SOUTH DAKOTA CODIFIED LAW 1-19A-11.1 - ARSD 24:52:07:03 CASE REPORT FORM

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE (SHPO)
SOUTH DAKOTA CODIFIED LAW 1-19A-11.1 CASE REPORT

If a state entity or political subdivision of the state is required by law or rule to report possible threats to the historical integrity of a property listed in the National Register of Historic Places or the State Register of Historic Places, the threat must be reported by means of a case report.

Case reports must provide the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) with sufficient information for the office to make an independent review of effects on the historical integrity of historic properties and shall be the basis for informed comments to state entities and the public. Case reports shall thoroughly examine all relevant factors involved in a preservation question. Abbreviated case reports may be requested at the discretion of the SHPO if less than a comprehensive view is needed. (ARSD 24:52:07:03 - Standards for Case Report)

SHPO reserves the right to request more information if needed. Typed forms are preferred. Submittal of this form without all requested information will cause review delays.

☐ This is a new submittal. ☑ This is information relating to SHPO project number: 150930001S

PROJECT LOCATION

Address

523 6th Street (Alex Johnson Hotel)

City

Rapid City, South Dakota

County

Pennington

The responsible state entity or political subdivision of the state (cities, counties, etc.) must sign and date this form here prior to submitting it to the SHPO. Projects received without an original signature will cause review delays.

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Name

Title

Agency

FOR SHPO USE ONLY. DO NOT WRITE OR INSERT ANYTHING HERE.

STATE, CITY, COUNTY, OR OTHER GOVERNING BODY PERMITTING, FUNDING, LICENSING, OR ASSISTING THE PROJECT

STATE ENTITY, CITY, COUNTY, OR OTHER GOVERNING BODY

Agency Name

Agency Contact Person

Mailing Address

City, State, ZIP

Email Address

Phone Number

APPLICANT OR CONSULTANT CONTACT PERSON, IF APPLICABLE

Company Name

Chamberlin Architects

Contact Person

Brad Burns

Mailing Address

725 St. Joseph, Ste. B1

City, State, ZIP

Rapid City, SD 57701

Email Address

bburns@chamberlinarchitects.com

Phone Number

605-355-6804

PROPERTY OWNER, IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE

Name

Cortez, LLC dba Alex Johnson Hotel

Mailing Address, City, State, ZIP

523 6th Street, Rapid City, SD 57701

Email Address

pbradsky@aol.com

Phone Number

605-854-1004

STANDARDS FOR CASE REPORT AS OUTLINED IN ARSD 24:52:07:03

1 & 2. Project Description. Describe the project. Include photographs and maps showing the existing project site and details of the proposed project. Where applicable, drawings, three-dimensional models, or accurate computer-generated representations of proposed construction may be included. The models or representations must clearly show the visual impacts of new construction on the surrounding neighborhood or landscape. Photographs, maps, drawings, and other supplemental materials should be submitted with this form as separate documents.

The Owner wishes to replace the majority of the existing windows on floors 3 through 9.
There are three different existing window types on the building.
1. Window type 1: Original double hung wood windows - There are three of these on the 2nd floor on the north side. These will not be replaced. The openings have been walled over on the inside, so they aren't used as windows. The exterior may be covered to minimize further damage to the windows, or the owner will continue to maintain the windows. This has not been decided.

2. Window type 2: Aluminum-clad, wood, casement windows - The majority of the windows on 3rd through 9th floors are of this type. These windows were installed in the late 1970's or early 1980's. This replacement also included installation of an aluminum infill panel and air conditioning units in the lower third of some of the window openings. The new windows were installed in the remainder of the opening space. Windows without air conditioning units filled the entire window opening. These windows consist of one-third outswing casement and two-thirds fixed sash. The installation of type-3 windows utilized a manufactured receiver flashing around the perimeter of the opening so that the new windows could be installed from the inside of the building. The existing windows are not considered to have met the Secretary of Interior Standards for Historic Preservation, so the new windows will be a better representation of the historic windows, and will not damage or destroy the historic property further.
The proposed window replacement would utilize the existing receiver flashing so they can be replaced from inside the building by simply removing interior trim, removing a set of retainer clips, removing the existing window, installing the new window, reinstalling the retainer clips and reinstalling the interior wood trim. This eliminates the need for cranes and lifts and shut-down of the sidewalks and streets.

3. Window type 3: Wood, cottage style, double hung windows - There appear to be 8 of these on the 8th and 9th floors on the east side of the building, 7 on the same floors on the north, 11 on the same floors on the west, and 9 on the same floors on the south. These are not original to the building, but it is unknown when they were installed. The original windows at most of these locations were 3-window operable casements. The replacement windows for type-3 windows will be the similar to the type-2 windows, except they will be 3-window, fixed casements. Pella still manufactures the same receiver flashing that the type-2 windows utilized, so it will be utilized on these windows.

The proposed fixed, metal clad wood windows on the south, east and north sides of the building will have a center mullion, a horizontal divider and six divided lites in the upper half of the windows. The divided lites will be simulated with spacers between the panes of glass. The west facade of the building has no architectural articulation, which indicates this side had little aesthetic importance when the building was erected. For that reason, we are proposing the same windows as the other sides, except that they will not have 6-pane divided lites.

3. What is the planning and approval schedule for this project?

4. How was this project brought to the attention of the state or political subdivision (city, county, etc.)?

- [ ] Demolition Permit
- [ ] Building Permit
- [ ] Other - Please explain:

5. Include a physical description of the affected historic property. Economic or situational information relevant to the affected property may be included if applicable.

