



Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Agenda
City Council Chambers, City Hall, 612 N. Main Street
April 6, 2023

- 1. 5:15 PM Call to Order**
- 2. Roll Call**
- 3. Declaration Of Conflicts Of Interests**
- 4. Approve Agenda**
- 5. Approve Previous Minutes: January 26, 2023**
- 6. Review and Comment: Razing 116 & 118 E 1st Ave**
- 7. Other Business:**
- 8. Public Input:**

If you need to address the Board on an item that was not on the agenda, excluding personnel items, please come forward to the podium and state your name and your concern. Presentations are limited to three minutes. Items will be considered but no action will be taken at this time.
- 9. Adjourn**

Individuals with disabilities who require special assistance to take part in this meeting may contact one of the following at City Hall (605) 995-8420 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting with requests for assistance: Human Resources Officer or the City Administrator.

Historic Preservation Commission Minutes
City Council Chambers, City Hall, 612 N. Main Street
January 26, 2023

1. Call to Order

Logan called the January 26, 2023 City of Mitchell Historical Preservation Commission Meeting to order at 5:15 P.M. in the Council Chambers, City Hall, 612 N Main Street.

2. Roll Call

Roll Call-quorum is met, simple majority vote required for all items.

Present: Clark, Enders, Jirsa (telephonically), Logan, Pooley.

Absent: Buechler, Swenson.

Staff Present: Jenniges

3. Election of Officers:

Logan called for nominations of Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson, and Secretary. Motion by Pooley to keep all officers the same, seconded by Enders. Roll call vote: Buechler - absent, Clark - aye, Enders - aye, Jirsa - aye, Logan – aye, Pooley – aye, Swenson - aye. . 5 aye, 0 nay, 2 absent; motion carried.

4. Declaration Of Conflicts of Interests

Jirsa item #7.

5. Approval of Agenda

Motion by Clark, seconded by Pooley, to approve the proposed agenda. Roll call vote: Buechler - absent, Clark - aye, Enders - aye, Jirsa - aye, Logan –aye, Pooley – aye, Swenson - aye. . 5 aye, 0 nay, 2 absent; motion carried.

6. Approval of Previous Minutes:

Motion by Pooley, seconded by Jirsa, to approve the amended minutes of the March 3, 22 Mitchell Historic Preservation Commission meeting. Roll call vote: Buechler - absent, Clark - aye, Enders - aye, Jirsa - aye, Logan –aye, Pooley – aye, Swenson - absent. . 5 aye, 0 nay, 2 absent; motion carried.

7. Recommendation: 123 N Main

Jirsa gave a history of his building and the emergency repair that he had to do due a storm event. He purchased the building 30 years ago and it had a 25-year-old roof on it at that point so he replaced it back then. He is submitting a BID application to help fund the repair.

Pooley questioned if the roof was sloped, which was answered that it is sloped from east to west.

Logan questioned if the roof was visible, to which was answered it sits below the parapet walls and would only be visible from the overpass on Sanborn.

Motion by Pooley, seconded by Clark, to recommend approval of the BID application . Roll call vote: Buechler - absent, Clark - aye, Enders - aye, Jirsa - abstain, Logan –aye, Pooley – aye, Swenson - aye. . 5 aye, 0 nay, 1 abstain, 1 absent; motion carried.

8. Review and Comment: Razing 112 & 114 E 1st Ave

Jenniges explained the applicant came in for a demo permit and it was sent to SHPO for their opinion and it came back that it would infringe on the historic nature of the building and required

a 11.1 case review. Jenniges noted this was the building that was run into in December of 2021 and no repair work has been done to the building. Also, the neighboring building to the east has also requested a demo permit and will be in front of this board in the future.

Clark questioned the timeframe of when the demo would be done, to which was answered as soon as they could, late February or early March.

Pooley believes deferred maintenance on these buildings are killing them, but when they get this bad there is no other choice but to demo.

Logan believes there are some economic factors that go along with demoing the building.

