “non-contributing”.

Kessloff indicated that the Standards state that a structure provides a physical record of a specific time. Discussion followed regarding the structure’s period of significance.

Dennis stated that this is a new construction review and addressed the elements that should be considered. Dennis encouraged the retention of the current character defining setback. Bender indicated that the only identifiable historic element of the structure is the recessed setback. Discussion followed regarding the remaining historically significant elements of the structure.

**Krull moved to recommend a finding that the demolition of the 9 feet 7 inches of the front façade back to the 1925 storefront and the reconstruction of a new storefront in the location of the 1925 storefront as reflected in the Front Façade rendering on the property located at 510 Main Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. Matson seconded the motion.**

Kessloff expressed concern that approval of the demolition of the 1950 façade could establish a precedent. Bender indicated that the documentation of the original setback establishes the criteria for approving the request and does not establish a precedent. Anderson indicated that he is unaware of any other structure in the downtown area that has a documented recessed front façade suggesting that approval of the request should not establish a precedent.

Pier indicated her intention to abstain from the vote due to the concerns associated with the disposition of the 1950 façade.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Anderson addressed the ADA accessibility issues and logistic issues associated with the reconstruction of the original stair entrance. Kessloff suggested that the ADA accessibility issues could be addressed using the rear entrance. Anderson addressed the impact the original stair entrance would have on both the exterior and interior of the structure. Discussion continued.

In response to a question, Anderson addressed the manner in which the adjacent facades would be repaired once they are exposed by the removal of the 1950 façade.

Bulman indicated that the State Historic Preservation Office is interested in the Commission's comments regarding the request to demolish the 1950 façade and the reconstruction of the new façade.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Dennis indicated that the contributing feature is the original recessed setback noting that this is a unique issue. Dennis stated that the 1950 storefronts can be lost unless the Downtown Historic District is resurveyed and updated to reflect the structures as contributing.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the demolition of the 9 feet 7 inches of the front façade back to the 1925 storefront and the reconstruction of a new storefront in the location of the 1925 storefront as reflected in the Front Façade rendering on the property located at 510 Main Street will have no adverse effect on historic property carried with Roseland, Grable, Krull, Matson, Baumgartner and Bender voting Yes, none voting No and Kessloff and Pier Abstaining (6-0-2).**

Anderson indicated that the rear façade would utilize the same material and color design as the front façade noting that the rear awning would extend into the alley right-of-way and is not included with this application. In response to a question from Bender, Anderson indicated that there would be no alteration to the size of the door and window rough openings. Bulman recommended that the motion clarify the window design.

**Pier moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the refurbishing of the rear façade as reflected in the Rear Façade rendering, including the redesign of the rear windows, on the property located at 510 Main Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

#### 518 7<sup>th</sup> Street (10CM029)

Orris presented the application to approve the construction of a landing and handrails between the 518 and 520 7<sup>th</sup> Street properties. Orris indicated that the landing is required due to the significant elevation differences between the two properties and provides patrons with an interior walkway between the two businesses.

In response to a question from Krull, Orris indicated that the International Building Code specifies the size of the landing noting that railing spindles are not required and will not be installed.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Orris indicated that the flooring is a rough finish marble.

**Krull moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the construction of a landing with handrails for the internal access between the 518 7<sup>th</sup> Street and 520 7<sup>th</sup> Street properties to comply with the safety guidelines required under the International Building Code on the property located at 518 7<sup>th</sup> Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

6<sup>th</sup> Street Reconstruction (10CM028)

Tech presented the request to reconstruct the Sixth Street Right of Way from Omaha Street south to Kansas City Street. Tech stated that the street section will not change from its current design noting that water lines will be replaced, minor sewer improvements will be completed and the storm sewer will be upgraded. Tech indicated that the sidewalk design will be the same as Kansas City Street with the exception of the dedicated bike lane which will be incorporated into the driving lane.

Tech addressed the design elements of the project including ADA access improvements, landscaping areas, new street and pedestrian lighting, and utilization of banded color concrete. Tech indicated that seven basements encroach into the 6<sup>th</sup> Street right of way noting that three of the basements will be filled in. Tech indicated that the basements are being addressed in response to the liability concerns outlined by the City Attorney's office.

Tech addressed the installation of the rain guards, the retention of the Alex Johnson loading zone, and the replacement of the Alex Johnson access hatch in compliance with current safety standards. Tech indicated that the Main Street and St. Joseph Street intersections will not be impacted by the reconstruction project. Tech reviewed the split sidewalk design on the east side of Prairie Edge noting that an ADA access ramp will be installed on the north end of the sidewalk. Tech indicated that a pedestrian crossing will be installed on 6<sup>th</sup> Street at the Milo Barber Center noting that a street clock will be installed at the Center.

In response to a question from Matson, Tech indicated that traffic studies are being conducted regarding providing a dedicated pedestrian only crossing and its resulting impact on traffic flows.

In response to a question from Krull, Tech reviewed the reasons for the retention of four of the right of way basements. Bender indicated that historically these were not basements but access to lower level stores.

Kessloff indicated that the Pipe and Knuckle design was historically used for railings and recommended the design be utilized for the Prairie Edge railing. Discussion followed regarding the Prairie Edge railing design and code requirements for railings more than 30 inches off the ground. Krull voiced support for the Pipe and Knuckle railing design. Tech indicated that staff would review the height requirements with regard to the Pipe and Knuckle railing design.

In response to a question from Krull, Tech addressed the grading issues with regard to the two level sidewalk at Prairie Edge. Bender encouraged adherence to the ADA requirements with regard to the trench grading. Discussion followed regarding utilizing a timeless design to prevent the project from becoming dated.

**Krull moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the reconstruction of the Sixth Street Right-Of-Way extending from Omaha Street south to Kansas City Street will have no adverse effect on historic property with the stipulation**

**that the Prairie Edge sidewalk railing be a Pipe and Knuckle design in black color with horizontal cabling utilized to address code requirements should it be necessary.**

In response to a question from Bareis, Bender indicated that the pipe railing color is to be black and recommended that the Rapid City Fruit building railing be utilized as a design guide.

#### Main Street Square Presentation

Senftner provided a brief introduction of the project noting that Dale Lamphere will be providing the artistic emphasis for the project.

Heikes provided an informal presentation of the project noting the input received from the Commission's Subcommittee regarding design elements. Heikes addressed the utilization of the first level of the parking garage for the mechanical room and public restrooms. In response to a question from Dennis, Heikes indicated that the parking garage awnings would be retractable by remote control.

Heikes addressed the placement of significant stone elements in the right of way depicting the Badlands and Black Hills. In response to concerns voiced by the Commission, Heikes indicated that the stone elements are classified as art under the 11.1 Review process. Lamphere addressed the cultural integrity of the stone tapestries and his efforts to create elements that are intrinsic to the area.

Heikes provided a brief overview of the facility noting that the Sears building improvements are private and are not the charge of Main Street Square at this time. Discussion followed regarding the pedestrian flow and access through the park, artistic contributions and the impact of the stone tapestries on the historic view shed.

Heikes indicated that Main Street Square holds the position that the stone tapestries are art which is viewed differently under the 11.1 Review process. Discussion followed regarding scheduling a meeting between Main Street Square and the State Historic Preservation Office to discuss the tapestry elements prior to the completion of the design drawings.

#### Other Business

Costello expressed his appreciation for the Commission members work on the 11.1 Reviews noting that abstention from voting should be done only when there is a conflict of interest. Costello recommended that the conflict be clarified prior to any discussion on the application and that the member refrain from participating in the discussions.

#### Approval of Minutes

**Krull moved, Pier seconded and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the July 2, 2010 meeting.**

#### Treasurer's Report

**Baumgartner moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to approve the Rapid City Journal On-Line Ad in the amount of \$27.05.**

#### Adjourn

**There being no further business, Baumgartner moved, Krull seconded and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 9:45 a.m.**

MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
August 6, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scott Sogge, Jean Kessloff, Richard Grable, Tamara Pier, Shawn Krull, Duane Baumgartner, Michael Bender

OTHERS PRESENT: Harry Christianson, Craig Christianson, Kris Bjerke, Doug Noyes, Kim Noyes, Michelle Dennis, Alan Hanks, Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

Call to Order

Sogge called the meeting to order at 7:32 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Agenda

**Baumgartner moved, Pier seconded and carried unanimously to approve the meeting agenda as presented.**

415 Main Street (10CM030)

Bjerke presented the request to renovate the interior of the 415 Main Street structure from an auto parts store to an office facility. Bjerke indicated that the new interior office walls would be glass to maintain the open space appearance, that ceiling skylights would be installed to allow more natural light into the building interior, that the elevator hoist would be retained and converted into a small conference area and the raised area to the rear of the building would be converted to offices. Bjerke indicated that no changes are proposed for the building exterior with the exception of signage that will be presented at a later date. In response to a question, H. Christianson indicated that the elevator hoist would remain operational.

In response to a question from Krull, Bjerke indicated that the existing ceiling materials will be replaced with an acoustical drop down tile to permit access to the new mechanical/duct work. In response to a question from Krull, H. Christianson indicated that the exposed brick will remain exposed. In response to a question from Krull, Bjerke indicated that the railing to the raised area would be replaced as it does not meet current Building Code requirements.

In response to a question from Krull, Bjerke indicated that no changes are proposed for the building exterior with the exception of a future change in signage. H. Christianson indicated that one of the Parts Central signs has been given to the previous owner noting that the second sign does not meet code requirements and will be removed. H. Christianson indicated that a plaque will be placed on the building identifying the date of the renovation.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Bjerke indicated that new drop down ceiling tiles will be installed to provide better service access to the new mechanical/duct work. Bjerke addressed the poor condition of the existing ceiling tiles and their inability to meet the acoustical demands of an office environment. Bjerke indicated that the existing florescent lighting will be replaced due to its inability to provide adequate lighting for the office environment. H. Christianson indicated that the light fixtures are available for donation to anyone wanting them.

