

Date: September 05, 2024

Case No. 240146
Address: 6 Dudley St

Staff Report

The applicant has submitted an application for work at 6 Dudley St, a contributing structure located in the Large's Flat Planning Unit in the City of Deadwood.

Applicant: Justin Rubenzer
Owner: RUBENZER, JUSTIN DO
Constructed: Unkown

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 is a contributing resource located in the Large's Gulch Planning Unit in the City of Deadwood. It was vacant for many years until 2011 when it was restored.

Architectural design of the resource and proposed alterations:

The applicant is requesting permission to replace the cedar siding with LP smart siding and replace the asphalt roof with a metal roof.

Attachments: Yes

Plans: No

Photos: Yes

Staff Opinion:

This property was in an extreme state of disrepair and was saved in 2011 with the original siding restored. (see attached before and after photos from Mike Berg – previous owner).

The applicant has removed the original restored cedar siding and asphalt roof without a building permit or Historic Preservation Commission approval. An investigation fee equal to two (2) times the permit fee will be added to the permit fee (in this case \$264.00).

Staff is recommending the siding be replaced with cedar siding with original 4.5" reveal to maintain the integrity of the historic structure. The roof had asphalt shingles before they were removed and should be replaced with asphalt shingles.

It is staff's opinion, based on the standards and guidelines adopted by the Deadwood Historic Preservation Commission, the proposed work and changes does encroach upon, damage, or destroy a historic resource and has 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.