Jenniges noted there are a few developers that are interested in the land to rebuild and not just turned it into a parking lot.

Motion by Pooley, second by Enders to agree with the 11.1 case report and demo the building do the damage occurred and it's the only option due to financial constraints. Roll call vote: Buechler - absent, Clark - aye, Enders - aye, Jirsa - aye, Logan - aye, Pooley - aye, Swenson - absent. 5 aye, 0 nay, 2 absent; motion carried.

9. Review and Comment: Razing 622 N Duff St

Terry Sabers of MAHI gave the history and goals of the organization. He said MAHI purchased the dwelling in December. The previous owner had been living there for 25 years. A branch fell through the roof in a summer storm and was never repaired. This is a nuisance property within the city. He noted at the time the previous owner moved out he did not have running water to the property. Sabers provided pictures of the interior and an estimate to fix the existing building and found it not financially feasible to remodel. They plan to raze the dwelling and build a new 1120 square foot dwelling slab on grade to match the neighboring dwellings. There is a detached two-stall garage that will be salvaged.

Pooley questioned what the roof would be; shingles or tin. Sabers answered it would be a shingled roof.

Logan believes the original dwelling was built for workforce housing and believes the proposal will fit the style of the neighborhood.

Jirsa believes this house will be perfect for the market and clean things up. It will fit into the neighborhood and be an improvement to what is there and will financially pan out.

Clark noted this is a high visibility corner and this would be better than what's there.

Motion by Pooley, second by Clark to agree with the 11.1 case report to demo the existing dwelling due to financial impact and build a new dwelling to match the neighborhood. Roll call vote: Buechler - absent, Clark - aye, Enders - aye, Jirsa - aye, Logan - aye, Pooley - aye, Swenson - absent. 5 aye, 0 nay, 2 absent; motion carried.

10. Sign Approval: 100 W 5th Ave

Tara Volesky stated she is proposing to install a 10' x 20' digital sign and believes that it will blend well with the building as she continues the remodel of the exterior which has already been approved by SHPO.

Jirsa stated he has concerns about the apartments across the street and the light the sign will

produce and the flashing that could be associated with it. Jenniges noted there are sections of the ordinance that she will have to follow that deal with brightness at night and flashing. Also, this is for on-premise only advertising for the businesses within the suite, no off-premise signage is allowed in Central Business. Jirsa also brought up the wind load this sign would have to endure and the structural integrity of it. He believes she will need a structural engineer to look at it and probably have to have concrete footings installed, not just tie downs on the roof due to flexing that could happen. He thinks a better location would be on the second floor by the windows covering up the brick.

Logan noted that back in the day they would paint the brick for advertising, but that is not practical anymore. He knows from experience that signs attached or braced on roofs can be a headache.

Pooley mentioned that she would want to contact her insurance company if she put up a sign like this.

Volesky noted she did not want to cover up the bricks because she likes the look of them. She plans to do some tuck pointing on them as well. She also did not know she would need a structural engineer and there could be more construction than anticipated. She is not opposed to a smaller sign and will have a template put in place before ordering the final sign.

At the request of Volesky, motion by Jirsa, second by Clark to table for the applicant to get more information. Roll call vote: Buechler - absent, Clark - aye, Enders - aye, Jirsa - aye, Logan - aye, Pooley - aye, Swenson - absent. . 5 aye, 0 nay, 2 absent; motion carried.

11. Other Business:

The board discussed the possibility of needing new board members.

12. Public Input:

Terry Sabers of Tickled Pink questioned his course of action for installing awnings at his business. He was informed of the process being similar to the 622 N Duff St project he is currently part of.

13. Adjourn

Chairperson Logan asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Motion by Enders, seconded by Clark, to adjourn the meeting at 6:14 P.M. Roll call vote: Buechler - absent, Clark - aye, Enders - aye, Jirsa - aye, Logan - aye, Pooley - aye, Swenson - absent. . 5 aye, 0 nay, 2 absent; motion carried.