Kessloff indicated that the defining features of an art deco building are the ceiling lights and ceiling tiles noting that only three art deco buildings remain in the City. Kessloff encouraged the retention of the lights and tiles if at all possible given their importance to the art deco design. Discussion followed regarding the status of the existing ceiling tiles and the impact the new drop

ceiling would have on the street view into the building. Kessloff commented on the ceiling recommendations outlined in the Preservation Briefs. C. Christianson addressed the safety issues associated with a portion of the existing light fixtures. Discussion followed regarding the proposed drop ceiling.

In response to a question from Krull, Bjerke indicated that all interior walls will be glass for the purpose of maintaining the open space atmosphere. In response to a question from Krull, Bjerke indicated that if the florescent lights can be refurbished and if they are not the main source of lighting an attempt would be made to incorporate them into the reception area.

Pier indicated that the project is exciting and will be an improvement to the downtown area noting her support for the use of the florescent lighting in the reception area in addition to proper lighting for work needs.

H. Christianson indicated that due to the glass walls, blinds will be utilized to provide privacy for the offices noting that the art deco accents will be incorporated where possible.

In response to a question from Dennis, Bulman reviewed the National Register Nomination. Dennis supported reflecting the art deco design in the reception area and recommended concentrating on what can be saved while finding a way to create a usable space.

Elkins indicated that while the exterior is art deco design the interior is industrial design. Elkins addressed the information provided by the State Historic Preservation Office regarding adaptive reuse. Elkins suggested that the Commission concentrate on the features being retained such as the elevator hoist and second floor area.

In response to a question from Elkins, Bjerke indicated that the interior details have not been finalized. Elkins suggested that the Commission approve the remodel concept with the understanding that the reception area material details will be submitted under a separate application when finalized.

**Krull moved to recommend a finding that the conversion of the interior office space including the removal of the existing interior walls and the addition of new interior glass walls on the property located at 415 Main Street will have no adverse effect on historic property with the stipulation that the details of the interior lobby finish including ceiling finish will be submitted under a separate application for formal review. Grable seconded the motion.**

In response to a question from Bender, H. Christianson indicated that the height and pitch of the skylights have not been finalized noting that they should not be visible from the street view. H. Christianson indicated that the intent of the skylights is to provide natural light to the building interior. Bender encouraged the applicant to keep the skylight pitch and height as low as possible. C. Christianson addressed their advocacy for Rapid City and historic preservation noting their intent is to create a building that will complement, not detract, from the downtown area. C. Christianson indicated their willingness to submit a separate application when the lobby design has been finalized.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Elkins clarified that the lobby area drop ceiling would be an element of the separate application.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the conversion of the interior office space including the removal of the existing interior walls and the addition of new interior glass walls on the property located at 415 Main Street will have no adverse effect on historic property with the stipulation that the details of the interior lobby finish including ceiling finish will be submitted under a separate application for formal review carried unanimously.**

1213 Clark Street (10RS016)

D. Noyes presented the request to construct a new residential structure on the Clark Street property. D. Noyes briefly addressed the history of the property and the vacation of the right-of-way along the rear property line noting that a “no build” easement has been placed on the area due to the unstable soils. D. Noyes indicated that the final structure elevations would be subject to the elevations required to support a gravity feed sewer. D. Noyes reviewed the photographs providing the view shed from the subject property to all adjacent properties.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Dennis indicated that the property is in the West Boulevard Historic District and therefore falls under the infill guidelines.

**Pier moved to recommend a finding that the construction of a new residential structure on the property located at 1213 Clark Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. Grable seconded the motion.**

Krull suggested the utilization of privacy screening between the new structure and the historic properties on the east property line to reduce the impact of the new structure on the district.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Dennis indicated that the evaluation elements would include size and scale, materials, setbacks and structure position.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the construction of a new residential structure on the property located at 1213 Clark Street will have no adverse effect on historic property carried with Kessloff abstaining.**

Elkins recommended that Kessloff clarify the conflict of interest to support the abstention vote. Pier stated that based on her research of the Commission bylaws a “conflict of interest” is not required for an individual to abstain from voting. Pier indicated that she would provide additional information on the abstention issue in the future.

Approval of Minutes

Kessloff requested that the minutes be amended to reflect that the applicant of 907 Clark Street did not object to the placement of the air conditioning unit in the rear yard. **Pier moved, Krull seconded and carried with Grable abstaining to approve the minutes of the July 16, 2010 meeting as amended.**

Treasurer's Report

Bulman addressed the current copy and postage charges assessed to the budget. Bulman advised the Commission that the 2010-2011 CLG grant has been approved and encouraged the Commission to begin working on the identified projects to insure their completion in a timely manner.

#### Emergency 11.1 Review Approved by SHPO

Bulman indicated that the application was submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office as an emergency review as the existing roof had been removed and needed to be replaced as quickly as possible. Bulman indicated that she has advised the property owner of the 11.1 Review requirements for the property.

#### West Boulevard Photo Project

Kessloff indicated that she is continuing to work on the project.

#### West Boulevard Study Committee

Elkins indicated that Goetzinger will present the final report to the September 1, 2010 Legal and Finance Committee.

#### Dakota Middle School Liaison Committee

Baumgartner addressed the architect's request for clarification regarding the removal, restoration and reinstallation of the balcony seating. Bulman indicated that the State Historic Preservation Office was contacted and the request is a permitted action as long as the restored seating is reinstalled.

In response to a question from Dennis, Elkins indicated that the architect advised that the plans would be presented to the Commission in mid-September. Baumgartner indicated that a meeting with the liaison committee has been scheduled for August 15, 2010.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Krull indicated that her concerns and comments would be presented to the architect at the August 15, 2010 meeting.

#### Main Street Square Subcommittee

Krull indicated that the Mayor, the State Historic Preservation Office and the Main Street Square Group met after the last presentation noting that the Subcommittee was not included in the meeting. Elkins indicated that it was a last minute meeting called at the Mayor's request.

Krull indicated that the decisions reached during the meeting with the State Historic Preservation Office effectively make the Subcommittee input on the project ineffective and irrelevant.

In response to a question, Bender indicated that the project should be placed for bid at the end of August with a possible construction start of November. Bender expressed concern that while the same engineering firm is working on both the 6<sup>th</sup> Street Reconstruction project and the Main Street Square project, the plans are not compatible.

#### Mt. Rushmore Road Corridor Study

Elkins addressed the current status of the study noting that the study has been completed and the Final Report approved. Elkins suggested that the item be removed from the Subcommittee list. **Krull moved, Baumgartner seconded and carried unanimously to remove the Mt Rushmore Road Corridor Study from the Subcommittee list.**

#### Skyline Drive Rock Guardrails

In response to a question, Elkins indicated that the City has been unable to secure funding for the restoration of the Skyline Drive rock guardrails. Krull indicated that he has asked a contact



of his who specializes in restoration of these types of structures to evaluate the guardrails and provide information regarding the type and cost of restoration required. Discussion followed.

Other Business

Kessloff indicated that the grandson of Valentine McGillicuddy will be in Rapid City August 19-21, 2010.

Adjourn

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:58 a.m.

MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
September 3, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Pat Roseland, Jean Kessloff, Richard Grable, Tamara Pier, Shawn Krull, Cynthia Matson, Duane Baumgartner, Michael Bender, Eric James, Bonny Petersen, Council Liaison

OTHERS PRESENT: James Van Nuys, Beth Palmer, Vicki Boll, Marcia Elkins, Sharlene Mitchell

Call to Order

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:32 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Agenda

The following item was added to the agenda:

- Treasurer's Report – National Trust for Historic Preservation Membership \$20

**Matson moved, James seconded and carried unanimously to approve the meeting agenda as amended.**

516 Sixth Street (10CM032)

Van Nuys presented the request to remove the existing transom and replace it with clear glass. Van Nuys indicated that the existing glass is a safety hazard noting that the clear glass transom will allow more natural light into the building interior and improve the visual appearance of the store façade.

Roseland presented historic photographs of the 516 Sixth Street building noting that the historic district survey indicates that the original transom has been altered.

Van Nuys indicated that the current condition of the transom is a safety hazard. In response to a question from Pier, Van Nuys indicated that the vent is non-functioning. In response to a question from James, Van Nuys indicated that the new transom would match the store front design.

Kessloff stated that the altered transom has gained historic value in its own right, noting that there are grant programs available that could assist with the transom restoration.

Bender suggested that the alteration referenced in the history survey is most likely the vent penetration noting that this is a minor alteration. Bender indicated that if the vent is non-functioning it can be removed and the glass restored. Discussion followed regarding the availability of stain glass artisans with both stain/lead glass and structural restoration disciplines.

Roseland indicated that it would be necessary to remove the transom should restoration be feasible. Matson briefly noted the documentation requirements of the Deadwood grant.

Van Nuys indicated that the offset transom design detracts from the building. Discussion followed regarding allowing the transom to be removed and restored and the Commission members researching grant programs for financial assistance with the project.

Kessloff indicated that a local stain glass artist has volunteered to inspect the transom with regard to the feasibility of its restoration and recommended that the application be continued to the September 17, 2010 meeting.

Palmer indicated that the artist in question is not familiar with the structural issues associated with the transom.

Bender commented on the downtown buildings that have glass fronts installed over existing transoms for energy efficiency and encouraged Van Nuys to consider that option. Bender expressed his opinion that the transom glass is original to the structure. Discussion followed regarding the possible redesign of the storefront resulting in the offset transom.

**Kessloff moved to continue the 516 Sixth Street application to the September 17, 2010 meeting to allow for further research on the restoration and stabilization of the transom, to allow further research on the history of the transom and to allow the Commission to research grant programs to assist financially with the restoration project. Krull seconded the motion.**

Krull indicated that he would contact a second stain glass artist regarding inspection of the transom.

