



# Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, September 27, 2023 at 4:00 PM

City Hall, 102 Sherman Street, Deadwood, SD 57732

---

## 1. Call Meeting to Order

A quorum present, Commission Chair Posey called the Deadwood Historic Preservation Commission meeting to order on September 27, 2023, at 4:00 p.m.

## 2. Roll Call

PRESENT

HP Commission Chair Bev Posey  
HP Commission Vice Chair Leo Diede  
HP Commission 2nd Vice Chair Robin Carmody  
HP Commissioner Molly Brown  
HP Commissioner Trevor Santochi  
HP Commissioner Vicki Dar  
City Commissioner Charlie Struble-Mook

ABSENT

HP Commissioner Tony Williams

STAFF PRESENT

Kevin Kuchenbecker, Historic Preservation Officer  
Bonny Anfinson, Historic Preservation Coordinator  
Amy Greba, Administrative Assistant  
Mike Walker, Neighborworks

## 3. Approval of Minutes

- a. HP Commission Minutes 9/13/23

***It was moved by Commissioner Santochi and seconded by Commissioner Dar to approve the minutes of the September 13, 2023, meeting. Voting Yea: Carmody, Santochi, Posey, Brown, Diede, Dar.***

- b. Minutes of September 21, 2023 Special Meeting

Commissioner Santochi stated add a consensus of options was discussed". ***It was moved by Commissioner Santochi and seconded by Commissioner Dar to approve the minutes of the September 21, 2023, special meeting. Voting Yea: Carmody, Santochi, Posey, Brown, Diede, Dar.***

## 4. Voucher Approvals

- a. HP Operating Vouchers

***It was moved by Commissioner Santochi and seconded by Commissioner Diede to approve the HP Operating Vouchers in the amount of \$110,050.09. Voting Yea: Carmody, Santochi, Posey, Brown, Diede, Dar.***

- b. HP Grant Vouchers

***It was moved by Commissioner Santochi and seconded by Commissioner Carmody to approve the HP Grant Vouchers in the amount of \$10,704.16. Voting Yea: Carmody, Santochi, Posey, Brown, Diede, Dar.***

- c. HP Revolving Vouchers

***It was moved by Commissioner Santochi and seconded by Commissioner Dar to approve the HP Revolving Vouchers in the amount of \$7,241.99. Voting Yea: Carmody, Santochi, Posey, Brown, Diede, Dar.***

## **5. HP Programs and Revolving Loan Program**

- a. Historic Preservation Loan Requests

Rick Engsminger - 130 Charles St. - Loan Extension  
Kevin Bloom - 17 Fillmore - Final Loan Extension Request  
Lance Bobolz - 7 Emery - Final Loan Extension Request  
Lance Bobolz - 57 Van Buren - Final Loan Extension Request  
Nugget Saloon LLC - 604, 606, 610, 696 Main - Two Month Loan Extension

***It was moved by Commissioner Dar and seconded by Commissioner Carmody to approve all loan requests listed. Voting Yea: Carmody, Santochi, Posey, Brown, Diede, Dar.***

## **6. Old or General Business**

- a. Permission for Conrad's Big "C" Signs to remove historic Tootsie Neon Sign from it current location at 669 Main Street at a cost of \$2,752.05 and store at City facility until new location is established. (To be paid by HP Capital Assets.)

Mr. Kuchenbecker stated the Tootsie sign was purchased and installed by Deadwood Historic Preservation Commission and installed on the building adjacent to the original Spot Liquor store. In 2014 the Tootsie sign was restored after a hailstorm and reinstalled to the rooftop which was leased by the City of Deadwood. The building owner is terminating the agreement and is requesting the city remove the Tootsie sign. Staff has received a quote from Conrad's Signs to remove the sign from 669 Main and transfer to the cold storage until a new location can be established. Staff is recommending hiring Conrad's Big C Signs to remove the sign for a cost not to exceed \$2,752.05 and be paid out of Capital Assets General Maintenance. ***It was moved by Commissioner Santochi and seconded by Commissioner Diede to approve the removal of historic Tootsie Neon Sign from it current location at 669 Main Street and store at City cold storage facility. Voting Yea: Carmody, Santochi, Posey, Brown, Diede, Dar.***

## **7. New Matters Before the Deadwood Historic District Commission**

## **8. New Matters Before the Deadwood Historic Preservation Commission**

a. PA 230118 - Bonnie Fosso - 170 Pleasant - Install Wooden Fence

Mr. Kuchenbecker stated 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 (proposed eight feet) 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.

