

Date: September 17, 2024

Case No. 240172  
Address: 67 Terrace

### **Staff Report**

The applicant has submitted an application for Project Approval for work at 67 Terrace, a structure located in the Cleveland Planning Unit in the City of Deadwood.

Applicant: WILKINSON, LORI MAY TRUSTEE  
Owner: WILKINSON, DAVID H & LORI MAY REVOCABLE TRUST  
Constructed: c 1900

### **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:**

Requesting permission to construct a small addition onto the back screened- in-porch area. The exterior finish will be cedar siding with 4 1/2" reveal to match the current siding. Because we are installing an outside water spigot on the exterior in the same area, this would be a good time to include a much-needed laundry room. We will be utilizing an entry door currently not being used for access to the structure. It would now be entry to the laundry room from the interior. There will still be two other entry doors into the structure from the porch. A double hung window will also be moved to a new exterior location. We would also like to install a short knee wall at the base of the screened in porch to help keep weather out and extend the life of the porch deck material. This wall will also help, by allowing us to square up the openings, with the addition of a modular type screened-in-porch system that is easier to maintain and looks more like it was meant to be there. This modular system will allow us to remove the outer screening material and reveal the original posts that really can't be seen in its current form. These posts will now be featured, as well as other above door wood details that we were able to salvage and will reuse above the two door openings. The exterior and interior knee walls will be finished with cedar siding.

**Attachments:** Yes

**Plans:** Limited

**Photos:** Yes

**Staff Opinion:**

This project was first submitted at your August 28, 2024, meeting but was denied and a resubmittal has been presented. As you will see in the attached site plan, the blue area is the wrap around porch. The applicant is requesting permission to construct a laundry room on the short "L" portion of the porch and move the double hung window to the new exterior wall. This is a small addition, 87" by 57", which is just large enough to house a washer and dryer.

The replacement of the screen on the exterior of the porch will better highlight the posts. The new screens will be centered on the interior of the posts and the framework will be wood. This will give a better view of the significant porch features that are currently non-visible in the current exterior screen system. With the addition of the proposed knee walls and newly proposed screens, the porch will maintain its historic look.

The proposed changes are at the back side of the structure, making them less apparent to the public. Therefore, it is the staff's opinion the project does not encroach upon, damage or destroy a historic resource nor does it have an adverse effect to the historic character of the resource or the historic districts.



**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.