**The motion to continue the 516 Sixth Street application to the September 17, 2010 meeting to allow for further research on the restoration and stabilization of the transom, to allow further research on the history of the transom and to allow the Commission to research grant programs to assist financially with the restoration project carried with Kessloff, Pier, Krull, Baumgartner and Bender voting Yes and Roseland, Grable, Matson and James voting No.**

Discussion followed regarding researching the Deadwood grant program. Pier indicated that the available options for the transom project included replacement, cover in place, and remove, restore and replace.

#### 621 Sixth Street (10CM033)

Boll presented the application to install three awnings over the rear entrance doors to the United Way Building. Boll provided an example of the bracket that will hold the awnings in place. Boll indicated that this is a new building located within the environs of the individually listed City Library building.

**Krull moved, James seconded and carried unanimously to recommend a finding that the installation of three awnings over the rear entrance doors on the property located at 621 Sixth Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

#### Approval of Minutes

**Krull moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the August 6, 2010 meeting.**

#### Treasurer's Report

Mitchell reviewed the Treasurer's report noting the OfficeMax and National Trust billings. **Krull moved, Matson seconded and carried unanimously to approve the OfficeMax billing of**

**\$9.79, the National Trust membership billing of \$20.00 and the Treasurer's report as presented.**

New Business

Roseland indicated that he would contact Goetzinger regarding attending a future Commission meeting to discuss the recommendations of the Report and the actions taken by City Council. In response to a question, Elkins indicated that the Council would take action on the Report at the September 7, 2010 meeting.

Discussion followed regarding the report recommendations and effective methods for quantifying the Commission's progress on those recommendations. Elkins recommended that the Commission schedule a special meeting for the Goetzinger discussion given the issues that need to be reviewed.

Pier recommended that a facilitated meeting to be scheduled to provide a structured discussion on the Report, the adopted Comprehensive Plan and the implementation processes.

In response to a question, Elkins indicated that the Report is on the consent calendar for "acknowledgement" only. Elkins noted that the Report can be pulled from the consent calendar for individual discussion. Discussion followed regarding the Commission working with Goetzinger regarding the recommendations contained in the report. In response to a question, Elkins clarified that this is not the final report of the Historic Study Commission, rather an interim report.

Commissioner Timesheet Report

Mitchell presented the summary of timesheets submitted by the Commission.

Other Business

Roseland welcomed James to the Commission. James provided a brief summary of his professional qualifications. Mitchell requested that James provide a resume for grant purposes.

Roseland welcomed Petersen to the Commission as Council Liaison.

Kessloff encouraged the members to commit the time necessary to thoroughly review and research the 11.1 applications and to follow the Comprehensive Plan when making recommendations on the applications.

Adjourn

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 a.m.

MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
September 17, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scott Sogge, Pat Roseland, Jean Kessloff, Richard Grable, Tamara Pier, Shawn Krull, Cynthia Matson, Duane Baumgartner, Michael Bender, Eric James, Bonny Petersen, Council Liaison

OTHERS PRESENT: James Van Nuys, Beth Palmer, Brian Bade, Eirik Heikes, Dan Senftner, Bob Fuchs, Rod Johnson, Alan Hanks, Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Sharlene Mitchell

Call to Order

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

Approval of Meeting Agenda

The following item was added to the agenda:

- New Business – Goetzinger meeting

**Baumgartner moved, Sogge seconded and carried unanimously to approve the meeting agenda as amended.**

516 Sixth Street (10CM032)

Van Nuys indicated that the removal and replacement of the existing transom with clear glass will bring more natural light into the building interior noting that the existing transom is unattractive and a safety issue. Van Nuys indicated that should restoration of the transom be required, the project would be referred to the building owner. He expressed his concern with the possible requirement to protect an unattractive and inappropriate addition. Van Nuys presented a photograph to support his position that the original transom design was three clear glass windows.

Bade voiced his support for the Van Nuys proposal noting that the transom is unstable and a safety issue.

Pier and Krull entered the meeting at 7:33 a.m.

Bade stated that he felt the stained glass transom is not original to the building and that, as this is the last Italianate structure constructed in the area, installation of the clear glass transom would be more appropriate with the original appearance.

Kessloff presented her research of the project, noting that she has been unable to obtain a cost estimate to restore the stain glass at this time. Kessloff indicated that Viall has inspected the transom to determine what can be done to stabilize the structure.

James indicated that the applicant has provided acceptable photographic evidence that the existing transom is not original to the building. Kessloff indicated that, while the existing transom may not be original, it has gained historic significance in its own right.

Peterson entered the meeting at 7:35 a.m.

**Baumgartner moved, James seconded and carried with Kessloff voting No to recommend a finding that the removal of the existing stain/leaded glass transom and**

**replacement with a three pane clear glass transom on the property located at 516 Sixth Street will have no adverse effect on historic property.**

Bender entered the meeting at 7:38 a.m.

Main Street Square (10CM034)

Heikes presented the request to construct the Main Street Square at the northeast intersection of Main Street and Sixth Street. Heikes complemented and thanked the Historic Preservation Subcommittee for their assistance and input on the project.

Heikes provided a review of the site improvements including the expansion of the garden areas into the right-of-way, the addition of the Native American color wheel and waterfall. Heikes addressed the manner in which the Subcommittee's concerns with the size and mass of the garden areas have been addressed. Heikes indicated that the spire heights have been reduced to comply with the Secretary of Interior Standards height requirements noting that the materials for the garden-scapes will be provided from local quarries.

Heikes indicated that the improvements to the Parking Garage will reflect and complement the historic aspect of the structure noting that eight foot retractable canopies will be installed on the south side of the structure.

Krull complemented FourFront for the design work on the project.

**Krull moved to recommend a finding that the construction of the Main Street Square and the remodel of the Parking Garage on the property located at the northeast corner of Main Street and Sixth Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. James seconded the motion.**

Kessloff stated that the purpose of a Main Street Square has always been to create a City's own sense of place and history. Kessloff stated that the design focuses on the surrounding geographical features not on the history and development of the City itself noting that rocks and spires are not natural to the downtown area. Kessloff stated that she cannot support the design as it does not respect the City's history and the mass and scale of the project are not in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

Roseland indicated that the design is appropriate noting the impact the Black Hills had on the development of both Rapid City and the surrounding communities. Krull indicated that due to the proximity to the Black Hills and the Badlands, tourism has been a prominent economic force in the development of Rapid City noting that the design addresses that influence.

In response to a question from Pier, Heikes indicated that the height of the spires is 10% lower than the Prairie Edge parapets in accordance with the Secretary of Interior Standards. Matson addressed the input provided by the Subcommittee and the manner in which the design group incorporated those recommendations into the final design of the Square. Grable commented on the volume of public input the project has received.

Heikes addressed the incorporation of the Lamphere's artistic input on the project. In response to a question from Pier, Heikes indicated that the garden walls are utilized to reduce the impact of sound on the Square and to provide privacy for visitors to the Square.

Bender indicated that during the project review he was not contacted by the Commission members regarding concerns with the project noting that if there were concerns they should have been voiced earlier in design phase.

James indicated that the Black Hills and Badlands are physical elements which have been present in the area much longer than Rapid City.

Peterson thanked Kessloff for her comments on the project. James requested clarification of the Commission's responsibilities with regard to the project. Bender indicated that the initial concerns focused on the size and scale of the spires and their impact on the historic view shed to and from the Square and complemented the efforts to reduce the overall impact of the spires. Bender indicated that the Subcommittee addressed the collaborative efforts between the Subcommittee and the design group on all aspects of the project noting that the adverse comments are unfair to the project designers.

Kessloff indicated that she had presented her concerns to the Subcommittee noting that in her opinion there was a lack of communication between the Commission and the Subcommittee. Kessloff recommended that the Commission refer to the Secretary of Interior Standards when making a final decision on the project.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the construction of the Main Street Square and the remodel of the Parking Garage on the property located at the northeast corner of Main Street and Sixth Street will have no adverse effect on historic property carried with Kessloff voting No.**

Matson left the meeting at 8:00 a.m.

622 Main Street (10CM035)

Fuchs presented the request to remodel the interior of the second floor suite of the 622 Main Street property noting that the interior of the west suite has been gutted by the former owner. Fuchs indicated that the existing carpeting will be removed and the existing oak flooring refinished, that a wainscot ceiling will be installed and the walls will be sheet rocked. Fuchs indicated that a future project will address improvements to the basement area.

**Kessloff moved to recommend a finding that the remodel of the second floor suites including refurbishing the existing oak flooring and retention of the existing skylights and existing second floor railing on the property located at 622 Main Street will have no adverse effect on historic property. James seconded the motion.**

Discussion followed regarding the refinishing of the oak flooring, the skylights and the second floor railing.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the remodel of the second floor suites including refurbishing the existing oak flooring and retention of the existing skylights and existing second floor railing on the property located at 622 Main Street will have no adverse effect on historic property carried unanimously.**

1701 Mt Rushmore Road (10CM036)

Johnson presented the request to reroof the Wilson Park gazebo. Johnson indicated that the gazebo was constructed during the 1990's and is not historic to the park. Johnson stated that an asphalt architectural shingle of the same color would be installed on the gazebo.

**James moved to recommend a finding that the reroofing of the Wilson Park Gazebo with asphalt architectural shingles on the property located at 1701 Mt Rushmore Road (Wilson Park) will have no adverse effect on historic property. Baumgartner seconded the motion.**

Discussion followed regarding the age of the gazebo. Sogge indicated that the site was vacant prior to the gazebo being constructed in the 1990's.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the reroofing of the Wilson Park Gazebo with asphalt architectural shingles on the property located at 1701 Mt Rushmore Road (Wilson Park) will have no adverse effect on historic property carried unanimously.**

Approval of Minutes

**Pier moved, Bender seconded and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the September 3, 2010 meeting.**

Treasurer's Report

**Baumgartner moved, James seconded and carried unanimously to approve the Rapid City Journal billing in the amount of \$10.82.**

Goetzing Meeting

Roseland indicated that Goetzing would be available to meet with the Commission on the evening of either September 22 or September 28 to discuss the recommendations of the West Boulevard Study report. The Commission recommended that the meeting with Goetzing be scheduled for Wednesday, September 22 at 5:00 p.m.

