

## Bulman Karen

---

**From:** ChrisB.Nelson@state.sd.us  
**Sent:** Monday, July 25, 2011 7:19 AM  
**To:** Bulman Karen; marcia.elkins@yahoo.com; prosel7950@aol.com  
**Subject:** WB Case Report  
**Attachments:** WB demos.doc


Hello all,  
Attached is the abbreviated case report request. The most important is #7 which is the description of alternatives explored and efforts to minimize the adverse effect.

One thing I think the city will need to look at is whether all or any of the C houses could be rehabilitated and incorporated into whatever new design is proposed for the property - is there a way to keep all or any of these houses and retain the residential feel of the street while still accomplishing what the property owner needs?

Thanks,  
Chris

Chris B. Nelson  
Historic Preservation Specialist  
South Dakota State Historical Society  
900 Governors Drive  
Pierre SD 57501-2217  
605-773-3103  
605-773-6041 (fax)  
[chrisb.nelson@state.sd.us](mailto:chrisb.nelson@state.sd.us)

[visit our website](#)



## **1305 West Main, 609 West, 617 West, 623 West and Environs Case Report**

Request addition information for an abbreviated case report

<http://legis.state.sd.us/rules/DisplayRule.aspx?Rule=24:52:07:03> for #s 3, 5, 7, 10, 11.

### **Below are some alternatives to explore under #7:**

#### Alternatives to avoid the adverse effect

1. Leave the property the way it is
2. Rehabilitate contributing houses to preserve their potential as residential/business property
3. Sell the contributing houses to someone who will rehabilitate them
4. Incorporate contributing houses into the proposed new use for the property. Does a new use plan exist? Should one be proposed before demo to see if these properties could potentially be incorporated and reused?

#### Alternatives to minimize the adverse effect

1. Do not demolish the contributing structures that can feasibly be rehabilitated - develop around them
2. Incorporate some of the contributing structures into a new infill design
3. Relocate the contributing houses that can be moved instead of demolition

The city should consider these alternatives as well as any others that the historic preservation commission or planning department may identify. Included in the report should be an explanation of what was considered and/or rejected.

Minutes of the July 15, 2011  
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

**Members Present:** Jean Kessloff, Pat Roseland, Cynthia Matson, Heather Knox, Eric James, Richard Grable, Tamara Pier, Duane Baumgartner, Shawn Krull, Scott Sogge, Jordan Mason – Council Liaison, Ron Sasso, Council Liaison Alternate

**Others Present:** Marcia Elkins, Michelle Dennis, Tony Block, Patri Acevedo-Riker, Eric Monroe, Bob Fuchs, Bill Kessloff, Emilie Rusch – Rapid City Journal, Jim Shaw, Eiric Heikes, Stan Adelstein, Karen Bulman, Jeanne Nicholson, Nora Simmons

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

**Approval of Meeting Agenda**

**James moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Sogge. The motion was approved unanimously.**

**11.1 Reviews**

1016 12th Street (11RS017)

Block reviewed the proposed request for the replacement of two basement walls.

**James moved to recommend a finding that the replacement of the two basement walls will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Matson.**

In response to a question from Kessloff, Block advised that the north and south walls will be replaced.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the replacement of the two basement walls will have no adverse effect on historic property carried unanimously.**

616 (618) Main Street (11CM028)

Fuchs reviewed the proposed request for the addition to the rear of the building. He added that the addition will be a winery and will be constructed with cinder blocks and have a Drivet façade. He briefly addressed parking, property access, hallway, roof lines and ceiling height. Fuchs noted that Black Hills Power has been contacted about the utilities in the area and the existing building will remain the same. A brief discussion followed.

**Sogge moved to recommend a finding that the addition to the rear of the building will have no adverse effect on historic property. The motion was seconded by Matson and the motion carried unanimously.**

502 & 512 Main Street (11CM029)

502 Main Street: Dennis reviewed the proposed request to add a metal canopy with fabric covering over the courtyard and to change the weather shade from wood to metal with a fabric covering. She added that the canopy will be a metal structure with a fabric that is compatible

with the project. She added that the canopy will have a gutter system and that the visual impact of the canopy will be minimized by the trees.

