

Minutes of the January 26, 2022  
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

**Members Present:** Brittany Neiles, Emily Calhoun, Jeremy Altman, Jenn Johnson, and Carol Saunders

**Members Absent:** Pat Roseland

**Others Present:** Sarah Hanzel, Melissa Karpo, Joel Landeen, Ritchie Nordstrom - City Council Liaison, Luke Jessen – C.R. Lloyd Companies, Inc. and Katie Krantz – VanDeWalle Architects

Johnson called the meeting to order at 8:03 a.m.

Quorum was met.

**General Public Comment** No Public Comment.

**New Business**

- 1) Comment on the Case Report for the proposed Block 5 Project
  - a. Case Report
  - b. Application
  - c. Aerial Map
  - d. Plans and Elevations
  - e. Massing and Solar Study
  - f. Site Photos
  - g. Contributing building heights
  - h. Standards for New Construction in Historic Districts

Action Requested: Agree with the findings of the Case Report, disagree with the findings of the Case Report, or decline to comment on the Case Report.

Hanzel reviewed the findings of the Case Report for the proposed Block 5 project, noting the project description, description of the affected historic property, and description of feasible and prudent alternatives. Hanzel summarized the feasible and prudent alternatives identified in the Case Report noting that the project was selected through an RFP process and alternative locations within the community were not applicable. Hanzel noted the other design considerations in the Case Report. Hanzel reminded the Commission that the State Historic Preservation Office requested the abbreviated case report due to the height of the project exceeding 10% variation of the median height of surrounding historic structures.

Johnson inquired about the site orientation and the position of the parking structure, noting the development will create activity to bridge the gap between downtown and the east of 5<sup>th</sup> area. Discussion followed.

In response to a question from Johnson, Hanzel noted that the solar study had been updated and she reviewed the updated graphics. Johnson asked if there were any issues with having two parking structures within a two-block radius. Jessen advised that they were required to provide a traffic impact study and coordinate with the city traffic engineers. Jessen clarified that the parking will also be for those utilizing the structure, not for public parking. Hanzel noted that the City's Parking Manager is working with current users of the lot and relocating their parking elsewhere.

Altman asked about whether the exterior materials had changed since the preliminary review by the Commission. Krantz replied that it had switched from brick and stone to pre-cast panels with then Brick. When asked for a clarification from Johnson, Krantz indicated it is proposed to be thin brick laid in a pre-cast form. Hanzel reminded the Commission that if the design or exterior materials of the project significantly changes then those changes will be reviewed at the time of building permit.

Neiles inquired about the effect of the height on the historic district with regard to the Case Report and the action needed from the Commission. Altman commented that the effect of height on new construction should be considered on a case by case basis within the context of the project. He noted that as an example, a vacant property mid-block may have a different effect on the historic district, than the structure which is proposed on a City block where historic structures are separated by right-of-way.

Calhoun inquired whether the Downtown Historic Commercial District specifically calls out the skyline as a significant feature, so as to ensure the structure would not affect the eligibility of the district. Discussion followed.

Calhoun asked whether mitigation was required for a finding of potential adverse effect, and if so whether the Commission would be responsible for such mitigation. Hanzel confirmed that mitigation of an effect by the Commission is not part of the 11.1 Review Process in the same way that the Section 106 process occurs. Hanzel added that the Case Report looks at the extent to which harm to historic property has been minimized.

Altman noted that the height of the structure may create a potential for adverse effect; however, that the complimentary aspects of the rest of the building's design outweighed the potential for negative effect on the district.

Neiles moved to agree with the findings of the Case Report noting that it overall met the standards for new construction in historic districts with the exception of height. The motion was seconded by Calhoun and carried unanimously.

#### Old Business

Review scope of work for Postwar Schools Survey Project

The committee discussed the upcoming CLG conference. Keynote speakers and sponsors lined up and the registration will be going out. Committee members will be checking and finalizing catering.

The committee briefly discussed the survey Post wars Survey project. The South Middle School component will be lead by the HPC and focused on education and research, and will have all of the work available to the commission for a time capsule. Hanzel indicated that City staff is working on the contract with the consultant, and then will schedule a kickoff meeting to start the project.

Calhoun moved to approve the December 13 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Neiles and carried unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:05 a.m.

