

Date: September 22, 2023

Case No. 230133
Address: 874 Main

Staff Report

The applicant has submitted an application for work at 874 Main, a contributing structure located in the Upper Main Planning Unit in the City of Deadwood.

Applicant: Dale & Susan Berg
Owner: Dale & Susan Berg
Constructed: c 1935

CRITERIA FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A PROJECT APPROVAL

The Historic Preservation Commission shall use the following criteria in granting or denying the Project Approval:

General Factors:

1. Historic significance of the resource:

This area of the National Historic Landmark District does not show up in the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps. This is a contributing structure built circa 1935 as the garage for the residence across the street at 872 Main.

2. Architectural design of the resource and proposed alterations:

The current garage has dry rot throughout the floor joists. The Foundation is off on all sides. The front floor gave way when a vehicle was parking in the garage causing significant damage to our car. We are requesting permission to raze the current garage and construct a 25'x 36' garage and the wall height will be 7' 6 1/4" with the total height of the structure being 21' 7 3/8". Plans are to reuse the tongue and groove siding on a garden shed across the street. We are asking the HP Commission to please allow us to build a safe garage that can keep our property safe.

Attachments: Yes

Plans: Yes

Photos: Yes

Staff Opinion:

The applicant previously applied in June 2023 for a similar project and was denied. A new project approval has been submitted with new building plans. The proposed structure will be a 25' x 36' structure with 8' 1 1/8" side walls for a total height of 15' 7 1/2".

Staff has conducted a site visit earlier this week and observed the deteriorated conditions of the existing structure. Attached to this report are some additional photographs of the existing conditions. The floor in the garage is of poor construction which may be typical of the era. The garage was built on a shallow footing and has wood joists and wood floor. The wood floor joists appear rotted and unsafe. This recent discovery by the applicant is also shown in the photographs.

The State Historic Preservation Office responded in their review of the application with the following:

SHPO has concerns with the removal of a contributing building but acknowledges that the property appears to have suffered deterioration and poses safety issues as alluded to in the application.

SHPO also notes that the replacement garage does take into account and matches the existing home of the applicant. However, SHPO is concerned with the height and overall scale of the replacement structure. SHPO recommends that the City take into account the scale of the replacement structure and possible visual effects within the historic district. Additionally, SHPO recommends that all prudent and feasible alternatives, including repairs to correct the structural deficiencies of the existing structure, be fully investigated.

SHPO Comments after updated staff report of 9/27/23: With this further information, SHPO still agrees that the removal of the structure destroys a historic contributing resource, but the replacement structure is compatible in size with the historic district. This was made aware to the SHPO on 9/27. The total height of the new structure is 15ft7-1/2. The existing historic garage height is 14ft7 tall. SHPO's previous comments were regarding an initial height of new construction set at 21ft7-3/8. The additional photographs showcase a large amount of deterioration on the current historic structure. SHPO recommends increasing the setback of the walkthrough front door on the new garage to better match the form and setback of the wing on the existing historic house.

The existing garage height is 14'-7" tall and 20'-0" wide. The proposed new construction shows the front section of the structure to 20'-0" wide with a step back from the front to a width of 25'-0" wide. The height at the gable is 15'-7 1/2" tall, being just a 1'-1/2" higher than the existing structure. The step back of the walkthrough from door needs to be further back to match the step back of the existing house.

The floor has separated in several areas from the foundation as shown in the photographs making use of the property unsafe for any vehicles. Furthermore, the foundation has a large crack due to settling on one side of the structure and appears to be off the foundation, based on the photos, on the other side. This is also shown in the photographs.

It is staff's opinion, that due to the condition of the structure, it would require the existing structure to be lifted to construct a new foundation and install floor. Lifting the structure may also be a challenge due to the construction and what appears as two separate bottom plates.

Finally, the commission would need to determine that all prudent and feasible alternatives have been explored. The applicant has looked at the possibility of donating the structure but if it can be moved it can be lifted. Staff is concerned the possible loss of original materials due to the necessary repairs and correction of structural deficiencies would be so great that the remains of a historic structure would be questionable, due to the replacement of foundation, roof, and floor, leaving only the walls.

While removal of the structure obviously damages and destroys a historic building and is adverse to the building itself, the proposed new garage is compatible in size with the historic district and surrounding area, therefore, it will not have an overall adverse affect on the historic district.



Photograph showing the area of the floor opened up by the applicant verifying construction method and deteriorated conditions.



Photograph showing how the garage floor has sank, and is unlevel due to the deterioration. The decking in this section actually moves when you walk on it.



This photograph shows the deterioration of the garage floor and the two separate bottom plates.



This photograph shows the two separate bottom plates and a bow in the floor.



This photograph shows where the structure is off the foundation as you can see light through it.



This photograph shows the foundation pulled away from floor and light showing through.



These photographs show the back side of the structure off the foundation.



This photograph shows the right side of the structure.



This photograph is the right side of the structure.



This photograph shows the left side of the structure.



This photograph is the cracked foundation on the left side.



This photograph is the left side of the structure.

Motions available for commission action:

A: If you, as a commissioner, have determined the Project DOES NOT Encroach Upon, Damage or Destroy a historic property then:

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.

If you, as a commissioner, have determined the Project will Encroach Upon, Damage or Destroy a historic property then:

B: First Motion:

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. [If this, move on to 2nd Motion and choose an option.]

C: Second Motion:

Option 1: 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 **NOT ADVERSE** to Deadwood and move to **APPROVE** the project as presented.

OR

Option 2: 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.

OR

Option 3: 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, but the applicant has explored **ALL REASONABLE AND PRUDENT ALTERNATIVES**, and so I move to **APPROVE** the project as presented.