Roseland indicated that Mike Stanley has agreed to facilitate a group discussion regarding implementation of the recommendations of the West Boulevard Study report. Discussion followed regarding scheduling of the facilitated group discussion. The Commission recommended that the facilitated group discussion be scheduled for Thursday, September 30 at 5:00 p.m.

Bulman provided the following options for amending the 2010-2011 CLG Grant to fund the development of the Design Guidelines:

Option #1

	<u>Existing</u>	<u>Changes</u>	<u>Proposed</u>
Supplies	1,500.00		1,500.00
Memberships	275.00		275.00
Workshop	225.00		225.00
Historic Street Signs	1,000.00	(1,000.00)	0
Commission Training/Speaker	5,000.00	(5,000.00)	0
Public Education/Home Show	2,000.00	(1,000.00)	1,000.00
Design Guidelines (Phase I)	0	7,000.00	7,000.00
Total	10,000.00	0	10,000.00



Option #2

	<u>Existing</u>	<u>Changes</u>	<u>Proposed</u>
Supplies	1,500.00		1,500.00
Memberships	275.00		275.00
Workshop	225.00	( 225.00)	0
Historic Street Signs	1,000.00	(1,000.00)	0
Commission Training/Speaker	5,000.00	(5,000.00)	0
Public Education/Home Show	2,000.00	(2,000.00)	0
Design Guidelines (Phase I)	0	8,225.00	8,225.00
Total	10,000.00	0	10,000.00

Discussion followed regarding the proposed reallocation of grant funds. In response to a question, Elkins addressed the timeline required to reallocate the grant funding, prepare and publish the Request for Proposals, complete the consultant selection process and secure Council approval for the consultant. Elkins encouraged the Commission to move the project forward as soon as possible to insure completion of the project by the grant expiration date.

Kessloff suggested approaching the West Boulevard Association for financial assistance with the project. In response to a question, Elkins indicated that the Request for Proposals would require the consultant to outline the public input process.

Other Business

James requested clarification of the specific directions given to Subcommittees acting as liaison on special projects such as the Main Street Square project. Discussion followed regarding the responsibilities of a liaison group. Elkins clarified that the Commission cannot delegate approval authority but can empower the liaison group to make recommendations on a project.

James recommended the use of an amicus statement to provide clarification and insight into the Commission's recommendations. Kessloff encouraged the members to utilize the review form provided in the Commissioner manual when reviewing applications.

Pier left the meeting at 8:26 a.m.

Discussion followed regarding the review process. Bender stated that the Commission is a recommending body only, noting that the State Historic Preservation Office can support or overturn a recommendation of the Commission.

Krull commented on the quality of contact the Main Street Square Subcommittee was afforded, noting that the Dakota Middle School Subcommittee has not been afforded the same level of outreach. Elkins indicated that she would contact the Rapid City Schools to schedule a meeting with Subcommittee members Baumgartner, Roseland and Krull.

Commissioners Timesheet Report

Bulman encouraged the Commissioners to submit their timesheets on a monthly basis.

Other Business

Elkins announced that Mitchell has accepted a position with the City Finance Office and thanked Mitchell for her work with the Commission. In response to a question, Elkins indicated that she and Bulman would provide support to the Commission in the interim.

In response to a question from Baumgartner, Bulman indicated that she would review the Alex Johnson application to determine if the approval included the installation of an elevator and bar on the top floor.

Adjourn

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:33 a.m.

Minutes of the  
Special Historic Preservation Commission Meeting  
September 28, 2010

Members Present: Eric James, Tamara Pier, Pat Roseland, Shawn Krull, Duane Baumgartner, Jean Kessloff, Mike Bender

Others Present: Marcia Elkins, Bill Kessloff, Michelle Dennis and Pat Goetzinger

Roseland called the meeting to order at 5:45 pm.

Goetzinger presented the Historic District Study Commission's Interim Report and recommendations.

In response to Pier, Goetzinger indicated that he felt that developing the design guidelines and shifting to local control can aid in shifting the paradigm as recommended in the report.

Discussion followed about how such a change is measured in a tangible manner. Discussion followed regarding how the vocal few had expressed objections to the Historic Preservation Commission's activities at the June public meeting. Discussion continued regarding the 62 option, the overlap with the 11.1 process and the requirement for an application to go through both the State process and the Local process. Discussion continued on the number of historic structures in the district as well as the number of members in the West Boulevard Association.

Roseland reminded the Commission that the West Boulevard Association is a neighborhood association and not a preservation organization. Discussion followed on the West Boulevard Association's purpose going beyond historic preservation and the West Boulevard Association being a barometer for the neighborhood's opinion of issues affecting the area.

Discussion continued on how an ordinance and design guidelines might be developed and support might be gained from the neighborhood.

In response to a question from Krull, Goetzinger confirmed that there is confusion in the neighborhood as to the roles of the Historic Preservation Commission and the West Boulevard Association. Discussion followed on the education needed, the responsibilities of owning property in the Historic District, how design guidelines might be developed and distributed and the enforcement process under both the existing regulations and the local regulations.

In response to a question from Krull, Goetzinger indicated that he anticipated that design guidelines would be narrower requirements developed specifically for the neighborhood. James indicated that the design guidelines would provide "helpful clarification and guidance." Discussion continued.

Goetzinger indicated that he would like to see the City or someone get serious about finding a grant or other funding source to hire someone to work full time on preservation issues. He expressed a hope that the historic preservation person would address issues in the Downtown

District as well as the West Boulevard District. Goetzinger indicated that he did not want to see the 62 Option rest on whether or not a staff member was hired.

Roseland raised the option of reallocating the State Historic Preservation Grant to retain a consultant to work on developing the design guidelines.

Pier indicated that she felt that it is crucial to provide an outside consultant guiding the process.

Roseland indicated that the Commission should also be introducing themselves to the community and building support.

Pier indicated that she hoped the consultant would bring forward suggestions on how the public input could be obtained.

Krull expressed support for separating the roles of those developing the rules and those adjudicated.

Discussion continued on how a consultant might accomplish the goals of developing guidelines and how the 11.1 Review Process would relate to the review under the 62 Option.

B. Kessloff indicated that the State Office of History has put together a law review committee that will be reviewing the State statutes related to Historic Preservation and indicated that he would be working with the Committee. He suggested that the law review committee may make changes to the State Statutes.

Pier noted that the 62 Option process will only be implemented if the design guidelines are embraced by the property owners. Goetzinger confirmed Pier's comments.

James noted the need for inclusion of the West Boulevard Association in the consultant's work so as to not spring anything on the neighborhood. Goetzinger reiterated his suggestion that the development of the design guidelines be used to talk about an ordinance implementing the 62 Option.

Pier noted that the RFP should request that the consultant include a consensus building process as part of the process of developing the design guidelines.

Krull indicated that the Secretary of Interior's website contained extensive information about the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and provided additional design guidelines. Discussion followed.

Roseland noted that the Preservation Commission must convince the West Boulevard residents of the benefits of preservation to convince them to buy into the process.

J Kessloff commented on the role of the Secretary of Interior's standards and specific guidelines for the style of the buildings in Rapid City and the materials available locally.

Discussion continued on the need for a consultant contract to address commission training and education and outreach.

Pier suggested that if the Historic Preservation Commission demonstrated that they are taking the report to heart and hiring a consultant to work on the design guidelines, then there may be the possibility of obtaining additional funds from the City as well as the opportunity for additional grant funding.

Bender noted that the Commission would need \$20,000 to \$30,000 to implement a public participation plan of the scope being discussed. Additional discussion followed regarding the scope of work, the public input required, the potential for additional State or City funding and the development of design guidelines and the reallocation of the existing grant funds.

**James moved to proceed with reallocating the grant funds in accordance with Option 2 and to request that staff begin developing a Scope of Work for a Request for Proposals for the development of design guidelines as recommended by the Historic District Study Commission. The motion was seconded by Pier.**

Bender expressed concern with the need for funding the Home Show to continue the public outreach. Discussion continued on the funding options, public outreach and the benefit of the Home Show

**James accepted a friendly amendment to accept Option 1B to retain \$2000 for the Home Show and reallocate \$6000 for the consultant contract. Pier concurred with the friendly amendment.**

Discussion continued.

Goetzinger left the meeting at this time.

Additional discussion continued on funding the consultant contract, the Preservation Month activities, the public outreach process and the reallocation and consultant selection process.

**The motion to proceed with reallocating the grant funds in accordance with Option 1B to retain \$2000 for the Home Show and reallocate \$6000 for the consultant contract and to request that staff begin developing a Scope of Work for a Request for Proposals for the development of design guidelines as recommended by the Historic District Study Commission was approved unanimously.**

**Baumgartner moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Pier and approved unanimously.**

Roseland adjourned the meeting.

Minutes of the October 1, 2010  
Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present: Jean Kessloff, Duane Baumgartner, Pat Roseland, Cynthia Mattson, Eric James, Mike Bender, Scott Sogge

Others Present: Bonnie Peterson, Marcia Elkins, Douglas Bradley, Mason Thorson, Gene Williams, Brad Dudley, Dan Claymore, Darwin Buus, Jr., Rev. Bob Evans, Robert Martin, Brian Cheborad, Bill Barber, Todd Peckosh, Matt Freidel and Doug Jones

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:30 am.

Approval of Meeting Agenda

Roseland requested that an item entitled "Legal and Finance Discussion of 516 6<sup>th</sup> Street Window Replacement" be added under New Business.

**Mattson moved to approve the agenda as amended. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.**

11.1 Review of 710 Kansas City Street (10CM037)

B. Dudley reviewed the proposed window replacement at the First Presbyterian Church noting that this project is a continuation of the window replacement project approved previously.

**Motion by Baumgartner and second by James to recommend a finding that the Window Replacement (61 windows) at 710 Kansas City Street has no adverse impact.**

Kessloff expressed her concerns with the use of fiberglass window replacement and referred to her previous objections to the original project. She expressed her opinion that the windows negatively impacted the historic building and have a negative impact on the aesthetics of the building.

