

Minutes of the July 12, 2023  
Rapid City Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

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

**Members Absent:**

**Others Present:** Sarah Hanzel, Jonathan Howard, Melissa Bloomberg, Pat Roseland (Council Liaison) Peter Schmid (applicant)

Johnson called the meeting to order at 8:02 a.m.

Quorum was met.

**General Public Comment** No Public Comment.

**New Business**

- 1) Comments on Case 809 South Street | 23RS005
  - a. Staff Memo #2
  - b. Project Concept #1 & Project Concept #2
  - c. Supplemental Information on Concepts
  - d. Secretary of the Interior Standards Addressed by the Applicant
  - e. Link to Information from the May 24<sup>th</sup> HPC meeting
  - f. Case Report

Howard reviewed the staff memo and materials for the project at 809 South Street noting that since the May 24 Historic Preservation Commission meeting date, the applicant has submitted two new proposed concepts for review. Howard provided a presentation on the project and history of the structure at 809 South Street. Molnar added comment on how the structure does not appear to be individually listed, and Hanzel confirmed that the structure is contributing to the district in terms of historic properties. Howard gave additional comment to the historic boundaries and contributing structures nearby. The commission also discussed the structures in the historic district that are four stories or higher.

Howard reviewed both proposed concepts for the project. Concept #1 adds one-4th floor rooftop apartment addition while Concept #2 adds 3 apartments with the 4<sup>th</sup> floor addition.

The commission discussed the May 24 meeting and their suggestion for setbacks to be provided on the concepts of the project in order to follow the Technical Preservation Brief for rooftop additions.

Molnar emphasized that the Guidelines recommend that all new additions be designed in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new; specifically, that rooftop additions, be set back from the wall plane and be as inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street and that they not damage or obscure character defining features.

In response to a question from Neiles about what issues he had when evaluating setting back the building Schmid advised it is not feasible for him to do a setback for concept #2

as it would give up too much space and not give access in the hallway for the fire escape. Schmid also mentioned concern of snow load.

Schmid commented that there are too many variables for construction costs. In request to a question from Calhoun regarding the feasibility of Option #1, Schmid said that the most feasible thing to do is not build at all, but that he wants to improve the building.

Hanzel also reminded Schmid that the maximum building height in the General Commercial zoning district is 45 feet, as measured as the midpoint between the peak and eave of the roof, noting that neither of the concepts can exceed that amount without a Variance or administrative zoning Exception.

Molnar noted she found that differentiation exists with both project proposals but the question of detracting from the existing building was the concern, given that is highly visible within the historic district. Molnar acknowledged that the structure has been modified, including part of it torn down; however, the Commission is still tasked with recommending that projects have the least amount of impact to historic property

Johnson added that the floorplan has not changed for Option #2 since the May 24<sup>th</sup> meeting where the suggestion was made to provide a setback, especially on the west façade. She agreed that Option #1 does differentiate but that it overwhelms the architecture of the existing building. She added the Commission looked for opportunities for the new construction to harmonize with the existing historic building, emphasizing that the role of the Commission is comment on projects using the Standards and Preservation Briefs as a reference. She added that if the new construction could be setback, even as little as 8 inches, so as not to interfere with the cornice it would be more harmonious with the historic architecture.

Schmid reminded the Commission the he submitted documentation suggesting a 4<sup>th</sup> floor addition was planned for the structure. Altman commented that we do not know what the intent of that addition was since no plans exist. Schmid reiterated he believed the intent was for the entire footprint.

Brittany motioned to disagree with the findings of the case report that there are feasible and prudent alternatives to proposed Concept #1, which would include setbacks, and to not impede the historic cornice of the structure. Calhoun seconded. Motion passed unanimously, with Altman abstaining.

Brittany motioned to disagree with the findings of the case report that there are feasible and prudent alternatives to proposed Concept #2, which would include setbacks, and to not impede the cornice of the historic structure. Calhoun seconded. Motion passed unanimously, with Altman abstaining.

## New Business

Acknowledge Committee Assignments

Hanzel reviewed the committee assignments for the commission members. Neiles also advised she is meeting with Sarah Gross on her project.

## Approval of Minutes

1. Approval of the June 14, 2023 meeting minutes

**Draft**

**Saunders moved to approve the June 14, 2023 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Altman and carried unanimously.**

**There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:45 a.m.**