Mr. Kuchenbecker stated 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. 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. ***It was moved by Commissioner Dar and seconded by Commissioner Carmody 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. Voting Yea: Carmody, Santochi, Posey, Brown, Diede, Dar.***

b. PA 230133 - Dale Berg - 874 Main - Replace Garage

Mr. Kuchenbecker stated 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 14ft 7 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.

Commissioner Dar stated So, you're saying any types of repairs would destroy the structure enough? Mr. Kuchenbecker stated in this case, the building was built in 1935 with anywhere from 18 to 24-inch foundation that is cracked and settled in numerous areas, so Mr. Berg would have to try to lift the garage to put a new foundation and floor in the garage. The roof is made from 2x4 joists which are

failing and cracked in a couple of spots and 2' on center. Mr. Berg corrected that they are not on center. Mr. Kuchenbecker added that by this time the wooden floor has been taken out. He also pointed out that it does not make sense to put a wooden floor into a garage these days. Mr. Berg's property would have a new concrete footing, a new concrete floor, and a new roof, which leaves three walls remaining of what was there historically.

Commissioner Santochi asked if the new structure is going to be the same size as what is onsite right now. Mr. Kuchenbecker responded that the structure widens out from 20 feet in the front. Commissioner Santochi asked for clarification on whether the garage is going to be wider than it was or longer than it was? Mr. Kuchenbecker answered that it is longer than it was, and it is 20 feet wide at the front. It steps to 25 feet at the back of the building. Commissioner Santochi asked if it is 20 feet wide now? Mr. Kuchenbecker states yes. Commissioner Santochi clarified the front is not changing at all. Mr. Kuchenbecker agreed and added that all the new material would be compatible, but it would be horizontal lap siding with a five-inch reveal and asphalt shingles. Commissioner Santochi stated that other than the change in plans, he does not see anything different from what the Commission made a motion on last month. Mr. Berg interjected that it is a lot different. Commissioner Santochi disagreed. He clarified that the plan is different but other than that, he does not see anything different. The commission was concerned with demolishing a contributing structure, which he feels is a slippery slope. There are other structures that have just as much damage as Mr. Berg's, some even more. Mr. Berg stated that he plans to remove the existing siding and bring it on to his property, all the tongue and groove from the outside of the garage. He plans to save it and preserve it and put it on his garden house on the property. But the rest of the structure is gone. He adds that it is historic.

Mr. Kuchenbecker recommended that the commission should enter a two-part motion, because of the adverse effect. Anytime you take down a historical resource, it is an adverse effect. So, part of what the commission should look at is whether they agree with staffs' opinion that demolishing the resource damages and destroys a historic resource. All commissioners agreed Yes.

Mr. Kuchenbecker recommended the commission make that motion and act on that. He then pointed out that the commission then had three additional motions to choose from after that; one, it is not adverse to Deadwood, two, all reasonable and prudent alternatives have been explored or three, deny the request. Mr.

Kuchenbecker recommended to at least get the consensus with the first motion that the action is adverse. ***It was moved by Commissioner Dar and seconded by Commissioner Santochi based on 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 history places or the state register of historic places. Voting Yea: Carmody, Santochi, Posey, Brown, Diede, Dar.***

Mr. Kuchenbecker then recommended the commission decide on the second motion. Does the commission feel that what has been proposed is adverse to Deadwood? Have all reasonable and prudent alternatives have been explored? Or

deny the request. Commissioner Diede asked if all other options have indeed been exhausted. Mr. Kuchenbecker stated that it is a tough one. He asked Mr. Berg if he received an estimate on lifting and building a new foundation under the garage. Mr. Berg stated he did not. Mr. Kuchenbecker continued by questioning how many of those Reasonable and Prudent alternatives does one look at, and the city ordinance and state law. Mr. Berg stated that everything in his plans would have to change. Mr. Kuchenbecker said that is the point in the staff report and there may not be enough historic materials left, other than the walls, that it basically would be a new garage with the original siding. Mr. Berg reiterated that the walls are going to stay up and all the siding. While appreciating the recycling of historic materials, Mr. Kuchenbecker pointed out that moving the siding from the garage to the garden shed, even though it is historic materials, it is no longer a historic resource.

