

Draft

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.