

Date: October 01, 2025

Case No. 250195
Address: 96 Charles Street

Staff Report

The applicant has submitted an application for Project Approval for work at 96 Charles Street, a Contributing structure located in the Cleveland Planning Unit in the City of Deadwood.

Applicant: Jim and Monica Wiasanen
Owner: YOST, HAROLD ALVIN & SHERRILYN B0
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 add a 35.7 square foot sauna to the northwest corner of the house. It will be attached to the house and become part of the deck.

Attachments: Yes

Plans: Yes

Photos: Yes

Staff Opinion:

The proposed work and changes is at the rear of the house. It is reversible and reads as an addition which does not overpower the resources, as such it does 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.