Commissioner Brown added that as someone who has been in construction for a very long time, she does not believe that all reasonable and prudent alternatives have been looked at because Mr. Berg would have quotes on other types of repairs, and not just raising the building. Both times that the issue has been brought before the commission, it has been to raze the garage and put up a new building. She stated she would like to see more information on what that would look like if there were to be some repairs. Commissioner Carmody asked if the building would survive being lifted. Mr. Berg explained that in 2008, he put in three-quarter inch tongue and groove flooring to stabilize it. At that time, the roof was literally falling in. There were holes everywhere when he bought the property. There were 13 squirrel entry points into the old Victorian and not quite as many in the garage. That was all repaired at that time and he put in a center beam to hold the garage up. If he took those two components out, the garage would fall over. Commissioner Diede asked if the staff agreed with Mr. Berg's statement. Mr. Kuchenbecker stated that his concerns, which are included in the staff report, are to lift that up there would have to be some type of LDL's or something outside of the building to lift it up, excavate, set it back down on the new footings and then address the roof system at that time and put a new roof on. Basically, there would be three walls of the original structure remaining. Commissioner Brown asked if an engineer had done a structural analysis on it. Mr. Berg answered No.

Commissioner Santochi asked what made the hole in the floor. Mr. Berg stated the floor joists fell. Mr. Kuchenbecker explained Mr. Berg cut the hole in the floor. Commissioner Santochi asked for clarification on how Mr. Berg's car was damaged, as stated in the Staff Report. Mr. Kuchenbecker explained that when Mr. Berg drove his car into the garage, the floor joists, where connected to the footings, were rotted and deteriorated. When the weight of Mr. Berg's car was applied to that, it dropped down. Mr. Berg interjected that it is a cavity two and a half feet down. Mr. Kuchenbecker continued that the photographs show where the entrance into the garage is below the existing floor.

Commissioner Santochi agreed that he could see what Mr. Kuchenbecker was referring to but wondered what originally caused the opening. Commissioner Santochi asked Mr. Berg if he made the opening bigger, at which Mr. Berg stated that he absolutely 'opened it up'. Commissioner Santochi asked Mr. Berg if there was damage to the vehicle to which Mr. Berg replied Yes. Commissioner Santochi then asked how that happened. Mr. Berg explained that it occurred when he was coming out of the garage, the floor fell in. Mr. Berg continued that he is not able to park a car in the garage. Commissioner Santochi agreed but added that he did not think one would keep Mr. Berg from pouring a concrete floor in garage. Commissioner Santochi asked staff if there was something Mr. Berg would have to come back to the commission to consider. Mr. Berg asked Commissioner Santochi how to do that without taking the old floor out, lifting the building up, which would be very complicated, then putting in a concrete pad. Mr. Berg stated he felt he was at a loss. Commissioner Santochi stated he did too.

Commissioner Posey stated that one of her concerns was that the last time Mr. Berg did any maintenance on the garage was in 2008. She continued that within the last 5-10 years, Mr. Berg could easily have saved the structure. She pointed out that Mr. Berg never even painted it. Commissioner Posey continued that from the very beginning it seemed Mr. Berg was only interested in getting rid of the garage. Commissioner Posey concluded that as far as she was concerned, this was a definite example of Demolition by Neglect.

Commissioner Santochi added that the city has a similar situation happening on Stewart Street where the roof is falling in. He continued that the City could be faced with the same sort of situation where the owner of the property does not want to spend the money or do what needs to be done to save the historic structure. He pointed out, that is historic preservation. Mr. Berg stated he wants to spend the money but wants a functioning garage and has the property for it and the means. Commissioner Santochi stated you know what, I believe you. I believe that is exactly what you want. Commissioner Posey added that she knows that, too.

Commissioner Dar stated there was discussion last time about going behind the existing structure. Mr. Kuchenbecker stated that one of the things is the design that the draftsmen came up with which is that the roofline is kept down low if it went back and do a 25-foot gable end, the roof would be higher, it may have an encroachment on the existing structure because of the height. Mr. Kuchenbecker stated when he received the plans, he liked the proposed design better than what he had in his mind. Rather than having the structure back and having a larger garage, overwhelming the smaller garage in front, the new design keeps it within the 10% of the new construction on either side of the resources. The new drawing shows the new construction being one foot one half inch taller than the existing garage. He continued that Mr. Berg is proposing an 8/12 roof on the new construction. The original construction may have been 8/12 but has settled over time.

