Board of Historic Preservation  

Wednesday, March 10  
4:00 pm  
City Center, Room 110  
231 North Dakota Avenue  
Sioux Falls, SD

MEETING ASSISTANCE. Upon request, accommodations for meetings will be provided for persons with disabilities. Please contact the Human Relations office, located on first floor of City Hall, 224 West Ninth Street, Sioux Falls, SD, at 367-8740 (voice) or 367-7039 (TDD) 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

AGENDA

Alex Halbach, Board Chair  
Lura Roti, Board Vice Chair  
Diane deKoeyer, Neighborhood & Preservation Planner/Staff Liaison

CALL TO ORDER & QUORUM DETERMINATION  
WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS  
APPROVAL OF REGULAR AGENDA  
APPROVAL OF 2/10/2021 MEETING MINUTES  
PUBLIC INPUT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS  
(5-minute comment period per individual)

NEW BUSINESS  
A. Mid Century Modern Homes  
   Final Report  
   (board action required)  
B. 1220 S. Phillips Ave. / All Saints HD  
   Window Replacement  
   (board action required)  
C. 707 E. 21st Street / McKennan Park HD  
   Addition & Remodel  
   (board action required)  
D. Minnehaha County Extension Building  
   Tuckpointing, Window Replacement, Steps & Handrail  
   (board action required)

OTHER BUSINESS  
A. Administrative Reviews

ADJOURNMENT

Rich Jensen, Dakota Preservation  
Justin, ABC Seamless  
Alex Halbach, Property Owner  
Lynn Remmers, JLG Architects  
Diane
Regular Meeting Minutes for February 10, 2021
City Center, Conference Room 110

Members Present:
Alex Halbach
Lura Roti
Lynn Remmers
Adam Nyhaug
Kathy Renken
Nolan Hazard
Nicholas Kummer
Gail Fossum Shea

Members Absent:
Pam Cole
Rachael Meyerink

Staff Present:
Diane deKoeyer, Staff Liaison

Public in Attendance:
Kent Metzger, Property Owner
Stacey McMahon, KH Architects
Ron Nelson, Nelson Commercial Real Estate
Mike Crane, Lloyd Companies
Rich Jensen, Dakota Preservation

Call to Order and Quorum Determination
Chair Alex Halbach called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m.

Welcome and Introductions
Chair Alex Halbach welcomed Board members and guests and gave introductory comments.

Approval of Regular Agenda
Chair Alex Halbach requested a motion to approve the regular agenda. Member Lura Roti made the motion to approve the regular agenda. Member Adam Nyhaug seconded the motion. The motion to approve the regular agenda passed unanimously.

Approval of the December 9, 2020 Meeting Minutes
Chair Alex Halbach requested a motion to approve the December 9, 2020 meeting minutes. Member Lynn Remmers made the motion to approve the minutes and Member Nicholas Kummer seconded the motion. The motion to approve the December 9, 2020 meeting minutes passed unanimously by the remaining board members.

Public Input on Non-Agenda Items (five-minute period)
None

New Business
A. 200 S. Main Ave., Glacial Lakes Distillery
   Stacey McMahon, KH Architects
   Stacey reviewed the proposed project and existing building. The building is in good condition with the following modifications proposed:
   • North brick façade is in good condition and tuck-pointing is not required.
   • New north door replaced at street entrance.
• Overhead doors and storefront system will have low-e glass. No tinting.
• West façade is constructed of block, with stucco overlay.
• Stucco will be cleaned-up and repaired.
• Signage will be placed at header where “pickled sheet steel” is installed.
• Existing interior concrete flooring will remain.
• Garage door mullions and storefront system will be anodized aluminum.
• Trellis at courtyard will be freestanding and not attached to the building.
• Courtyard surface will likely be concrete, but detail to final finish (pavers, stamped concrete, etc.) has not been determined.

Comments by board members and staff included that the project is a good reuse of the building and will be a good addition to reactivate this corner.

After review and discussion by the board, property owner and architect, Member Adam Nyhaug made the motion that the proposed project as designed will not have an adverse effect to the Downtown Historic District. Member Lynn Remmers seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by the remaining board members with exception to Nolan Hazard who recused himself from the vote.

Rich provided a summary of the report. He also handed out a document that included the National Register of Historic Places for Multiple Property Documentation. Rich anticipates completing the report after SHPO provides comments.

The board accepted the report as presented and will review the final draft to sign off when complete.