Jeff Logan
Historical Preservation Commission Chairperson



January 4, 2023

Mark Jenniges
City of Mitchell
612 N Main St
Mitchell, SD 57301

SDCL 1-19A-11.1 Consultation

Project: 221207005S – 116 and 118 E 1st Ave
Location: Davison
COM - City of Mitchell

Dear Mark,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above referenced project pursuant to SDCL 1-19A-11.1. The South Dakota Office of the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) would like to provide the following comments concerning effect of the proposed project on the non-renewable cultural resources of South Dakota.

On December 7, 2022, the SHPO received notification of the above-referenced project located at 116 and 118 E 1st Ave in Mitchell, SD. The proposed project consists of demolishing two buildings, 116 E 1st Ave (Earles Meat Market) and 118 E 1st Ave (Griese Plumbing Shop). These two properties are contributing to the Mitchell Historic Commercial District, which is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. SDCL 1-19A-11.1 outlines a specific process that must be followed prior to any governmental action that may harm any historic property that is included in the National or State Registers of Historic Places.

Based upon the information provided, the proposed project has the potential to encroach upon, damage or destroy historic property that is included in the National Register of Historic Places or the State Register of Historic Places. Specifically, the proposed project will destroy historic property that is included in the National Register of Historic Places.

Therefore, the SHPO is requesting an abbreviated case report regarding the proposed demolition of the two National Register listed structures consisting of ARSD 24:52:07:03 items 1, 2, 5, 7, and 10. For item #10, please have the Mitchell Historic Preservation Commission review and comment on the abbreviated case report within 180 days of receipt prior to submittal to SHPO.

Should you require any additional information, please contact Duncan Trau at Duncan.Trau@state.sd.us or at (605)773-6005. Your concern for the non-renewable cultural heritage of our state is appreciated.

Sincerely,
Ted M. Spencer
State Historic Preservation Officer



Duncan Trau

Duncan Trau
Historic Preservation Specialist





**SOUTH DAKOTA STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE (SHPO)
SOUTH DAKOTA CODIFIED LAW 1-19A-11.1 CASE REPORT**

If a state entity or political subdivision of the state is required by law or rule to report possible threats to the historical integrity of a property listed in the National Register of Historic Places or the State Register of Historic Places, the threat must be reported by means of a case report.

Case reports must provide the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) with sufficient information for the office to make an independent review of effects on the historical integrity of historic properties and shall be the basis for informed comments to state entities and the public. Case reports shall thoroughly examine all relevant factors involved in a preservation question. Abbreviated case reports may be requested at the discretion of the SHPO if less than a comprehensive view is needed. (ARSD 24:52:07:03 - Standards for Case Report)

SHPO reserves the right to request more information if needed. Typed forms are preferred. Submittal of this form without all requested information will cause review delays.

This is a new submittal.

This is information relating to SHPO project number:

PROJECT LOCATION

Address

City

County

The responsible state entity or political subdivision of the state (cities, counties, etc.) must sign and date this form here prior to submitting it to the SHPO. Projects received without an original signature will cause review delays.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Name

Title

Agency

FOR SHPO USE ONLY. DO NOT WRITE OR INSERT ANYTHING HERE.

**STATE, CITY, COUNTY, OR OTHER GOVERNING BODY
PERMITTING, FUNDING, LICENSING, OR ASSISTING THE PROJECT**

STATE ENTITY, CITY, COUNTY, OR OTHER GOVERNING BODY

Agency Name

Agency Contact Person

Mailing Address

City, State, ZIP

Email Address

Phone Number

APPLICANT OR CONSULTANT CONTACT PERSON, IF APPLICABLE

Company Name

Contact Person

Mailing Address

City, State, ZIP

Email Address

Phone Number

PROPERTY OWNER, IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE

Name

Mailing Address, City, State, ZIP

Email Address

Phone Number

STANDARDS FOR CASE REPORT AS OUTLINED IN ARSD 24:52:07:03

1 & 2. Project Description. Describe the project. Include photographs and maps showing the existing project site and details of the proposed project. Where applicable, drawings, three-dimensional models, or accurate computer-generated representations of proposed construction may be included. The models or representations must clearly show the visual impacts of new construction on the surrounding neighborhood or landscape. Photographs, maps, drawings, and other supplemental materials should be submitted with this form as separate documents.

