



Historic Preservation Commission Minutes

Wednesday, May 28, 2025 at 4:00 PM

City Hall, 102 Sherman Street, Deadwood, SD 57732

1. Call Meeting to Order

A quorum present, Commission chair Diede called the Deadwood Historic Preservation Commission meeting to order on May 28th, 2025, at 4:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call

PRESENT

HP Commissioner Chair Leo Diede

HP Commissioner Vice Chair Vicki Dar

HP Commissioner 2nd Vice Chair Trevor Santochi

HP Commissioner Molly Brown

HP Commissioner Anita Knipper

HP Commissioner Tony Williams

City Commissioner Charles Eagleson

ABSENT

HP Commissioner Jesse Allen

City Commissioner Blake Joseph

STAFF PRESENT

Kevin Kuchenbecker, Plann, Zoning and Historic Preservation officer

Bonny Anfinson, Historic Preservation Coordinator

Cammie Schmidt, Administrative Assistant

Susan Trucano, Neighborworks

3. Approval of Minutes

a. Minutes of 5/14/25 meeting

It was motioned by Commissioner Dar and seconded by Commissioner Santochi to approve minutes of the May 14, 2025, meeting. Voting Yea: Diede, Dar, Santochi, Knipper, Brown, Williams.

4. Voucher Approvals

a. HP Operating Vouchers

It was motioned by Commissioner Williams and seconded by Commissioner Santochi to approve HP Operating Vouchers in the amount of \$26,406.14. Voting Yea: Diede, Dar, Brown, Santochi, Knipper.

b. HP Revolving Vouchers

It was motioned by Commissioner Dar and seconded by Commissioner Santochi to approve HP Revolving Vouchers in the amount of \$17,400.00. Voting Yea: Diede, Santochi, Dar, Brown, Knipper, Williams.

5. HP Programs and Revolving Loan Program

- a. Accept 79 Stewart - Maria Hedger - into the Retaining Wall Program

Mr. Kuchenbecker stated the Historic Preservation Commission has received an application for the Retaining Wall Program. Maria Hedger – 79 Stewart – Wall is located in front of structure along the city sidewalk. Staff conducted an on-site review of the retaining wall and determined it is not a historic wall. However, if the retaining wall fails it could fall into the street causing a life safety issue which would then qualify under the Retaining Wall Program. ***It was motioned by Commissioner Santochi and seconded by Commissioner Brown to accept Maria Hedger, 79 Stewart St, into the Retaining Wall Program. Voting Yea: Diede, Santochi, Brown, Dar, Knipper, Williams.***

6. Old or General Business

7. New Matters Before the Deadwood Historic District Commission

8. New Matters Before the Deadwood Historic Preservation Commission

- a. PA 250080 - Lance Bobolz - 37 Denver - Repairs to Porch

Mr. Kuchenbecker stated that the applicant has submitted an application for Project Approval for work at 37 Denver, a noncontributing structure located in the Deadwood Creek Planning Unit in the City of Deadwood. The applicant is requesting permission to tear out and remove front entry and sidewalk concrete - 32" wide x 26' sidewalk, 9'x11' entry pour. Tear out and replace one support column for porch support. Repair/Replace main cross beam, support structure, and roof membrane. Apply new EPDM roof membrane and slip layer under deck rebuild. Build treated deck support structure, composite decking and railing. Paint and trim the entire house. The proposed work and changes do not encroach upon, damage or destroy a historic resource or have an adverse effect on the character of the building or the historic character of the State and National Register Historic Districts or the Deadwood National Historic Landmark District. ***It was moved by Commissioner Knipper and seconded by Commissioner Dar based upon all the evidence presented, I move to make a finding that this project DOES not encroach upon damage, or destroy any historic property included in the National Register of Historic Places or the State Register of Historic Places. Voting Yea: Knipper, Dar, Diede, Santochi, Brown, Williams.***

- b. PA 250069 - James Buttke - 39 Centennial - Remove upper porch rail to replace with smaller railed porch

Mr. Kuchenbecker stated this was continued from our last meeting so staff could do research on the porch design. Since then the applicant contacted us stated the preference for the porch restoration is basically the same as the photo from your archives for 39 Centennial. If I am not required to have any sort of railing around the upper door, I will secure the door in the closed position to prevent small