Mr. Berg stated he wants to keep it as close to historic appearance as possible, but come out of it with a garage that he can work in. Commissioner Carmody asked about taking the original siding and instead of putting them on the garden shed,

could they be placed on the front of the garage, facing the road. Mr. Berg said no, they were going to take a lot of work. Mr. Kuchenbecker clarified what Commissioner Carmody was asking and that was if the siding could be used on the front facing part of the garage to keep the original historic look. Mr. Berg replied that he was not opposed to that idea. Commissioner Diede stated he was having difficulty wrapping his mind around the entire situation. He stated if Mr. Berg were in front of the commission proposing to put new siding on the building, take the old siding off and put approved siding up, he believed the commission would not have a problem with that request. Commissioner Posey confirmed that the commission offered him that option the previous time he appeared in front of the commission. She stated the commission suggested applying for both siding and foundation grants.

Commissioner Diede stated he has lived in the area a long time and has seen many garages like Mr. Berg's garage. He stated that they do become dangerous. He was empathetic to Mr. Berg on the issue because Mr. Berg's garage is basically nonfunctional, whether it is his fault or not. If Mr. Berg put new siding on the garage, basically tear the walls down, put in a new floor and then put the walls and siding back up, he would have a functional garage. Commissioner Santochi agreed with Commissioner Diede's view of the situation. His main point was that the board needed to be extremely careful moving forward in that, they need to be very specific so as to not be faced with someone coming and saying, "You know what? My house on Stewart Street has dry rot. It's got this, it's got that. It's not even worth saving." Commissioner Diede replied that he understood exactly the point that Commissioner Santochi was making and agreed. Commissioner Santochi continued that he felt that is exactly what he was hearing from the situation before the board. Commissioner Diede agreed and stated that he had a real problem destroying a historic structure.

Mr. Berg interrupted to ask Commissioner Santochi, "Can I speak?" Commissioner Santochi replied, "Sure." To which Mr. Berg continued, "I'm here. You act like I'm not here." Commissioner Santochi replied, "I know, but we (the commission) are talking about the situation. We're trying to make a decision." Mr. Berg continued by explaining that when he bought the property, he paid a lot of money for the property, and it was in extremely poor shape. He pointed out that he has put hundreds of 1000s of dollars into the Victorian structure. He continued that he is not opposed to restoring something that's restorable. But just really having a problem. Commissioner Santochi replied that the problem he has had from the get-go is this property hasn't been worth saving, and that was the problem that a lot of Commissioners have which is what has pushed the board in this direction. He continued that another thing that created a problem is that Mr. Berg previously wanted to tear the building down, in order to build a two-story garage. That was one of the initial plans. Mr. Berg replied that was never really what he wanted. Commissioner Santochi reminded Mr. Berg that it looked like he wanted it because Mr. Berg spent a lot of money on those plans for something he didn't want. Commissioner Santochi said he agreed with Commissioner Diede. At the end of the

day, Commissioner Santochi wants the directions pertaining to the structure to be specific. He continued that he would want to see Mr. Berg reuse the siding as recommended by the Commission. The finished structure would maintain some of the original building and it would not be quite so egregious as just tearing the old garage down and building a new structure.

Mr. Walker, Neighborworks, asked Mr. Kuchenbecker for his opinion if the three perimeter walls would support a new roof system. Mr. Kuchenbecker stated that new rafters would have to be made and the walls could support rafters. Commissioner Santochi suggested that Mr. Berg could possibly put in a false wall. He continued that he did it in his house in Simi Valley, California. The house was deteriorated, and they had to put new false walls inside the structure. Commissioner Diede recalled doing that up in a house on Williams Street. Commissioner Santochi continued by saying he understood Mr. Berg's desire to have a functioning garage but wants to try and resolve the situation in a way that the commission does not create a precedent where others request to remove historical structures without attempting rehabilitation of those structures. Commissioner Carmody asked if the commission would need to discuss all the various components of the structure, i.e., the floor, roof, and using the siding on the front end. Commissioner Santochi suggested referring to the scope of work. Commissioner Brown added that the commission needs to be specific.

Commissioner Diede pointed out that once the floor is removed, which is 25% of the structure, the remaining foundation is in rough shape. He said it could be repaired but probably wouldn't be as safe as removing the foundation. Removing the foundation and putting a concrete floor in it is reasonable. Commissioner Santochi agreed. Commissioner Diede stated that the commission has already determined it is going to be an adverse effect. Have we looked at all possible alternatives? Probably not.