Evans reminded the Commission that the building is not on the National Register and is being reviewed because it borders the Downtown Historic District. He commented on the benefits of energy conservation and the importance of the window replacement and other improvements to provide the Church with the ability to stay in its downtown location. In response to a question, Evans indicated that the original building was constructed in 1951 and the additional wing shown in the photograph was constructed between 1958 and 1960.

Bender noted the difference between the original window and the replacement windows and the difference in the appearance as evidenced by the photograph. He expressed concern with the impact on the building and indicated that the building is eligible to be listed on the National Register.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Evans indicated that he had spoken to representatives from Pella and Warren Window and that they had indicated that there is no external grid that is currently available for their application that is appropriate for the weather conditions experienced at this location. He noted his ongoing support for historic preservation in numerous communities including the efforts to preserve and maintain the building in question.

Barber encouraged the Commission to support the window replacement project noting the Church's efforts to be more energy efficient and to protect the building.

Elkins reminded the Commission that the building is located in the environs and that they had recommended approval of the first phase of the window project.

James noted the consideration given to the building being located outside the district and the previous approval granted for the initial phase of the window project. He encouraged the Commission to support the project noting the effort to improve the energy efficiency of the building and upgrade the existing structure.

Kessloff indicated that this was an example of the difficulty the Commission has in making decisions without having the materials in front of the Commission when they make decisions on applications.

**Motion carried 5-2 (Mattson, Sogge, Roseland, Baumgartner, James voting aye and Bender and Kessloff voting nay.)**

#### 11.1 Review of 315 Rapid Street (10CM038)

Brad Dudley presented the request to demolish the wooden storage building located at 315 Rapid Street. He noted that the building is located within 50 feet of an individually listed building; however, he indicated that he had a survey of the site that identified the building as being 50.02 feet from the property located on the National Register. He indicated that the building is being used for storage. Dudley stated that the owners are requesting approval to demolish the building due to the concerns with the condition of the building, the issue of vagrants sleeping under the building and concerns with fire and possible impact on adjoining historic properties.

Williams indicated that the building was originally constructed as a lumber storage building. He noted that other similar buildings had been removed from the site in the 1960's at the request of the City due to their poor condition. He indicated that the building has no plumbing and no heating. He requested that the Commission recommend approval of the demolition of the building.

**Motion by Mattson and second by James to recommend a finding that the demolition of the wood storage building at 315 Rapid Street will have no adverse impact.**

Kessloff reviewed her research of the 1930's Sanborn maps of the property and expressed her opinion that the building is in good condition and not in imminent danger of falling down. Kessloff stated that the building is worth saving.

Mattson expressed her opinion that the goals of the Preservation Commission are to preserve history of the community and encourage businesses to locate in the downtown. She expressed her belief that the Commission's role is to assist businesses in improving their property and that the Commission must be careful not to freeze the downtown in place and make it impractical for businesses.

In response to a question from Kessloff, Dudley indicated that the property would be used for parking for now.

Kessloff suggested the building could be eligible for tax credits for an adaptive reuse of the structure.

Dudley indicated that he was aware of the tax credits.

Elkins asked for a copy of the survey and indicated that she would be reviewing the issue with the State noting that she was not certain if the demolition of the building was required to go through the review process. She suggested that the Commission continue with their review and make a recommendation so that the applicant would not have to come back to the Commission in the future if the review is required.

A brief discussion followed.

Bender expressed his opinion that the structure is not as significant as many other buildings noting that it is a wooden warehouse. He suggested that it might be appropriate to preserve the building by measuring and photographing the building.

Williams indicated that they have a picture of the site from May 1929 but that the building was not in that photograph.

James expressed his opinion that the public interest of maintaining the historic character of the community has to be weighed against the private property rights. He expressed concern with the safety of the structure due to its location adjacent to other historic properties and also expressed concern with possible liability if the unsafe building is kept on the site.

Bender reiterated his position that it would be appropriate to preserve the history of the structure through photographic documentation and allow the project to proceed.

In response to a question from Bender, Dudley indicated that he agreed to provide a week to the Commission to allow Bender to document the building photographically. Additional discussion followed.

**The motion carried 6-1 (Mattson, Sogge, Roseland, Baumgartner, James and Bender voting aye and Kessloff voting nay.)**

#### 11.1 Review of 6<sup>th</sup> Street Reconstruction (10CM039)

Todd Peckosh representing the City of Rapid City requested that the Commission reconsider their previous action requiring a pipe and knuckle style railing for the guard rail to be located along the western sidewalk on 6<sup>th</sup> Street adjacent to Prairie Edge. He presented a drawing of an alternate rail design.

In response to a question from Bender, Friedel indicated that the design team had reviewed the option of including a cable railing; however, there were concerns with the safety and aesthetics associated with the cable system. He also noted the cable railing has a tendency to rust and can fail when individuals stand or sit on the cable.

Discussion followed regarding other railing applications in the downtown area including the Buell Building, alternative designs and use of cables or other designs, the ADA requirements and the aesthetics of the various designs.



Bender indicated that he felt that the design was a good compromise.

**Motion by Bender and second by James to recommend a finding that the revised railings design would have no adverse impact.**

Kessloff expressed concern with the railing design being obtrusive and negatively impacting the Prairie Edge building. She distributed pictures of other railings from Deadwood and other communities.

Discussion followed regarding the safety standards, the ADA requirements, the visual impact and the color of the railing.

**The motion approved unanimously.**

#### 11.1 Review of 924 Quincy Street (10CM040)

Dan Claymore reviewed the request to replace the shingle roof at 924 Quincy Street.

**Motion by Mattson with second by Sogge to recommend a finding that the replacement of the shingle roof on the commercial structure at 924 Quincy Street will have no adverse impact.**

Mattson accepted a friendly amendment to include both the replacement of the shingle roof and the gutters. Sogge concurred.

Discussion followed regarding the color of the shingles and the affect on the appearance of the structure. Mattson clarified that the color was not included in her motion.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the replacement of the shingle roof and gutters on the commercial structure on the structure at 924 Quincy Street will have no adverse impact carried unanimously.**

#### Approval of the Minutes

**Baumgartner moved to approve the Minutes of the September 17, 2010 meeting. The motion was seconded by James and approve unanimously.**

#### Treasurer's Report

Elkins indicated that there was no Treasurer's Report.

#### New Business

##### 516 Sixth Street - Legal and Finance Committee Review

Roseland indicated that he had reviewed the video of the Legal and Finance Committee meeting. He noted that there was confusion regarding Kessloff's presentation to the Legal and Finance Commission. He expressed concern with the perception that resulted when Kessloff spoke against the request after a 9-1 vote by the Commission on a motion to find that the removal of the window would have no adverse impact. He noted concern that the Legal and Finance Committee had been left with the impression that Kessloff was speaking on behalf of the Preservation Commission. He also noted concerns with the impression left by Kessloff's

presentation that there was conflict and friction between the State Office of History and the Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission, when that is not accurate.

Discussion continued regarding the discussion that occurred at the Legal and Finance Committee.

Mattson expressed concerns with the comments at the Legal and Finance Committee and the confusion that created for the property owner who was relying on the State's comments that the options were not economically viable.

Discussion continued.

Bender expressed concern with applicants using the safety word to justify demolition and owners allowing property to deteriorate.

Kessloff indicated that she erred in not indicating that she was representing herself rather than the Commission when she began her presentation. She commented on the misuse of the safety issue with no documentation of the building condition. Kessloff indicated that Nelson's comments on the condition of the stain glass transom were based on only one artisan and she felt additional opinions and cost estimates should be obtained.

Discussion continued on the review process and the role of the State Office of History and the local Preservation Commission and the fact that the two groups work well together. Additional discussion followed on the options of encapsulating the transom window, removing the window and rehabilitating the window. Discussion continued.

#### Old Business

#### Subcommittee Reports

Roseland remove Item # H and Item #8 from the Subcommittee Reports as the Alex Johnson project is complete. He also noted that the Sweeney house will be put on market.

#### Dakota Middle School Liaison Committee

Roseland provided a briefing on the Subcommittee's meeting with the architect. He reviewed the inclusion of a smaller theatre practice space with no permanent seating and indicated that the School District might reuse the old restored seats in the smaller theater if permanent seating is installed in the future. He noted that the plans call for the plaster to be restored and for the windows to be retained in placed. He presented information regarding the revisions to the existing central aisle and the ADA requirements, replacement of the flooring to address the heating and ventilation system and the location of the control room on the first floor. Discussion followed on the space below the stage being filled in and the other changes that would occur as part of the project.

In response to Mattson's questions, Baumgartner and Roseland indicated that they are very comfortable with the plans and information that have been provided with the exception of a few issues they are waiting on additional information from the State Office of History.

Discussion followed on the role of the Commission and its subcommittees. Kessloff stated that the Dakota Middle School Liaison Committee is not representing her. Additional discussion followed on the specific changes to the building as well as on the role of subcommittees and the members relying on subcommittees to do their work.

Adjournment

**Mattson moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.**

Roseland adjourned the meeting.

Minutes of the October 15, 2010  
Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present: Richard Grable, Duane Baumgartner, Tamara Pier, Pat Roseland, Scott Sogge, Cynthia Mattson, Shaun Krull, Eric James

Others Present: Lori Weller, Michael Pelly, David Vial, Petri Riker, Fred Thurston, Karen Bulman, Marcia Elkins

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:38 am.

632 Main Street (10CM041)

Fred Thurston reviewed the proposal to add a canopy over the doors at the building located at 632 Main Street (10CM041). Thurston indicated that he is requesting approval of two canopies over the two entrances (south and east sides) to the building and over the drive up area.

In response to a question from Krull, Thurston stated that the canopies would be fabric and he noted that the colors would match the existing structure.

**Krull moved to recommend a finding that the installation of two canopies over the existing doors (south and east sides) to the building and over the drive up area will have no adverse affect. The motion was seconded by Mattson.**

A brief discussion followed.

