Call to order – Chairperson Tom Keller called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m., welcomed guests, and gave introductory comments.

1. Approval of the July 13, 2016, Meeting Minutes
Chairperson, Tom Keller, requested a motion to approve the July 13, 2016 meeting minutes. Member Josh Chilson made the motion to approve the meeting minutes. Member Shelly Sjovold seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Public input on non-agenda items:
Chairperson, Tom Keller, requested if there was anyone from the public who desired to provide input to the Board on any non-agenda items. There was no citizen input received.

3. New Business:
A. 1600 S. 4th Ave. – Front and rear addition
   McKennan Park Historic District
   (Board action required)  Brad Weber, Weber Construction
   Amy Kimber, Homeowner
   (over)
Applicant Brad Weber, contractor, and homeowner, Amy Kimber, were present and explained the proposal for an addition to the front and rear of the residence. The owner purchased the home in 2013. The applicant described the proposed house renovations include: removing the existing garage and constructing new garage with a second story above; adding to the north side of the existing home (all floors); and building a front porch north to the existing entry; and replacing the existing windows under the new covered front porch area with French doors; and replacing the front entry door.

The applicant stated all the windows are in bad condition such that the sills are rotted and they are either painted or nailed shut. Metal Rusco window screens exist on the interior. The applicant mentioned that all the existing windows would be replaced with double glazed Anderson Woodwright type windows (40 percent), and Palmer type windows (60 percent), and the grid work design would be identical to the existing window grid. The applicant also commented the three smaller side by side upper windows located on the front (west) side of the residential structure, along with the basement windows, are part of the original house construction and would remain. The replacement windows would be similar to the other homes around the park. The homeowner commented the windows on the third floor level were replaced in 1991. The applicant indicated the existing front entry door would also be replaced and that they would like to start construction in early September 2016.

The staff report references the residence was constructed in 1916 and is considered as contributing to the McKennan Park Historic District. The residential structure is two-and-a-half stories in height. This stucco, gable-roofed structure has a large gable dormer projection on its main façade. The lines of the dormer are reflected in the projecting, gabled porch. The building has slightly asymmetrical massing, with an off-center entrance, and projecting bays and wings. This irregular massing, combined with the stucco finish and the suggestion of half timbering in the dormer, gives the building Tudor Revival character. The interior of this building features oak floors and woodwork on the first and third floors, and pine on the second floor.

Board members examined the applicant’s drawings and photographs provided.

Member Rachael Meyerink commented the proposed front renovations will definitely change the west facade of the house. She asked the homeowner if consideration had been given to modifying the front entry to accommodate a patio, rather than a covered porch. The homeowner responded that a covered porch is their desire.

Another board member asked how much the front porch would project out. The applicant answered the new covered porch area would protrude about six (6) feet and the windows under the new porch would be replaced with French doors.

Member Lura Roti asked about the size of the proposed main front door which will have two side panels. The applicant replied that there is no more room to expand the existing door opening and the egress is a 30” X 6’8” standard size opening.

Member Lura Roti expressed that she likes the fact the homeowner’s renovation plan is in keeping with the original house bump out in the front, and that the gable end of the proposed porch extends six feet.
Member Jennifer Dumke asked staff if this style of home has cover porches. Staff Liaison, Diane deKoeyer responded yes, and that it is the same roof design – just extended out.

The homeowner inquired about the Board’s role and responsibility. Chairperson, Tom Keller, responded that the Board serves in an advisory capacity, providing guidance and recommendations to the Mayor and City Council on matters related to historic preservation, and the City’s seven historical districts. Board consideration is given to whether or not in this case the proposed renovations have an adverse effect on the subject property and McKennan Park Historic District and he noted the Secretary of the Interior’s standards for new construction and additions within historic districts are applied. Such standards address: compatibility of design; height; width; proportion; rhythm and scale; materials; color; details and ornamentation; roof shape and skyline; setting; and landscaping.

Members Rachel Meyerink, Shelly Sjovold, and Jennifer Dumke, commented the building elevation drawings presented were difficult to understand and they do not feel confident in what the house will look like when the proposed renovations are completed.

Member Josh Chilson expressed the front of the house will look different, and not historic, with the proposed covered porch addition and columns.

Member Robbie Veurink remarked the main entry is the dominant feature of the front of the house.

Chairperson Tom Keller stated that although the proposed renovation is substantial to the home, that he has no problem with the proposed back addition. Also, in regard to the other structural renovations, they reflect suitable spatial scale and function. Adding the bump out on the front of the house for the covered porch is ok, and the window replacements are spot for spot. The other proposed addition to the house is around the corner, but set back.