Mr. Kuchebecker stated but the other part of that, is it adverse to Deadwood. Commissioner Santochi stated I do not believe it is adverse to Deadwood when all said and done. Mr. Kuchenbecker stated in that case it would be an approval because it's not adverse to the overall Historic District. Commissioner Brown asked how is the commission viewing a new building as not adverse to Deadwood? Commissioner Diede clarified by saying that it would be approved by all of the standards utilized to restore. Commissioner Brown pointed out the way it is put into this packet says Mr. Berg is going to raze the building and construct a brand-new building and that is language I am not comfortable with. Commissioner Santochi replied Mr. Berg is going to repurpose the wood that's already on it and the front will be the same width and it is going to look the same from the outside.

Commissioner Santochi reminded the commission that the first motion has already dealt with the fact that what Mr. Berg is planning on doing is going to damage and destroy an existing structure. Commissioner Brown stated she is comfortable with the phrase reconstruction because that implies that the current building is being used.

Mr. Walker added that in the past, there have been a few carriage houses that were allowed to be removed, but they had to document the entire structure; the framing, all the kinks so that way it could be rebuilt later. He did not know if that could be applied here but thought it might lend to the argument.

Commissioner Santochi stated that it does not sound like the changes are going to be near what they were and at least from the front, the structure should look very much the same other than the garage door being different with a rollup single door versus a double door. Mr. Berg offered that if the commission would like to pick the look of the door, he would be okay with that.

Commissioner Carmody asked how the motion would have to be written. Mr. Kuchenbecker answered that if the committee determined that the plan is not averse to Deadwood and the commission would like to approve this, add to the fact that Mr. Berg would be using existing materials in a reconstruction method. He asked the commission to keep in mind the footprint is not the same because it gets wider as it goes back but reminded them that there are a lot of buildings in town that have garages with lean-tos on them, also. Mr. Kuchenbecker displayed a rendition of the proposed structure to help the commission understand what the finished structure would look like. The front would be the 20' that exists now with a 5' step back where there would be a kickout and the width would increase to 25' wide.

Commissioner Diede stated the commission would not be opposed to Mr. Berg removing the siding and putting on new siding. Commissioners Santochi, Brown and Posey said that they would be opposed to that option. Mr. Berg stated he would try very hard to salvage what he could. The siding has round nails used somewhere between 1935 and 1960. He does not know how brittle the wood is now. Mr. Kuchenbecker stated Mr. Berg would be lucky to salvage 60% of the existing siding. Commissioner Santochi stated he only needs enough to cover the front of the garage, facing the street. He added if not enough shiplap of the same size or close in size would be possible, too. Mr. Berg stated that he will do his best.

Commissioner Posey asked if there is any additional discussion, or any questions. Commissioner Santochi requested a roll call vote on the motion.

***It was moved by Commissioner Diede and seconded by Commissioner Santochi, based on 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 tha the project is not adverse to Deadwood and move to approve the project as presented. Roll Call: Voting Yea: Carmody, Santochi, Diede, Dar. Voting Nay: Posey, Brown. Motion carries.***

## **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 stated the FEMA Whitewood Creek project is scheduled to start the week of October 2, 2023. Report has been sent to both South Dakota Historic Preservation Office and National Park Service and both have 30 days to comment on report.

They held a progress meeting on Stage Run development/The Ridge.

The new owners of the Franklin will be applying for the Façade program to continue the next phase of the façade project.

Roger Tellinghuesen will be the city's lobbyist during the upcoming 2024 Legislative session.

Peck's Garden and Methodist Memorial Church plaques will be placed in their respective locations.

Ms. Anfinson stated that smooth Smart Siding is not being manufactured at this time. It is being reformulated and will be available in the spring.

Dakota Lumber in Belle Fourche will no longer be a vendor for Marvin Windows.

## **11. Committee Reports**

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

City Commissioner Mook reminded everyone that First Responders will be honored at Outlaw Square tonight.

Commissioner Posey stated that Main Street Initiative hired consultant to help Main Street business owners improve their impact and sales. The event is scheduled for Wednesday, October 3, 2023 at Holiday Inn basement.

## **12. Adjournment**

The Historic Preservation Commission Meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

ATTEST:

---

Chairman, Historic Preservation Commission

Minutes by Amy Greba, Administrative Assistant