**The motion was approved unanimously.**

824 Columbus Street (10RS017)

Michael Pelly reviewed the corrosion of the existing decks and the proposal to enclose the existing decks with glass and metal noting the need to enclose the area.

In response to a question from Pier, Lori Weller reviewed the windows that will be installed.

Pelly noted that the building is located in the environs of the West Boulevard Historic District. Elkins commented that the building is a non-contributing structure.

**Mattson moved to recommend a finding that the enclosure of the existing balconies with glass and metal will have no adverse affect. The motion was seconded by Krull and approved unanimously.**

**Mattson moved to approve the minutes of the October 1, 2010 meeting. The motion was seconded by Sogge and approved unanimously.**

Roseland reviewed the list of existing Subcommittees. Discussion followed.

James entered the meeting at this time.

Discussion of the status of the existing Subcommittees continued.

Pier departed the meeting at this time. Roseland requested that the discussion be continued to the next meeting.

**Sogge moved to remove Item 2d 416-426 Omaha Street (Tri-State Milling Complex) from the agenda. The motion was seconded by Mattson and approved unanimously.**

Roseland requested that a discussion item be included on the next agenda regarding "Contacts with the News Media."

Roseland adjourned the meeting at 8:10 am.

Minutes of the November 5, 2010  
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission

Members Present: Pat Roseland, Tamara Pier, Duane Baumgartner, Eric James, Jean Kessloff, Michael Bender, Richard Grable, Cynthia Mattson and Shawn Krull.

Others Present: Karen Bulman, Marcia Elkins, Michelle Dennis, Dick Dempster, Kris Bjerke, Bonnie Peterson, Mike Kenton, Carol Merwin, Mason Thorson, Brad Dudley, Bill Kessloff, Susan Hixson, Darin William, Mayor Alan Hanks, Steve Morgan, Dave Kulish, Vince Braun, Bill Winter, Dick Schuelhe, Blaise Emerson, Sylvia Conrad, Wayne Gilbert, Stan Adelstein, Brad Saathoff, Larry Fuss, Gale Johnson, Kent Kennedy, Steve McCarthy and Jack Caudill.

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:30 am.

Baumgartner moved to approve the agenda as presented. The motion was seconded by Mattson and approved unanimously.

601 Columbus Street (10CM042)

Dempster reviewed the project in detail noting that this is the first phase of the project. He explained that this phase addresses the theater room, an addition to the theater itself and the energy plant.

**J. Kessloff moved to delay the consideration of the request for a sufficient amount of time to allow for forums for input from the public. There was no second.**

**Mattson moved to recommend a finding of no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by James.**

In response to a question from Krull, Dempster reviewed the displacement air system proposed to be installed into the floor system.

In response to a question from Krull, Dempster reviewed the changes made to the layout of the seating and entry based on the need to create a control room, a cry room and a sound and light lock in a vestibule. He noted that there is not adequate depth in the balcony or adequate sight lines to accommodate the control room in the balcony. He indicated that the theater consultant had indicated that the best location for the control room is under the balcony. Dempster noted that the theatre consultant has indicated that the center aisle concept has not been used in theatre designs in decades due to the affect on performances. Dempster noted that the wooden seats would be retained on both sides in the balcony.

In response to a question from J. Kessloff, Dempster indicated that the actual seats have not been selected at this time.

J. Kessloff expressed her opinion that consideration should be given to locating the control booth in the balcony. Discussion continued regarding the location of the control room and the arrangement of the seats.

In response to a question from Baumgartner, Dempster indicated that the architectural team has not heard anything back from the State Office of History staff following the conference call with the Historic Preservation Commission Subcommittee. Discussion followed.

Roseland asked for public comment.

Adelstein commented on the history of the theatre, the quality of the original construction as well as the proposed development. He commented on the existing seats noting that the seats installed currently are not the originals and have been replaced at least once. He indicated that the wooden seats do not lend themselves to the performance. Adelstein noted that he hopes the School District will maintain the structure while allowing the building to continue to function as a high quality performance facility.

Merwin asked that the Commission establish learning opportunities to allow the community to go into the theatre during a weeknight, weekend and at 4 pm during the week to tour the building and understand the proposed changes. She encouraged the Commission to involve the public.

Conrad commented on the desire to retain the beauty of the building.

Emerson commented on allowing the building to evolve while maintaining the core historic elements of the building.

B. Kessloff expressed his concern with the changes to the seats that have been proposed and commented on the need to follow the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Discussion followed.

Pier expressed her support for having at least one opportunity for the public to discuss the seating and other aspects of the project.

Discussion followed regarding the length of time that the conceptual drawings and the plans have been available to the public for comment.

Kenton indicated that the School District will open bids for the project on November 17, 2010. In response to a question, Dempster clarified that the seats are not part of the bid package. Discussion continued.

In response to a question from Roseland, Dempster indicated that the School District is seeking approval for the adaptive reuse of the theatre, the behind stage theatre support spaces and the energy plant. Discussion continued regarding the rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the structure and the character defining features. Discussion continued regarding the seating and the seating arrangement and the location of the sound booth as well as handicap accessibility to all of the facilities.

**The motion to recommend a finding of no adverse impact was approved with Baumgartner, James, Roseland, Grable, Bender and Mattson voting yes, and Kessloff, Pier and Krull voting no.**

738 St. Joseph Street (10CM044)

Johnson presented the request to demolish the non-contributing buildings at 514 and 516 Mt. Rushmore Road.

**Pier moved to recommend a finding that the demolition of the non-contributing buildings at 514 and 516 Mt. Rushmore Road will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by Krull and approved unanimously.**

312 Main Street (10CM044)

Thorson reviewed the request to remove the electrical and plumbing infrastructure and the ceiling, and to add temporary electrical services. He noted that the fire protection system will be retained.

**James moved to recommend a finding that the removal of the electrical and plumbing infrastructure and the ceiling and the addition of temporary electrical services will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by Mattson and approved unanimously.**

312 Main Street (10CM048)

Thovson reviewed the proposal to demolish the north 25 feet of the building. A brief discussion followed.

**Baumgartner moved to recommend a finding that the demolition of a portion of the contributing building would have no adverse impact noting that the owner has looked at all alternatives. The motion was seconded by Pier and approved unanimously.**

523 6<sup>th</sup> Street (10CM045)

Kennedy reviewed the proposed rehabilitation of the 10<sup>th</sup> Floor and mezzanine (11<sup>th</sup> Floor) of the Alex Johnson building.

**J. Kessloff moved to recommend a finding that the rehabilitation of the 10<sup>th</sup> Floor and Mezzanine to include the patios and increasing the height of the existing guard rail would have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by Mattson.**

Discussion continued.

**The motion was approved unanimously.**

529 Main Street (10CM046)

Bulman indicated that Steve McCarthy had to leave earlier in the meeting and had requested that this item be continued to the next meeting.

**James moved to continue the request to remodel the interior and demolish all non-bearing interior walls in the contributing building located at 529 Main Street to next meeting. The motion was seconded by Mattson and carried unanimously.**



1002 West Main Street (10CM047)

Steve Morgan presented the request to remove and relocate fuel dispensers including the underground piping on the property located within the environs of the West Boulevard District at 1002 West Main Street. A brief discussion followed.

**Pier moved to recommend a finding that the removal and relocation of the fuel dispensers including the underground piping on the property located at 1002 West Main Street will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by Grable and approved unanimously.**

701 South Street (10RS018)

Fuss reviewed the proposal to add four decks to the rear of the non-contributing buildings located within the environs of the West Boulevard District.

**Krull moved to recommend a finding that the addition of four decks to the rear of the non-contributing building located within the environs of the West Boulevard District will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by Baumgartner and carried unanimously.**

Approval of the Minutes

**Mattson moved to approve the minutes of the September 28, 2010 Special Historic Preservation Commission meeting and the October 15, 2010 Historic Preservation Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.**

Adjournment

**Mattson moved to continue the balance of the agenda to the November 19, 2010 meeting and adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by James and carried unanimously.**

Minutes of the November 19, 2010  
Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present: Pat Roseland, Richard Grable, Shawn Krull, Cynthia Matson, Scott Sogge, Tamara Pier, Duane Baumgartner, Eric James

Others Present: Bonnie Peterson, Fred Thurston, Michelle Dennis, Steve McCarthy, Marcia Elkins and Karen Bulman

Roseland called the meeting to order at 7:30 am.

**James moved to approve the agenda with the addition of “Potential Special Preservation Commission Meeting” to the agenda under new items. The motion was seconded by Krull and approved unanimously.**

**529 Main Street (10CM046)**

McCarthy reviewed the proposed changes to the exterior of the building. McCarthy outlined the proposal to replace the 1982 windows with updated replacement windows with the same appearance. He stated that they are requesting to repair the glass covering the leaded glass panels, repair the bolt holes using a special product and overlay the east wall with stucco.

**James moved to consider the interior and exterior changes separately. The motion was seconded by Matson and approved unanimously.**

**Matson moved to recommend a finding that the proposed changes to the exterior of the building at 529 Main Street including the installation of replacement windows, replacement/repair of the glass covering the leaded glass panels, repair of the exterior of the building including the bolt holes and the overlay of the east wall with a stucco material as described by the owner will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.**

McCarthy reviewed the proposed remodel of the interior of the building noting that the interior has been remodeled extensively on a number of occasions over the past 70 years. Discussion followed regarding the proposed work, the history of the building, the ceiling installed in the lobby approximately 70 years ago, the installation of the new electrical, new doors, new heating systems, new ceilings (except in the lobby area), the flooring materials and trim and millwork to be utilized throughout the building.

**Matson moved to recommend a finding that the demolition of all of the non-bearing interior walls and the interior remodel at 529 Main Street would have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by Sogge.**

Additional discussion followed regarding the window sills, the mill work and other finish work. In response to a question, McCarthy indicated that the demolition is scheduled to begin after Thanksgiving and that the interior plans should be completed after the first of the year.