512 Main Street: Dennis reviewed the proposed request to add stairs from the first floor to the basement and to renovate the interior basement walls. She advised that an original floor plan has been discovered showing a stairway from the main floor to the basement and the request is to add the stairwell to allow access from the main floor to the basement.

Monroe briefly reviewed the location of the partition walls in the basement and added that the renovations will better accommodate the four retail spaces. A brief discussion followed.

**Matson moved to recommend a finding that the addition of a metal canopy with fabric covering over the courtyard and the change to the weather shade from wood to metal with fabric covering will have no adverse effect on historic property located at 502 Main Street. The motion was seconded by James and the motion carried unanimously.**

**James moved to recommend a finding that the addition of stairs from the first floor to the basement and the renovations to the interior basement will have no adverse effect on historic property located at 512 Main Street. The motion was seconded by Matson.**

In response to a question from Shaw, Monroe advised that no changes will be made to the bearing walls and that the renovations will help maintain the integrity of the common space and corridors.

**The motion to recommend a finding that the addition of stairs from the first floor to the basement and the renovations to the interior basement will have no adverse effect on the historic property located at 512 Main Street carried unanimously.**

#### 1311 W. Main Street (11CM027)

James briefly reviewed the Joint Powers Agreement between the State Office of History and the City of Rapid City for Historic Preservation.

Pier explained that the Historic Preservation Commission will make a recommendation to the State. A brief discussion followed.

Elkins reviewed the proposed request to demolish the structure, the building history of the structure, the uses of the surrounding properties and the boundaries of the West Boulevard Historic District. She added that a portion of the property is not located in the environs and that the Commission can request that the environs be extended to include the entire property. Elkins suggested that the Commission should request the owner to move any salvageable parts of the structure.

Kessloff expressed her opinion that the request should be continued until the Commission receives legal opinion from the State Attorney General regarding the definition for environs. She added that the owner also needs to show that all alternatives for the structure have been explored and that the integrity of the district will be maintained.

**Kessloff moved to recommend that the request to demolish the structure at 1311 W. Main Street be continued until the Commission receives the State Attorney General's legal opinion on the definition of environs. The motion died due to a lack of a second.**

Elkins advised that the Commission has the authority to extend the environs and requested that the Commission not delay action on the request. A brief discussion followed.

**James moved to recommend a finding that demolishing the structure, or allowing the structure to be removed from the district, will have an adverse effect on historic property due to the intensity of the entire project, with the understanding that the environs include the entire property. The motion was seconded by Sogge.**

Bill Kessloff expressed his opinion that the Commission should not take action on the request until a legal opinion is received from the State Attorney General about the definition for the environs.

Elkins expressed her opinion that the motion on the floor includes the entire property and encouraged the Commission to review the Joint Powers Agreement to determine if further clarification needs to be included in the agreement.

Discussion followed regarding the process for 11.1 Reviews.

Roseland expressed concern with the removal of the structure and the lot remaining vacant.

Pier added that the request could possibly set a precedent throughout the Historic District.

Simmons, resident at the corner of Twelfth and Kansas City, expressed concern with the demolition of the eight structures and inquired as to what the owner is proposing to develop on the properties.

James advised that the Commission does not know what the owner's intent is at this time.

Krull briefly reviewed the Historic Preservation Commission's role throughout the City and expressed concern with the encroachment of commercial development into residential areas.

Shaw expressed his concern with commercial development encroaching into this residential historic district. Additional discussion followed.

**The motion to recommend a finding that demolishing the structure, or allowing the structure to be removed from the district, will have an adverse effect on historic property due to the intensity of the entire project, with the understanding that the environs include the entire property carried unanimously.**

1311 W. Main Street (11RS018)

Elkins reviewed the proposed request to demolish the garage and noted that the structure is located within the environs of the West Boulevard Historic District.

**James moved to recommend a finding that demolishing the garage, or allowing the garage to be removed from the district, will have an adverse effect on historic property due to the intensity of the entire project, with the understanding that the environs include the entire project. The motion was seconded by Pier and the motion carried unanimously.**

1310 Kansas City Street (11RS019)

Elkins reviewed the proposed request to demolish the residence and noted that it appears that the structure is being used as storage.

