

Date: September 21, 2023

Case No. 230118
Address: 170 Pleasant

Staff Report

The applicant has submitted an application for work at 170 Pleasant, a contributing structure located in the Highland Park Planning Unit in the City of Deadwood.

Applicant: Bonnie Fosso
Owner: FOSSO, BONNIE
Constructed: 1895

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 building is a contributing resource in the Deadwood National Historic Landmark District. This is an early Deadwood house which was remodeled during the pre-World War II years; consequently, it has historic associations with both Deadwood's nineteenth-century mining boom and the region's mining revival of the late 1920s and 1930s. This house displays architectural elements which were popular during the latter period. In Deadwood – as elsewhere in the United States – residential remodels commonly borrowed from the then popular Craftsman Style. Other remodels copy traditional forms seen in the "Picturesque Revival" styles.

2. Architectural design of the resource and proposed alterations:

The applicant is requesting permission to construct an eight-foot-high wooden fence with a six-foot high, ten foot wide, two panel wooden gate. This will be constructed between her property and the neighbor at 36 Burnham.

Attachments: Yes

Plans: No

Photos: Yes

Staff Opinion: This item was continued from our September 13, 2023 meeting. A site visit was conducted on September 21, 2023, 2:00 p.m. to review the proposed location and height of the fence. The eight foot section of fence will be along the property line between the two structures/properties and will not be seen from Burnham Street. A six foot gate would block the view of the structure so a five foot gate is recommended with no more than a six foot high fence on the downhill slope side.

Staff has worked with the applicant for several years with the rehabilitation of this resource. Due to conflicts with the neighbor, the applicant is requesting to add a privacy fence to separate the property and reduce potential confrontations with the neighbor. While staff understands the applicants wishes and desires, staff is concerned with the height and location of the proposed fence. A six-foot fence may be more appropriate; however, both options will hide the historic property from the street view and may have an adverse effect on the resource as well as the district due to the location of the fence. Privacy fences have been approved but typically on a side or rear yard of the resource. While staff understands the reasoning behind the proposed request, it may have an adverse effect on the districts. However, fence is a reversible alteration and does not damage or destroy a historic resource.

It is staff's opinion; the proposed work and changes does encroach upon but does not damage or destroy a historic resource but does have an adverse effect on the character of the building and the

historic character of the State and National Register Historic Districts or the Deadwood National Historic Landmark District.



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.