James suggested that the Commission consider the request for the demolition of all of the non-bearing walls and that the interior finish work be resubmitted when plans are completed. Discussion followed.

**Matson accepted a friendly amendment to recommend a finding that the demolition of all of the non-bearing interior walls for the property at 529 Main Street will have no adverse impact and that the request for approval of the interior remodel be submitted when the plans are available. Sogge concurred with the friendly amendment. The motion as amended was approved unanimously.**

Roseland turned the gavel over to Sogge.

**1018 Fairview Street (10RS019)**

Roseland, speaking as applicant and owner of the property, reviewed the photos of the exterior of the opening on the second floor noting that glass had been installed in the opening when an air conditioner was removed a number of years ago. He indicated that the opening would be covered with cedar or fir siding matching the rest of the wall.

**Krull moved to recommend a finding that closing the window opening and installing cedar or fir siding to match the existing wall on the property at 1018 Fairview Street will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by Grable and carried unanimously.**

Sogge turned the gavel back to Roseland.

**507 Main Street (10CM049)**

Headid presented the request for reroofing the Rapid City Journal Building located at 507 Main Street indicating that they will be replacing the existing roof with a white roof similar to the roof on the adjoining roof area, replacing the deteriorated tile coping with metal coping and replacing the existing shake shingle mansard façade with a standing seam metal roof.

Matson noted that the building is a non-contributing building located in the environs. Discussion followed.

**Krull moved to recommend a finding that the reroofing, replacement of coping and installation of the metal roof on the property located at 507 Main Street will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by Matson and approved unanimously.**

**402 St. Joseph Street (10CM050)**

Thurston reviewed the proposed changes to the Motor Service building located at 402 St. Joseph Street. He indicated that he is seeking approval of the concept of replacing one of the two window openings on the west wall with a doorway to facilitate the reuse of the building. Discussion followed.

**James moved to recommend a finding that the installation of a door in the location of one of the two existing windows on the west wall on the property located at 402 St. Joseph Street will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by Sogge.**

**James clarified that the motion includes the installation of awnings and Sogge concurred.**

In response to a question from Krull, Thurston clarified that the Motor Service Co. sign will be restored and the neon on the columns will also be restored.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the installation of a door in the location of one of the two existing windows on the west wall and the installation of the window awnings**

**on the property located at 402 St. Joseph Street will have no adverse impact was approved unanimously.**

#### **415 Main Street (10CM051)**

Thurston reviewed the proposed project to develop offices at the rear of the first floor, create access to the lower floor, make the back of the building the primary entrance and install an awning along the rear of the building along with a support column and hand rail. Thurston reviewed the floor plan and other possible improvements to the building. He noted that the owner will retain the 1 foot by 2 foot ceiling tiles, restore and retain the fluorescent light fixtures in the back and install 9 foot walls to reflect the original building. He noted that tenant space will be developed in the basement and a skylight will be installed in the old shaft. Thurston indicated that he is proposing to install windows on the west side of the building.

Extensive discussion followed.

**Krull moved to recommend a finding that the development of the rear of the building in accordance with the elevations presented and the installation of the three skylights on the property located at 415 Main Street will have no adverse impact and to require that the request to install windows on the west wall be resubmitted when plans are available. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.**

Thurston reviewed the plans for the interior of the building. Discussion continued.

**Matson moved to approve the interior remodel with the retention of the ceilings, the reuse of the existing lights as described and the installation of the offices at the rear of the building in accordance with the elevations that were submitted. The motion was seconded by Sogge and approved unanimously.**

#### **Approval of the Minutes**

**Pier moved to approve the minutes of the November 5, 2010 Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.**

#### **Treasurer's Report**

**Baumgartner moved to approve the payment of the Commission's National Trust Membership dues. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.**

Elkins indicated that she had reviewed the procedure the Commission uses to approve the payment of bills prior to processing the payment with the City Attorney and determined that process is not required by City Ordinance or City policy for the budgeted items. She indicated that action will be required for the Commission's funds.

**Pier moved to authorize staff to process the payments for budgeted items without requiring Commission review and approval. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.**

#### **Contact with News Media**

Krull reviewed concerns with how the media contacts are handled. Discussion followed regarding using a subcommittee to provide media contact information and the perception that statements made by individual members of the committee represent the opinions of the entire Commission. Pier suggested that the Commission develop a policy regarding media contacts. Discussion continued.

Pier agreed to assist in drafting a policy and bringing it back for review by the Committee. Discussion followed on how individuals can clarify that the comments they make are their individual opinions, how what the news media publishes is not controlled by the Commission or the individual and that the comments made during the meeting are not a condemnation of an individual but a concern with the way the media handles comments.

**Matson moved to request Pier's assistance in drafting a policy on how the Commission members deal with the news media. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.**

#### **Citizen Comments at Beginning of Meeting**

Roseland proposed that the Commission take public comment at the beginning of the meeting similar to the manner used by the City Council. Pier expressed concern regarding the opportunity for relevant public comment to be made after the applicant presents the proposal. Discussion followed regarding the difficulty of commenting on a request prior to the information being submitted, concern with individuals using the time as a soapbox and the need and the desire to use the Commission's time more efficiently. Discussion continued.

Roseland requested that the Commission give consideration to the item and that the matter be included for further discussion at a future meeting.

#### **Request for Proposals for Design Guidelines**

Bulman reviewed the draft Request For Proposals and suggested that the item be continued to the next meeting to allow the Commission to review the document in more detail.

Matson requested that the Commission review the section on Training to see if it adequately describes the services that are required.

**Baumgartner moved to continue the discussion of the Request for Proposals for Design Guidelines to the December 3, 2010 Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Matson and approved unanimously.**

Matson moved to hold a Special Historic Preservation Commission meeting to review the Abbreviated Case Report on the Dakota Middle School Theater project on Tuesday, November 30, 2010 at 5:30 pm. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.

Bulman reminded the Commission to complete their time sheets for the grant match.

Roseland briefed the Commission on the Special Project on the Clock to be restored to the location at the southeast corner of 7<sup>th</sup> Street and Main Street. He indicated that the clock workings have been taken to Rosenbaum's Signs to be repaired with the work anticipated to be completed after the first of the year.

**Pier moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Krull and approved unanimously.**

Roseland adjourned the meeting.

Minutes of the November 23, 2010  
Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Members Present: Pat Roseland, Scott Sogge, Duane Baumgartner, Shawn Krull, Rich Grable, Cynthia Matson, Tamara Pier, Eric James, Jean Kessloff and Mike Bender

Others Present: Karen Bulman, Marcia Elkins, Bill Kessloff, Michelle Dennis, Mike Gould, Dr. Ron Reed, Mike Albertson, Mike Kenton, Kris Bjerke

Roseland called the meeting to order at 5:35 pm noting that a quorum of the Commission was present.

**Bender moved to approve the agenda as distributed. Krull second the motion and carried unanimously.**

**Matson moved to allow the public to comment during the meeting. The motion was seconded by James and carried unanimously.**

Kenton briefed the Commission on the Case Report and Addendum as distributed. He noted that the effort has been a cooperative effort with the School District, the City and the Performing Arts since the project's inception.

Mattson commented on the Case Report received from the architectural team and the School District regarding the need for the changes to the theater to make the building a viable facility. She expressed her support for the findings contained in the case report and the complete manner in which the architectural team addressed the questions and requests for information put forth by the State Office of History. She voiced her agreement with the findings of the case report.

Krull asked for clarification as to which of the documents is the case report. Elkins reviewed the documents distributed to the Commission identifying the Case Report prepared by Architectural Inc as well as the Addendum.

Pier noted that many of the Commission members had concerns regarding the seating arrangement and proposed replacement seating and asked if any alternatives had been explored. She briefly spoke to the internet research she had done noting the option of providing pads for the existing seating. Kenton referenced a discussion by the School District's Facilities Committee noting that several individuals had been unable to find any companies that complete that kind of work. Discussion continued.

Krull asked if the PAC had conducted a study to determine the percentage of individuals that would not come to an event due to the issues associated with the wood seats.

Reed indicated that no study had been completed; however, individuals have made comments at some of the events held in the facility. Grable commented on how uncomfortable the seats are based on his personal experience.

J. Kessloff expressed her opinion that the purpose of the Commission is to be there to protect the historic resource. She noted that the Commission nominated the building. She suggested that the Commission should consider what the PAC groups need to perform in the building. She suggested that the PAC groups need heating and air, sound, lights, and ADA accessibility and

she expressed her opinion that those were all available in the facility. Discussion continued regarding the seating.

In response to a question from Matson, Kessloff stated that she disagrees with the findings in the Case Report because the report addresses desires not needs. Discussion continued.

Krull expressed support for the changes to the heating and cooling system. He expressed concerns with the findings related to the changes to the seats, the arrangement of the seats and the extension of the stage over the orchestra pit and along the side wings.

Discussion continued regarding the proposed changes and the potential alternatives.

Kessloff asked if the Commission is going to discuss the alternatives included in the comments provided by Dennis.

Mattson suggested that Dennis' comments should be forwarded on to the School Board for their consideration. Pier suggested that as an option the Commission could forward Dennis' comments on with the Commission's recommendation that they disagree with the case report. She noted that she hates to see the discussion become historic preservation versus the theater groups.

Discussion followed regarding the options available to the Commission, the role of preservation in the project, the options explored in the case report, the option of using the same seating arrangement, the option of using the wooden seats or replacement seating similar to the existing wooden seats, the potential re-use of the seats, additional review of the comments included in the case report and the specifications included in the contract for salvaging the seats.

Bender commented on the changes that have been made to the plans for the facility throughout the process to preserve many of the character defining features of the facility and minimize the impacts.

**James moved that the Commission agrees with the findings of the Case Report and Addendum as submitted by Architecture Incorporated. The motion was seconded by Matson.**

Discussion followed on the discussions with the subcommittee, the full Commission and the School District's architect over the life of the project. James noted that the discussion was not appropriate at this time and asked that the issue of "Reports by Subcommittees" be added as a discussion item to a future agenda.