3. What is the planning and approval schedule for this project?

4. How was this project brought to the attention of the state or political subdivision (city, county, etc.)?

Demolition Permit

Building Permit

Other - Please explain:

5. Include a physical description of the affected historic property. Economic or situational information relevant to the affected property may be included if applicable.

6. Describe the potential effects of the proposed project on the historic property, including but not limited to physical and visual effects, alterations to the property, moving the property to another location, or change of use.

7. Provide a description of the feasible and prudent alternatives that were considered and rejected based on factors relevant to the project. Relevant factors should be supported by facts. Include the reason(s) for rejection of feasible and prudent alternatives. Describe other efforts undertaken to minimize harm to the historic property. Provide as much detail as possible when explaining consideration of alternatives and mitigation measures. Questions to be considered when reviewing the project include:

- (a) How were decisions based on the consideration of factual reports, research, tried methods, and/or professional and lay preservation advice?
- (b) How were alternatives beyond the immediate project explored, taking into account broad community or regional issues in which the historic resource may play a contributing role?
- (c) How was the impact of potentially adverse effects on surrounding historic resources, community preservation plans, and long-range community opportunities taken into account, if applicable?
- (d) Were decisions based on professional assessment(s) of the value and basic structural condition of the affected property and estimates of a range of rehabilitation or mitigative options prepared by people experienced in historic preservation work?
- (e) Were adequate periods of time provided for information to be prepared and for preservation options to be attempted?

8. Provide a copy of correspondence with SHPO. Correspondence should include the identification and evaluation of historic properties, assessment of effects, and any consideration of alternatives or mitigation measures. Copies of this information should be submitted with this form as separate documents.

9. Describe efforts made to consider the views of affected and interested parties.

10. If applicable, the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) in the community where this project is located should review and comment on this case report prior to its submittal to SHPO.

The HPC agreed with the findings of the case report.

The HPC disagreed with the findings of the case report.

The HPC declined to comment on the findings of the case report.

In addition to the above findings, please include official comments from the HPC, if applicable.

11. Provide copies of written views submitted by the public to the state entity, city, county, or other governing body concerning the potentially adverse effects of projects on historic properties and alternatives to reduce or avoid those effects. Copies should be submitted with this form as separate documents.

**Please print this entire form, sign and date the first page,
and mail completed form with any additional documentation to:**

Review and Compliance Coordinator
South Dakota State Historical Society
900 Governors Drive
Pierre, SD 57501

Questions about South Dakota Codified Law 1-19A-11.1 can be directed to:

Review and Compliance Coordinator
(605) 773-8370

Restoration Specialist
(605) 773-6005

Project information submitted to SHPO cannot be returned. This documentation is kept on file at the South Dakota State Historical Society. We review faxed and electronic submissions in the same manner as any other submission and with the same considerations for clarity and completeness. However, original documents with original signature must follow all faxed and electronic submissions. The submission of incomplete, unclear, or confusing information may result in unnecessary delays in the review process until adequate information is obtained.

Additional Resources:

South Dakota State Historic Preservation Office: <http://history.sd.gov/Preservation/>
Link to National and State Register Listed Properties: <http://history.sd.gov/Preservation/NatReg/NatReg.aspx>
Historic Contexts: <http://history.sd.gov/Preservation/OtherServices/SHPODocs.aspx>

National Park Service: <http://www.nps.gov/nr/>
Publications (National Register Bulletins, Preservation Briefs, etc.): <http://www.nps.gov/history/publications.htm>