children from accessing the porch roof and not have any upper rail on the roof of the porch. The current porch posts have concrete poured around them and the bottom part of each post is basically buried in concrete which I believe is causing the wood to rot on the bottom and shifting of the entire post. I feel the best restoration would be to replace the current posts with solid 6x6 cedar posts which will sit on top of the concrete. Cedar posts will last for centuries if not allowed to sit in water for long periods of time. I also feel a beam on top of the posts is necessary to better support the porch roof as it is currently sagging in some places. Feel free to contact me if you have any further questions of my restoration plans. The applicant discussed changes to the original request with staff. Plans are to do away with the upper porch and block the door on the second story from the inside and repair the support posts with Cedar. Cedar posts are available in turned columns or should at least add some architectural details to make the posts congruent with the resource. The posts as well as the beam should also be primed and painted. If the posts are enhanced with architectural details with the resource and painted, the proposed work and changes do not encroach upon, damage or destroy a historic resource or have an adverse effect on the character of the building or the historic character of the State and National Register Historic Districts or the Deadwood National Historic Landmark District. ***It was moved by Commissioner Dar and seconded by Commissioner Santochi based upon all the evidence presented, I find that this project DOES NOT encroach upon, damage, or destroy any historic property included in the National Register of Historic Places or the State Register of Historic Places, and therefore move to grant a project approval contingent upon staff approval and review. Voting Yea: Knipper, Dar, Diede, Santochi, Brown, Williams.***

- c. PA 250044 - Dale & Susan Berg - 874 Main - Construct carriage house - (Continued from April 9, 2025, meeting)

Mr. Kuchenbecker stated, in the packet is the most recent concept for a proposed building. The applicant has removed the other structure. Staff have met and discussed the proposed project with the applicant on a few occasions over the past several weeks including conversing with the drafting company. The latest plan bases its design from Victorian carriage houses and is more compatible with the existing contributing house and historic district than previous designs. Based on the submitted scaled drawings, the size has been reduced to 44' in length and 18'-6". The height of the covered porch has also been reduced from 13'-0" to 8'-4". This plan is more appropriate than the previous structure and design alternatives submitted. Mr. Kuchenbecker stated this plan is more appropriate than previous structure and design alternatives submitted. Staff opinion is it does not damage or destroy a historic resource, but it does encroach upon the structures in the neighborhood due to the size and mass. Commissioner Knipper commented so based on the drawing, it looks like the elevation of that carriage house, the roof line is above the existing roofline of that house? Mr. Kuchenbecker stated from that perspective of the architectural rendering, yes. Chair Diede commented, it also appears that they are cutting into the hillside to allow that entire structure to be, is that a correct assumption? It looked that way from the rendering. Mr. Kuchenbecker stated the cut is already there from the previous structure, when he

had the lean two type structure on there, he had already cut into that hillside. Commissioner Knipper commented and maybe that's true because when I walk by it, I am looking from the ground or below the house level, so when I look up at it, it never looked like that structure was above the existing house roofline, the old one. Now this is going to be taller than that old one was, I assume? And the old thing got torn down. Are we sure it's going to be? I mean from this drawing, I think it looks way above that house roofline or the top of the roof. Mr. Kuchenbecker stated yes because the perspective that the architectural rendering is above the existing house, but the second rendering does look like it sits up there quite a ways. Chair Diede asked how tall is this structure? Mr. Kuchenbecker stated 13 feet plus the 22-23 feet to the ridgeline. Chair Diede stated that's a two-story structure. Commissioner Santochi commented yes it is, storage. Mr. Kuchenbecker stated and that's again, I am trying to work with the applicant to come up with something more compatible. He had that, I will call it the front porch of the carriage house was at 13 foot and so I worked with the draftsman to bring that down, the previous rendering that we received didn't have any doors or windows across the front, so we added that. Again, my concern is that it's 13-foot interior, floor to ceiling height and 44 foot in length and so it's a large structure in the rear of this historic property. Commissioner Knipper commented I mean it looks like the elevation on that part of the property is high. When I'm walking by, there is no way that would appear from an angle of somebody on the street as being higher than that tall house, because of the perspective. Commissioner Santochi stated that it's up for discussion because that is their drawing. That is not our drawing. So, I mean if they wanted to give it a better look, they didn't try. I went to the residential neighborhood guidelines because we didn't have a recommendation in the staff report and the only thing I could find it's just so vague, that for a garage structure, it basically says that the new structure should be secondary in nature of the main house and smaller in scale. Now it's smaller, but not much and when you put it up on that hill, it really looks big. So, I still think it's too big. And if you want specifics, I think something half that size would be more appropriate. Chair Diede stated I think we've gotten some push back from the neighborhood as well, as far as the size of this particular structure and that needs to be taken into consideration as well. Commissioner Knipper commented, but does it really need to be taken into consideration? Commissioner Santochi stated the structure would still be up there if it wasn't for the neighbors. Commissioner Knipper stated if you're looking at this structure without the input from the neighbors, right, we need to look at it may be without preconceived notion that issues we've had in the past with that property. I think it needs to be looked at as if somebody came in clean and said that this is something we want to do on our property rather than say the neighbors don't like it or we've had issues with these people in the past. He's done what we've asked and not trying to defend anybody, just trying to look at it clearly. He's torn down what we've asked him to tear down, so I guess we need to I think at least be willing to take into consideration these facts. Commissioner Dar stated but then do we want 5 of those? Commissioner Knipper stated he is not asking for 5 of them. Commissioner Dar commented no but it sets precedent for the future. (Something about calling it the carriage house??). Commissioner Santochi stated as Anita pointed out the last meeting we discussed this, there are large structures in the