Member Lura Roti excused herself from the vote.

Member Cindy Konda asked if the proposed covered porch on the front of the house would have a flat or pitched roof. The Applicant responded the porch roof would be pitched.

There was no further input received from the applicant or contractor.

Member Rachael Meyerink expressed the new replacement windows will maintain the look of the house. The proposed addition located around the corner and back of the house is acceptable. However, the proposed front porch addition and French door, would have an adverse effect on the historic district.

Member Rachael Meyerink made a motion that all portions of the renovation project, except for the outdoor front porch addition and French door, would not have an adverse effect on the historic district. Member Jennifer Dumke seconded the motion and the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Member Lura Roti returned to the meeting.

(over)
4. **Historic Landscape Strategies - Outline**

Thomas Schneider, SDSU Landscape Architect Student presented an outline and brief Powerpoint slide presentation for the Board’s consideration of developing a residential historic planting pamphlet. Mr. Schneider explained the pamphlet would be valuable for residents within historic districts, as it would include an extensive plant list that depicts what plants are considered historic plantings and hearty for our climate zone. The planting list presented by Mr. Schneider designates trees, shrubs, and perennials that make planting design more organized.

Mr. Schneider’s informative presentation highlighted the American elm as the recognizable historic street tree planting, until Dutch Elm Disease (DED) overtook many urban tree canopy areas. Now other alternative varieties such as “Prairie Expedition” can be used in redeveloping historic streetscapes. Other notable specimens such as the Bur Oak, Cottonwod, and Green Ash trees can also be planted to achieve historic residential and community character.

The principles of quality planting design were explained and maintaining a historic landscape were also emphasized by Mr. Schneider.

The Board members expressed their sincere appreciation to Mr. Schneider for his educational presentation and enthusiastically accepted his recommendation to develop a residential historic planting pamphlet.

Member Robbie Veurink left the meeting.

5. **Other Business:**

A. Introduction of new board member

Rob Collins, Architect, TSP

Diane deKoeyer, staff liaison, introduced Rob Collins, Architect with TSP, Inc. to the Board members. The Board members welcomed Mr. Collins and expressed their appreciation for his appointment and having his professional background and experience as an architect to further historic preservation efforts in Sioux Falls.

**Adjournment** - A motion to adjourn the Board of Historic Preservation meeting was made by board member Cindy Konda and seconded by board member Shelly Sjovold. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:08 p.m.

The next meeting of the Board of Historic Preservation will be on September 14, 2016, at 4:00 pm in the Commission Room on first floor of City Hall.
Call to order – Diane deKoeyer, staff liaison called the workshop meeting to order at 3:00 p.m., welcomed guests, and gave introductory comments.

Ted Spencer, Liz Almlie and Kate Nelson representing SHPO, were explained roles & responsibilities and the 11.1 process. Liz Almlie explained their office administers CLG applications for historic grants; 11.1 Process; reviews historic nominations; provides assistance for reviewing historic preservation matters; and builds relationships with citizens and other city departments. The State’s current five year Memorandum of Agreement with the City Of Sioux Falls will expire in 2018.

Three handouts were distributed to Board members:

1) Flow Chart Summary of SDCL 1-19A-11.1 Review Process between the City of Sioux Falls and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO);
2) Standards for 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 on the state register, the threat must be reported by means of a case
   report. Case reports must provide the Office of History 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 examine relevant factors involved
   in a preservation questions and contain:

3) Standards for new construction and additions in historic districts
   The Secretary of the Interior’s standards for new construction and additions within historic districts
   address: compatibility of design; height; width; proportion; rhythm and scale; materials; color; details
   and ornamentation; roof shape and skyline; setting; and landscaping.

SHPO and Board Discussion Takeaways:
• An asphalt shingle roof can be replaced a wood shingled roof;

• There is a misperception of disapproving projects. SHPO consults and advises and reviews economic
  benefits for restoration. Part of the review is to determine if there is an infusion of cash into local
  economy;

• Regarding adverse effects on properties – determine if the materials to be used are compatible, and
  if the renovation is differentiated for new construction;

• Building addition(s) to contributing properties – It is best if the building additions are added as far
  back as possible, as seen from the street.

• Wood windows - encourage repair and replacement with like materials. Suggest the applicant check
  the National Trust for good examples and methodologies.

Adjournment - Board of Historic Preservation workshop meeting was adjourned at 3:55 pm. to set up for the
regular monthly Board meeting scheduled for August 10, 2016, at 4:00 pm.

The next monthly meeting of the Board of Historic Preservation will be on September 14, 2016, at 4:00 pm in
the Commission Room on first floor of City Hall.