

Date: June 20, 2025

Case No. 250107

Address: 136 Charles St.

Staff Report

The applicant has submitted an application for Project Approval for work at 136 Charles St., a Noncontributing structure located in the Cleveland Planning Unit in the City of Deadwood.

Applicant: Roland Barkey

Owner: SMITH, DARIN DO

Constructed: 1939

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 house has been re-sided with a variety of materials; it also has a majority of modern replacement windows and doors. Because of these alterations, the house has lost integrity and cannot contribute to the Deadwood National Historic Landmark District at this time.

2. Architectural design of the resource and proposed alterations:

The applicant is requesting permission to replace the windows with performax white sliding with nail flange and grilles, replace front door with Mastercraft prime steel external grille, half moon light. Add a small stoop over front door. Replace back door with full light prime exterior door. Replace siding with pre-finished 6 inch LP Smartside siding. Replace old wood on the back deck with ultradeck low maintenance composite decking.

Attachments: Yes

Plans: No

Photos: Yes

Staff Opinion:

This project was started without a building permit and project approval. The applicant stated he was told the structure was not in the historic district when he purchased the property. The proposed stoop is not original to the structure. Staff is recommending smooth LP Smart Siding with a 5" reveal. 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. Staff



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.