

Date: August 22, 2024

Case No. 240141  
Address: 67 Terrace St.

### **Staff Report**

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

Applicant:

Owner: WILKINSON, LORI MAY TRUSTEEWILKINSON, 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:**

The applicant is requesting permission to replace the siding with LP Smartside, replace the windows with Marvin wood windows and conduct maintenance to the screened in porch.

**Attachments:** Yes

**Plans:** No

**Photos:** Yes

**Staff Opinion:** On June 2, 2024, the contractor and staff meet at the property and conducted a walk around the structure and discussed proposed ideas. Staff reviewed the project approval process, grant/loan programs and building permit requirements with the Contractor and handed out a packet of program information.

On August 7, 2024, a Project Approval was submitted for replacement of siding, windows and maintenance to the screened in porch. (The quotes included with the application were dated in June 2024.) In preparing the Project Approval and reviewing the history of the structure, staff discovered the applicant was entered into the windows and doors program in 2011. This prompted a site visit to determine what had changed since then and what had been done previously to the windows.

In 2001 the owners applied for project approval to replace the siding with steel siding. This request was denied by the Historic Preservation Commission. Meeting packet information is attached for review.

In 2011 the owner applied for and was accepted into the Wood Windows and Doors program for repair to the windows and installation of wood storm windows. The staff report and program approval from the meeting are attached. The owner did not follow through with the grant program. New wood storms were never installed but three windows were replaced without approval and a building permit was not issued.

Staff conducted a site visit and met with the owners and contractor on August 16, 2024. Upon review it appeared the siding is in good condition with some peeling paint apparent on the street sides of the structure along with a limited quantity of wood siding needing replaced due to cracking or deterioration. The windows are in very good condition but there are issues with them being very difficult to open or cannot open and stay open which the applicant has expressed concerns as this may be a safety issue for fire exit and the fear of the window slamming shut and breaking or hurting someone. It appears the windows have not been properly maintained to allow for opening and closing and there were no signs of rot in the framing, sills or sashes. These issues can be corrected with proper maintenance and repairs.

During the walk through it was witnessed that construction of a knee wall and a laundry room on the porch had begun without Historic Preservation approval or a building permit.

The proposed work and changes does 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.