

Date: May 08, 2025

Case No. 250069
Address: 39 Centennial

Staff Report

The applicant has submitted an application for Project Approval for work at 39 Centennial, a Contributing structure located in the Forest Hill Planning Unit in the City of Deadwood.

Applicant: James Buttke
Owner: BUTTKE, JAMES
Constructed: 1890

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. It is significant for its historic association with the founding and initial period of growth of the town of Deadwood. Spurred by the tremendous mining boom of 1876, Deadwood grew quickly and became the first major urban center of western South Dakota. Deadwood's economic prominence during the late 1800s and early 1900s was reflected by the construction of a number of large residences such as this one. These houses displayed a variety of architectural styles: Queen Anne, Second Empire, Colonial, and even Gothic variants are found locally. Together, these houses are among the strongest reminders of Deadwood's nineteenth-century boom.

2. Architectural design of the resource and proposed alterations:

The applicant is requesting permission to remove upper porch rail which is very rotted and not historic. Replace with much smaller upper railed in area only around upper door. Replace lower plywood posts with solid cedar 6"x6" posts with two added posts and solid cedar beam under porch roof supported by new posts. Lower posts are also starting to rot. Plan is to use iron railing for upper railed in area around upper door.

UPDATE AFTER CONTINUATION: The look I prefer 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.

Attachments: Yes

Plans: Yes

Photos: Yes

Staff Opinion:

In review of the Sanborn Fire Insurance maps, the first coverage of this area is 1903 which shows the front porch. The wrap-around side porch was added between 1915 and 1923. The deck of the main floor of the front porch and presumably the balustrade balcony was removed and rebuilt in the configuration shown today.

The original configuration and post design has not been researched at this time due to meeting and conference schedules. As such, staff opinion is that the current configuration is appropriate but the proposed 6x6 post and smaller balcony with metal railing will not be appropriate. Until a photograph is found, staff is not comfortable recommending approval or rendering an opinion that 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.

UPDATE AFTER CONTINUATION

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 can 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.



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.