6. Describe the potential effects of the proposed project on the historic property, including but not limited to physical and visual effects, alterations to the property, moving the property to another location, or change of use.

7. Provide a description of the feasible and prudent alternatives that were considered and rejected based on factors relevant to the project. Relevant factors should be supported by facts. Include the reason(s) for rejection of feasible and prudent alternatives. Describe other efforts undertaken to minimize harm to the historic property. Provide as much detail as possible when explaining consideration of alternatives and mitigation measures. Questions to be considered when reviewing the project include:
(a) How were decisions based on the consideration of factual reports, research, tried methods, and/or professional and lay preservation advice?
(b) How were alternatives beyond the immediate project explored, taking into account broad community or regional issues in which the historic resource may play a contributing role?
(c) How was the impact of potentially adverse effects on surrounding historic resources, community preservation plans, and long-range community opportunities taken into account, if applicable?
(d) Were decisions based on professional assessment(s) of the value and basic structural condition of the affected property and estimates of a range of rehabilitation or mitigative options prepared by people experienced in historic preservation work?
(e) Were adequate periods of time provided for information to be prepared and for preservation options to be attempted?

On a typical historic preservation project, we would recommend replacing the existing windows with metal clad, wood windows of the same function with the same divided lite patterns, with muntins on the exterior and interior and spacers between the glass.
After multiple meetings on site with window suppliers and installers, there are several reasons that meeting the Department of Interior Standards is not practical in this case.
1. NPS would require all of the new windows to fill the entire original window openings. Because the last window replacement included an infill panel to accommodate an air conditioner unit, the new opening size is smaller in some cases. The hotel cannot function without air conditioning, so it is unreasonable to remove the A/C units to accommodate the larger windows.
2. Double-hung and operable, casement windows similar to the original windows were discussed. However, in a multi-story hotel, this creates a liability, as it would provide an opportunity for windows to be opened, objects to be thrown out, or people to fall out. The preferred solution is to provide a sash, mullion and muntin pattern that resembles the original windows.
3. Muntins (grills): A window cleaning company was consulted to determine options for cleaning windows. The most cost effective way requires a very long pole for washing and "squeegeeing". If the muntins are installed on the exterior of the glass, this would be infeasible. The preferred solution is to use spacers between the glass to simulate the divided lites.
4. We evaluated the the removal and installation method options. The first option was to remove the entire existing window assembly, including the existing receiver flashing, the original wood frames, and the existing windows to allow for a completely new installation. This would require installing the new windows from the exterior. Because of the building height, a crane or extremely tall lift would be needed, which would require closing portions of the street and sidewalks. There would be more risk to installers and pedestrians below. It would also require approximately three or four times the installation time and double the number of installers. As we understand it, Rapid City School utilized the "receiver flashing" method so windows could be installed from the inside.

In addition to the above, we offer the following additional considerations:

a. The installation of the existing windows that are being replaced have already "encroached upon, damaged or destroyed" that portion of the historic property, so the replacement of those windows with the proposed windows do not create an adverse effect. The new windows will, however, improve the historic character of the building. The replacement windows will also provide consistency of character by eliminating one of the multiple window types.

b. Even in the Secretary of Interior Standards, there is some leniency allowed for windows above the ground floor, where the window details are not as identifiable.

8. Provide a copy of correspondence with SHPO. Correspondence should include the identification and evaluation of historic properties, assessment of effects, and any consideration of alternatives or mitigation measures. Copies of this information should be submitted with this form as separate documents.

9. Describe efforts made to consider the views of affected and interested parties.

10. If applicable, the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) in the community where this project is located should review and comment on this case report prior to its submittal to SHPO.

- ☐ The HPC agreed with the findings of the case report.
- ☐ The HPC disagreed with the findings of the case report.
- ☐ The HPC declined to comment on the findings of the case report.

In addition to the above findings, please include official comments from the HPC, if applicable.

11. Provide copies of written views submitted by the public to the state entity, city, county, or other governing body concerning the potentially adverse effects of projects on historic properties and alternatives to reduce or avoid those effects. Copies should be submitted with this form as separate documents.

Please print this entire form, sign and date the first page,
and mail completed form with any additional documentation to:

Review and Compliance Coordinator
South Dakota State Historical Society
900 Governors Drive
Pierre, SD 57501

Questions about South Dakota Codified Law 1-19A-11.1 can be directed to:

Review and Compliance Coordinator
(605) 773-6004

Restoration Specialist
(605) 773-6005

Project information submitted to SHPO cannot be returned. This documentation is kept on file at the South Dakota State Historical Society. We review faxed and electronic submissions in the same manner as any other submission and with the same considerations for clarity and completeness. However, original documents with original signature must follow all faxed and electronic submissions. The submission of incomplete, unclear, or confusing information may result in unnecessary delays in the review process until adequate information is obtained.

Additional Resources:

South Dakota State Historic Preservation Office: http://history.sd.gov/Preservation/
Link to National and State Register Listed Properties: http://history.sd.gov/Preservation/NatReg/NatReg.aspx
Historic Contexts: http://history.sd.gov/Preservation/OtherServices/SHPODocs.aspx

National Park Service: http://www.nps.gov/nr/
Publications (National Register Bulletins, Preservation Briefs, etc.): http://www.nps.gov/history/publications.htm