neighborhood and there are motions and votes that I've made on this commission that if I could take back I would but we've got to look, we've got to look at this particular project. I just think it's too big. I've seen it from the very beginning, and I was wondering what's he doing up there? I didn't know and I just assumed that it had been approved. And it went on and I was kind of watching because of the garage that we approved and I'm thinking well you know he is sure busy, and I didn't like it then and I have neighbors in my neighborhood asking me about it because I am on Historic Preservation and I am going, I don't know. I don't care what motion gets made, I just know how I'm going to vote on this. I'm happy to make a motion and I'm also happy to entertain someone else's motion here.

Commissioner Dar stated I am prepared to make a motion that it does encroach upon this. Commissioner Santochi stated on the Historical Preservation and nature of the neighborhood. ***It was moved by Commissioner Dar and seconded by Commissioner Brown based upon all the evidence presented, I move to make a finding that this project DOES encroach upon, damage, or destroy any historic property included in the National Register of Historic Places or the State Register of Historic Places. Voting Yea: Diede, Dar, Santochi, Brown, Knipper, Williams.***

It was moved by Commissioner Dar and seconded by Commissioner Brown based upon the guidance in the U.S. Department of the Interior standards for historic preservation, restoration, and rehabilitation projects adopted by rules promulgated pursuant to SDCL 1-19A & 1-19B, et seq, I find that the project is ADVERSE to Deadwood and move to DENY the project as presented.

- d. PA 250082 - Danika McFarland - 37 Lincoln - Construct Conservatory on back of structure

Mr. Kuchenbecker stated the applicant has submitted an application for Project Approval for work at 37 Lincoln Ave., a structure located in the Ingleside Planning Unit. The applicant is requesting permission to construct a conservatory on the back of the house. Plans are to remove the newer addition on the back and replace with the conservatory. ***It was moved by Commissioner Williams and seconded by Commissioner Knipper based upon all the evidence presented, I move to make a finding that this project DOES encroach upon, damage, or destroy any historic property included in the National Register of Historic Places or the State Register of Historic Places. Voting Yea: Diede, Dar, Santochi, Brown, Knipper, Williams.***

9. Items from Citizens not on Agenda

(Items considered but no action will be taken at this time.)

10. Staff Report

(Items considered but no action will be taken at this time.)

Mr. Kuchenbecker reported the historic ceremony at Carbonate Camp Cemetery, Lawrence County, SD for Joseph N. Ritter scheduled for 1:00 p.m. on Monday, July 7, 2025. Several historic organizations in the Northern Hills will be involved. We anticipate requests for a grant for Interpretive Signs, the National

Guard and Veteran Affairs. They're asking that we carpool to Carbonate Camp, due to limited parking. If you are interested in attending, please contact Bonny and Cammie and they will make sure to reserve City vehicles to go out there. You can not get to it from Richmond Rd., due to the mine. The Carbonate Camp is located between Preston and Maitland. Come in Spearfish side, down the back side. It is kind of a rough area to drive through, but it is do-able.

Mr. Kuchenbecker reported on the Soap Suds Row Archeology Project, we have scheduled a site visit for June 10, 2025. Mrs. Anfinson stated a tour is scheduled at 10:00 am and this is the 3rd year of archaeology for this project. If you would like to attend, we will be leaving at 9:30 am. Also, we will be planning a plaque presentation for Custer Outside of Deadwood project.

Mr. Kuchenbecker stated there will not be a restaurant as planned at Landmark. Letters will be going out to building owners for the sidewalk vaults to schedule an inspection by the city's engineer. Staff met with State Tourism to discuss next year's conference. Masonry repair is currently being done on the back of the Bloody Nose buildings.

11. Committee Reports

(Items considered but no action will be taken at this time.)

Mr. Kuchenbecker presented plaques to outgoing Historic Preservation Commissioners Vicki Dar and Tony Williams.

Commission Dar stated the farmers market will start June 20.

12. Adjournment

The HP Commission meeting adjourned at 4:39 p.m.

ATTEST:

Chairman, Historic Preservation Commission

Minutes by Cammie Schmidt, Administrative Assistant