1305 W. Main Street (11RS020)

Elkins reviewed the proposed request to demolish the residence and noted that the residence is a contributing structure.

Matson expressed her opinion that the structure is beautiful and that the structure should be moved and used somewhere else.

Adelstein stated that he would be willing to give the structure to someone at no charge if they can find another appropriate location for the structure.

609 West Street (11RS021)

Elkins reviewed the proposed request to demolish the residence and noted that the structure has been used for both commercial and residential purposes.

617 West Street (11RS022)

Elkins reviewed the proposed request to demolish the residence and noted that the sandstone foundation could possibly be salvaged to be used somewhere else.

617 West Street (11RS023)

Elkins reviewed the proposed request to demolish the garage and that historic records indicate that the garage was built in 1919.

623 West Street (11RS024)

Elkins reviewed the proposed request to demolish the residence and noted that the residence is a contributing structure.

A brief discussion followed regarding whether to take action on each individual request or to take action on all requests grouped together.

1310 Kansas City Street (11RS019)

**James moved to recommend a finding that demolishing the residence, or allowing the residence to be removed from the district, will have an adverse effect on historic property due to the intensity of the entire project. The motion was seconded by Pier.**

Heikes stated that he lived in this area as a child and that the property at that time was questionable. He expressed his opinion that the property owner should be allowed to make positive changes to the neighborhood and improve the property.

In response to a comment from Bill Kessloff, Adelstein advised that the residence is unlivable and has been vacant for some time.

Shaw stated that this is a residential neighborhood and expressed concern about setting the precedent for allowing commercial development to encroach into residential areas.

Sasso expressed his opinion that the Historic District boundary should be changed if the structure is removed from the property.

Additional discussion followed regarding the 11.1 Review process and the Case Report requirements.

**The motion to recommend a finding that demolishing the residence, or allowing the residence to be removed from the district, will have an adverse effect on historic property due to the intensity of the entire project carried unanimously.**

1305 W. Main Street (11RS020)

**James moved to recommend a finding that demolishing the residence, or removing the residence from the district, will have an adverse effect on historic property due to the intensity of the entire project. The motion was seconded by Matson and motion carried unanimously.**

609 West Street (11RS021)

**Matson moved to recommend a finding that demolishing the residence, or removing the residence from the district, will have an adverse effect on historic property due to the intensity of the entire project. The motion was seconded by Grable and the motion carried unanimously.**

617 West Street (11RS022)

**Krull moved to recommend a finding that demolishing the residence, or removing the residence from the district, will have an adverse effect on historic property due to the intensity of the entire project. The motion was seconded by Pier and the motion carried unanimously.**

617 West Street (11RS023)

**Pier moved to recommend a finding that demolishing the garage, or allowing the garage to be removed from the district, will have an adverse effect on historic property due to the intensity of the entire project, with the understanding that the environs included the entire property. The motion was seconded by Matson and the motion carried unanimously.**

623 West Street (11RS024)

**Pier moved to recommend a finding that demolishing the residence, or removing the residence from the district, will have an adverse effect on historic property due to the intensity of the entire project. The motion was seconded by Knox and the motion carried unanimously.**

**New Business**

Krull expressed his opinion that it would be beneficial for the Commission to review the Mt. Rushmore Road Corridor Study to review the transition areas between the residential and commercial uses.

Bulman informed the Commission that the meeting minutes are available to the State as soon as they have been completed.

Shaw expressed his concern with commercial development encroaching into residential areas. Discussion followed.

### **Approval of Minutes**

**James moved to approve the July 1, 2011 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Matson and approved unanimously.**

### **Other Business**

Roseland informed the Commission that he continues to do research on the maintenance for the clock and that he will bring the information to the next meeting.

Bulman reminded the Commission members to complete a timesheet for the Home Show so that she can submit them for the grant reimbursement.

James suggested that the Commission think about creating a way to record preservation of structures and to hire someone or enlist a volunteer to document the information.

**James moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:11 a.m. The motion was seconded by Sogge and approved unanimously.**