

CITY OF MITCHELL
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

February 9, 2016

Chairman Logan called the February 9, 2016 meeting of the Mitchell Historic Preservation Commission to order at 12:00 pm, Council Chambers, City Hall, Mitchell, South Dakota.

Members Present: Logan, Swenson, Buechler, Clark, Hauser, Metzger Absent: Pooley

Staff: Putnam Ex-officio, Carl Koch, City Attorney

Approval of Agenda: Motion by Buechler, seconded by Clark to approve the agenda as published. All members present voting aye, motion carried.

Approval of Minutes: Motion by Buechler, seconded by Metzger to approve the minutes of the January 19, 2016 meeting. All members present voting aye, motion carried.

Action: Terry Sabers presented the construction project for the business located at 217 N Main Street, Mitchell, SD. His family acquired this property about a year ago and have done extensive renovation since the purchase. It is currently used for retail. The property has received Deadwood Grant funding for its renovation. Mr. Sabers is currently seeking additional Deadwood funding for a new roof. He is requesting a letter of support to be included in his new application. Motion by Swenson, seconded by Clark to support the Sabers application and send a letter of support on behalf of the MHPC. All members present voting aye, motion carried.

Action: Demolition of the rectory structure located at 321 E. 3rd Avenue that is located within the Holy Family property (block), which is located within a designated historic district. A case report along with various documents were submitted to the commission for their consideration. The case report has been sent to the State Historic Preservation Office for their review. On January 28, 2016 SHPO has requested comments from the local preservation commission, which are to be included in the case report. Putnam and Koch provided the commission a description of the process and requirements of state law and rules.

Dean Uhre and Terry Sabers representing Holy Family provided a brief history of the rectory and a description of the building's physical features. They also provided a summary of the parish's plan to provide their clergy a residence across the street to the east. They said the building was built in 1923 and for the past two years it has not been occupied. Uhre and Sabers shared with the commission how the decision of the church's leadership in examining the long range future and viability of the rectory building. The building is not connected to the church. They provided the commission a description of the physical challenges the building is currently facing which include; water seepage, black mold (air quality), the brick veneer loosening from the exterior walls, handicapped accessibility (ADA), and necessary repairs that are required to make the property habitual and compliant with codes. The case report included quotes from reputable and competent professionals that provided estimation of renovation costs in addressing the current challenges of the rectory.

The parish has explored the possibility of moving the structure to another site. A letter from a mover was included in the case report and it was determined this is not practical.

Uhre and Sabers also shared with the commission the church's examination of renovating the rectory into another use. The existing design and layout would require substantial renovation and costs. Moreover, the diocese also restricts the use of church property for non-religious uses, therefore there is a limitation of potential occupants.

Logan inquired about the architecture of the structure and questioned if the design is consistent or compatible with similar South Dakota buildings constructed during the 1920-1930s'. Simply, does it fit in the area.

Uhre and Sabers indicated the parish has been notified on numerous occasions of the possibility of demolishing the rectory and they were notified in December of 2015 that a demolition permit was to be pursued soon.

The church has not made a final determination of what the site of the rectory will be used for once the rectory is removed. However, they want to insure that it enhances the historic appearance of the iconic church. Possible uses include enhanced green space, grotto or other attractive landscaping features. The church feels that removing the rectory building will provide a better view of the historic church building.

The church would like to use the resources that are currently being used for the rectory and invest them into the historic preservation of the church.

Findings:

1. The commission has determined the case report submitted by church has shown that all feasible alternatives and possible other uses have been examined.
2. The church has examined the possible of moving the building
3. The current design, floor layout, and physical challenges of the building contribute to the substantial cost of remediation, renovation, and code compliance.
4. The commission noted the restriction of the owner to potential occupants and marketability.
5. The commission has determined the parish members and their extended community have been informed of the potential demolition through an extensive series of meetings, handouts and repeated messages in the church bulletin and the commission has conducted a public hearing. The church has not heard of any opposition from their membership.

Motion by Swenson, seconded by Hauser to conclude based of the case report and testimony from representatives of Holy Family Church that the request for a demolition permit be granted. Members Logan, Buechler, Swenson, Hauser, Metzger vote aye, Clark abstained. Motion carried.

Action: VFW 215 N Main St. Putnam inform the commission of the VFW's plan to renovate the building's second floor into meeting rooms and they plan on installed another outside exit. They are also looking at an elevator and other improvements to bring the building compliant to various codes. The planning commission has approved the plan. The building is historic and the owners may seek historic funding at a future date. The commission encourages the building owners to

insure the renovations and improvements be compatible with historic standards. Motion by Clark, seconded by ~~Clark~~ to approve the plan. All members present voting aye, motion carried.

Hausser

Discussion of future members: The commission identified a few names of potential HPC members. Logan will visit with the mayor about future appointments. Putnam reminded the commission that members must live in the city or have a business in the city.

Projects: The commission discussed the possibility of updating walking tours publications that would for public distribution. The commission may seek funding and collaboration with other organizations. The commission also is exploring acquiring signs that may recognize properties that have received historic or main street funding. No formal action taken.

Next Meeting: The commission will try to meet again in March.

Chairman Logan adjourned the meeting at 1:30.


Chairman

1/18/17
Secretary
