

Date: August 02, 2023

Case No. 230091
Address: 12 Sampson St.

Staff Report

The applicant has submitted an application for work at 12 Sampson St., a contributing structure located in the Large's Flat Planning Unit in the City of Deadwood.

Applicant: Terry Van Zanten
Owner: VAN ZANTEN, TERRY L & RHONDA E0
Constructed: 1936

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 early twentieth-century economic activity in the town of Deadwood. In general, this was a period of economic stagnation for the Deadwood region, and relatively few new buildings were constructed in the town. Of the houses which were constructed, however, nearly all displayed elements of the Craftsman architectural style. This mirrored national architectural trends of the period. This structure was originally located at 2 Dunlap Street and was moved to 12 Sampson Street in 1994.

2. Architectural design of the resource and proposed alterations:

The applicant is requesting permission to add a 12'x24' portable storage shed/garage to be placed on adjoining lot. This is a new structure being purchased by 605 Sheds. The color will match the existing house and garage on the property. The siding and roof will be metal.

Attachments: Yes

Plans: Yes

Photos: Yes

Staff Opinion:

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.