

Date: March 17, 2025

Case No. 250033  
Address: 874 Main St.

### **Staff Report**

The applicant has submitted an application for Project Approval for work at 874 Main St., a contributing structure located in the Upper Main Planning Unit in the City of Deadwood.

Applicant: Dale & Susan Berg  
Owner: BERG, DALE N TRUSTEE / BERG, SUSAN R TRUSTEE  
Constructed: c 1935

### **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 take top deck off, reset all posts that do not meet code, change out, redo deck, railing and gates. Total cost \$20,000 to \$30,000. Will do whatever is not up to City code. Can not do site plan until early spring.

**Attachments: Yes**

**Plans: Yes**

**Photos: Yes**

**Staff Opinion:** This deck now removed was constructed without a building permit or Historic Preservation approval. The Commission reviewed a request at their October 23, 2024 meeting and it was denied and given 180 days to remove pool, deck and structure. Applicant does have the ability to resubmit revised plans prior to removal. Staff recommended the applicant consider two separate plans for the proposed deck and the proposed building/carport.

This application is for the reconstruction of the deck. Original submittal of plan indicated the deck around the pool was attached to the proposed upper building that had also been ordered to be removed. Staff recommended the deck not to be connected to the building due to the unknown actions of the commission regarding the proposed building and should be treated separately.

Unfortunately, work was completed which removed the opportunity for archaeological investigations and consideration by the commission for adverse effects to the landscape and associated contributing structure. Since the previous work has already been performed the landscape has been altered and in staff's opinion the work does encroach upon the contributing resource; however, may not be adverse to the 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.