Roseland requested a roll call vote. **The motion that the Commission agrees with the findings of the Case Report and Addendum as submitted by Architecture Incorporated carried with Mattson, Grable, Sogge, Bender, Roseland, Baumgartner and James in favor and Pier, Krull and Kessloff opposed.**

Roseland adjourned the meeting.

Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission  
December 3, 2010

Members Present: Jean Kessloff, Eric James, Duane Baumgartner, Pat Roseland, Scott Sogge, Cynthia Matson, Shawn Krull, Tamara Pier, Rich Grable

Others Present: Michelle Dennis, Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Barb Soderlin, Bonny Peterson

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

Kessloff requested to add an item to the agenda entitled "Letter by Concerned Neighbor."

**Baumgartner moved to approve the agenda with the addition of Item 5 "Letter by Concerned Neighbor" under New Business. James seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

Peterson and Grable entered the meeting at this time.

**Pier moved to approve the minutes of the November 19, 2010 Historic Preservation Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.**

**Matson made a motion to approve the minutes of the November 23, 2010 Historic Preservation Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.**

920 Fairview Street (10RS020)

Soderlin presented her request to remodel the garage addition including: the installation of a new footing and foundation; removal of the concrete planter; reinforcement, replacement and reconstruction of the walls; the addition of a false front garage door with two awning windows; the addition of two 26" x 48" vinyl windows; the replacement of the existing rear entry door with a 36" door (on the main structure); and, construction of a new roof. She indicated that they will use new cedar siding matching the rest of the house siding. Soderlin reviewed numerous photographs of the deterioration and rot existing throughout the structure.

**Matson made a motion to recommend a finding of no adverse impact of the proposed project remodeling of the previously enclosed garage structure including the installation of a new footing and foundation, removal of the concrete planter, the reinforcement, replacement and reconstruction of the walls, the addition of a false front garage door with two awning windows, the addition of two 26" by 48" vinyl windows and construction of a new roof. The motion was seconded by Sogge.**

Discussion followed regarding the floor replacement including the design and construction materials, the replacement of the windows with wood windows instead of vinyl windows, the



replacement of damaged materials, the reuse of the corner brackets, and the benefits of contacting the State regarding the tax moratorium.

**The motion was approved unanimously.**

**Krull moved to recommend a finding that the replacement of the rear entry door with a 36” wide door will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by Mattson.**

Discussion followed regarding the window location.

**The motion was approved unanimously.**

#### 1711 West Boulevard (10RS021)

**James moved to table the request to allow the applicant to attend the meeting and present the project. The motion was seconded by Mattson and approved unanimously.**

#### Treasurer's Report

Bulman indicated that an update was not available. Elkins asked if the item could be removed from future agendas based on the new policy that the Commission will not be reviewing the bills.

**Krull moved to eliminate the Treasurer's Report from the agenda. Mattson seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

#### Policy on News Media

**Pier moved to continue the discussion on “Policy on News Media” to the January 28, 2011 Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Grable and approved unanimously.**

#### Request for Proposal for Design Guidelines

Bulman provided an overview of the draft proposal.

Mattson expressed concern with the description of training. Discussion followed.

**James moved to accept the Request for Proposals as presented. The motion was seconded by Pier and approved unanimously.**

#### Subcommittee Reports to the Full Commission

**Kessloff moved to continue the discussion on the “Subcommittee Reports to the Full Commission” to the January 28, 2011 Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Pier and approved unanimously.**

#### Process for Citizen Comments

Discussion followed on the process for receiving citizen comment including: limiting the time for individual speakers: when on the agenda comments should be taken; when pro and con

comments are taken; and, not limiting the time for 11.1 applicants to speak. Roseland indicated that he would be willing to bring back draft guidelines for consideration at the January 28, 2011 Commission meeting.

**Matson made a motion to request that Roseland bring back draft guidelines for taking public comment to the January 28, 2011 Commission meeting. Grable seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

#### Letter by Concerned Neighbor

Kessloff read a letter she received expressing concerns with a rumored project to be constructed at 1004 St. James Street. Discussion followed regarding whether a building permit would be required and an 11.1 Review required.

#### Time Sheets

Roseland reminded the Committee to submit time sheets.

#### Status of Subcommittees and Other Business Items

Following a brief discussion, Roseland suggested that the Commission monitor the items on the list in the future and remove them when they are no longer necessary.

**James made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Matson seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

Roseland adjourned the meeting at 8:09 a.m.

.

Meeting of the Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission  
December 17, 2010

Members Present: Jean Kessloff, Eric James, Duane Baumgartner, Pat Roseland, Scott Sogge, Cynthia Matson, Mike Bender and Tamara Pier

Others Present: Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, Michelle Dennis, Brad Burns and Eric Monroe

Roseland called the meeting to order at 8:32 a.m.

James moved to approve the agenda with the 11.1 Review for 1711 West Boulevard being moved to the end of the agenda and continued to the next meeting if the applicant is not present and with the addition of Historic Rapid City under new business. The motion was seconded by Matson and approved unanimously.

502 Main Street (10CM052)

Dennis reviewed the history of the building built in 1962 located in the historic district. She noted that the building is non-contributing. Dennis described the proposed changes to the building including the re-facing of the building, the colors of the brick material, the proposed banding, the installation of new windows and changes in the existing window locations, the increased height of the building to hide the HVAC system, the installation of coping and a slight roof overhang, as well as the removal of the overhead doors. Dennis described the two options for first floor depending on the ground floor tenant.

Monroe reviewed the material samples that are proposed to be used on the structure. A brief discussion followed.

**James moved to recommend a finding that the proposed changes to the building at 502 Main Street will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by Bender.**

In response to a question from Elkins, Burns clarified that the alternative elevation of the rear of the structure had not been presented. He stated that the applicant is requesting approval of the elevation of the structures as presented.

**James and Bender concurred with the clarification of the motion indicating that the approval is for the changes identified in the elevations as presented.**

Bender and James both expressed support for the project and the improvements that are being proposed.

Roseland also expressed support and appreciation for the changes that have been presented. He noted that since the building is non-contributing, the Commission does not review the proposed changes to the internal elements of the building.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the proposed changes to the building located at 502 Main Street as outlined in the elevations as presented was approved unanimously.**

Pier clarified that the applicant would need to bring the alternative design back to the Commission for review should they decide to pursue that option. Burns acknowledged that they would bring the project back for review if they pursue the alternative.

#### 17 11 West Boulevard (10RS021)

Uhre reviewed the proposal to replace the existing wood roof on the residence located at 1711 West Boulevard with a metal/steel standing seam roof or an asphalt shingle roof. He indicated that he was leaning toward the installation of a gray roof.

**Bender moved to recommend a finding that the installation of an asphalt shingle roof on the residence located at 1711 West Boulevard will have no adverse impact. The motion was seconded by Baumgartner.**

Discussion followed regarding the metal roof and whether it was appropriate for the style of the house and the district. Additional discussion followed about the weather impacts on metal versus asphalt roofs and the impact of a metal roof on the historic district and surrounding properties. Discussion followed regarding other material options.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the installation of an asphalt shingle roof on the residence located at 1711 West Boulevard will have no adverse impact was approved unanimously.**

**Pier moved to recommend a finding that the installation of a standing seam metal/steel roof would have an adverse affect. The motion was seconded by Kessloff.**

A brief discussion followed regarding the impacts of the roof on the historic district and the surrounding properties. Pier noted that the comments on the previous motion were appropriate to this motion as well.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the installation of a standing seam metal/steel roof would have an adverse affect was approved on a 7-1 vote (Sogge, Baumgartner, Kessloff, James, Roseland, Sogge and Bender in favor and Matson opposed.)**

#### Approval of the Minutes

**Pier moved to approve the minutes of the December 3, 2010 meeting. The motion was seconded by James and approved unanimously.**

#### 2011 Meeting Dates

Roseland acknowledged the meeting dates for 2011.

#### Historic Rapid City

Sogge expressed his concerns with finding out about Historic Rapid City on the front page of the newspaper. He noted that the Journal article about the calendar mentioned the Historic Preservation Commission; however, the Commission had nothing to do with the calendar or Historic Rapid City. He reiterated the need for a communication policy and better communication by members of the Commission.

Discussion followed regarding the change of names for the Fiegel House Foundation, the similarity and confusion between the two organizations, the concerns with the perceptions of the media and the public, the credit taken by others for the clock project, the status of the clock project.

**Pier moved to authorize Roseland to contact the Rapid City Journal to clarify the issues surrounding the calendar and the role of the Historic Preservation Commission. The motion was seconded by James.**

Pier reiterated the need for better communications with Historic Rapid City.

Extensive discussion followed regarding the increased confusion relative to the role of the Historic Preservation Commission and Historic Rapid City.

Elkins suggested that the Preservation Commission should request a conversation with the Board of the Historic Rapid City about the roles of each group and the potential for cooperation. She also noted the problems and confusion resulting from the similarity of the names of the two organizations.

Discussion followed about the role and scope of Historic Rapid City, the confusion with the names, the existing confusion with the West Boulevard Association, the benefits of having a group supporting Historic Preservation and the benefits of the two boards meeting together.

Dennis pointed out that there was another article in the paper that incorrectly indicated that the sign at the Dakota Middle School being a project of the Historic Preservation Commission.

**The motion carried unanimously.**

Baumgartner reiterated the need for the Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission to have a central contact person for the Commission and that person is the Chairperson. Discussion followed.

**Matson moved to request that staff coordinate a meeting with the Historic Preservation Commission and Historic Rapid City. The motion was seconded by Pier.**

Discussion followed regarding the two groups meeting together to review the recently adopted Historic Preservation Master Plan and comparing those with the goals of Historic Rapid City.

**The motion carried unanimously.**

Commissioner Timesheets

Bulman reviewed the need for the timesheets to be submitted by the first of January to be submitted with the grant reimbursement request.

The Commission expressed their support for Bender's contribution to the Commission.

**James moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Bender and approved unanimously.**