

## CITY OF RAPID CITY

RAPID CITY, SOUTH DAKOTA 57701-5035

## Community Planning & Development Services

300 Sixth Street

Katherine Palmer, Planner I Long Range Planning Division city web: www.rcgov.org Phone: 605-394-4120 Fax: 605-394-6636

e-mail: katherine.palmer@rcgov.org

## **MEMORANDUM**

TO: Legal and Finance Committee

FROM: Katherine Palmer, Planner I

DATE: May 6, 2013

RE: Appeal the denial of two digital signs at 1801 Mount Rushmore

Road by the Historic Sign Review Committee

Dr. Jay Segrist is the legal property owner of 1801 Mount Rushmore Road (legally described as Lot 1, Block 22, West Boulevard, Section 2, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota). Vicky Fenhaus, Dr. Segrist's sign contractor, submitted a Historic Sign application, which requested a sign permit for two digital signs; one wall sign and one monument sign. The property is located within the West Boulevard National Historic District. The structure is not listed on the historic register.

On May 3, 2013, the Historic Sign Review Committee denied the 1801 Mt. Rushmore Road historic sign application. The Historic Sign Review Committee based their denial on the Historic Sign Ordinance, 17.50.080.Q, which states, "In considering sign permits within historic districts, the Historic Sign Review Committee shall consider the following criteria: size and position, projection, color, message, texture, materials, illumination and lettering style for the historic era for which the building or structure was constructed."

The building at 1801 Mt. Rushmore Road was constructed in 1940 and digital signs were not prevalent at the time. The Historic Sign Review Committee was also apprehensive about approving a sign when they were not given a full understanding of the colors, styles, and messages that would be displayed. The Historic Sign Review Committee denied both signs unanimously, based on the date of the construction of the building and Light-Emitting Diodes, (LEDs), not being of the era, along with the inability to approve the changeable content.



March 25, 2013 Page 2

Attached is a copy of the minutes of the Historic Sign Review Commission meetings at which this request was discussed, along with the original application request provided by Ms. Fenhaus.

The applicant stated that they would consider only one sign if both were not allowed.

<u>Staff Recommendation</u>: Staff recommends denial of the appeal based on the building being located within the historic district and digital signs not being of the era when the building was constructed, as per the Historic Sign Ordinance, 17.50.080.Q.