Other Business
A. David White is available for the Wood Window Restoration Workshop on Saturday, May 1 at the Women’s History Club from 8:00 am to 1:00 pm.
B. Tuthill Park House Update.
   Diane and Alex provided a verbal update of the house progress.
C. Mary Jo Arboretum East Sioux Falls
   Diane is providing $1,484 in CLG funds to the Arboretum for the history of East Sioux Falls to be documented. Liz Almlie approved the request.
D. With additional funds available due to Covid and the restriction of travel, Alex offered to put together a template that could be added to a property purchase in a historic district so current and future homeowners are aware of the property listing. Alex will provide a draft for SHPO and board approval.

Adjournment
With no further business, the Board of Historic Preservation meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.
Secretary of Interior Standards for Historic Properties – New Construction

24:52:07:04. Standards for new construction and additions in historic districts. New construction or additions within a historic district must comply with The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties as incorporated by reference in § 24:52:07:02. In addition the following standards apply:

(1)  Compatibility of design. Massing, size, and scale of new construction must be compatible with surrounding historic buildings. Overall architectural features of new construction must be of contemporary design which does not directly mimic historic buildings. Architectural elements such as windows, doors, and cornices must be similar in rhythm, pattern, and scale to comparable elements in adjacent historic buildings. The overall visual appearance of new construction may not dominate or be distracting to the surrounding historic landscape;

(2)  Height. The height of new buildings or additions to existing buildings may not exceed a standard variance of ten percent of the average height of historic buildings on both sides of the street where proposed new construction is to be located;

(3)  Width. The width of new buildings or additions to existing buildings must be similar to adjacent historic buildings;

(4)  Proportion. The relationship between the height and width of new buildings or additions to existing buildings must be similar in proportion to existing historic buildings. The proportion of openings in the facades of new construction or additions must be compatible with similar openings in adjacent historic buildings;

(5)  Rhythm and scale. The rhythm, placement, and scale of openings, prominent vertical and horizontal members, and separation of buildings which are present in adjacent historic buildings must be incorporated into the design of new buildings or additions to existing buildings;

(6)  Materials. Materials which make up new buildings or additions to existing buildings must complement materials present in nearby historic properties. New materials must be of similar color, texture, reflective qualities, and scale as historical materials present in the historic district;

(7)  Color. The colors of materials, trim, ornament, and details used in new construction must be similar to those colors on existing historic buildings or must match colors used in previous historical periods for identical features within the historic district;

(8)  Details and ornament. The details and ornament on new buildings or additions to existing buildings must be of contemporary design that is complementary to those features of similar physical or decorative function on adjacent historic buildings;

(9)  Roof shape and skyline. The roof shape and skyline of new construction must be similar to that of existing historic buildings;

(10)  Setting. The relationship of new buildings or additions to existing buildings must maintain the traditional placement of historic buildings in relation to streets, sidewalks, natural topography, and lot lines; and

(11)  Landscaping and ground cover. Retaining walls, fences, plants, and other landscaping elements that are part of new construction may not introduce elements which are out of character with the setting of the historic district.

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation

The Standards for Rehabilitation, a section of the Secretary’s Standards for Historic Preservation Projects, address the most prevalent preservation treatment today, rehabilitation. Rehabilitation is defined as the process of returning a property to state of utility, through repair or alteration which makes possible an efficient contemporary use while preserving those portions and features of the property which are significant to its historic, architectural and cultural values.

The Standards that follow were originally published in 1977 and revised in 1990 as part of the Department of the Interior regulations (36 CFR Part 67, Historic Preservation Certifications). They pertain to historic buildings of all materials, construction types, sizes, and occupancy and encompass the exterior and the interior of historic buildings. The Standards also encompass related landscape features and the building’s site and environment as well as attached, adjacent or related new construction.

The Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.

(1) A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

(3) Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historic development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

(4) Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

(5) Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

(6) Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

(7) Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

(8) Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

(9) New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

(10) New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
**Project Review**  
March 10, 2021

**Property Address**  
1220 S. 2nd Ave.

**Property Owner**  
Kevin Zimmer

**Year Built**  
1916

**Category**  
All Saints Historic District

**Project**  
Homeowner is requesting to replace existing wood windows with original grid pattern to Andersen Renewal Fibrex (pine wood fibers and PVC – polyvinyl chloride) windows without a grid pattern.

Some windows have been replaced but building permit was not found for previous review and approval in a historic district.

**National Register**  
This dwelling is a two-story rectangular pen with ell, and a one-story sunroom extends to the south. The building is finished in shingles, and a combination of stick and shingle lines the gables. The front entrance hood is supported by brackets.

C.H. Sibler was the first occupant, and he was not listed in the city directory as having an occupation. In 1918 Clarence C. Caldwell of Caldwell and Caldwell, lawyers, moved here. The Caldwells lived here until 1926 when Albert and Mary McWayne moved here. Albert McWayne was a partner in the architectural firm of Perkins and McWayne, and members of the McWayne family lived here until the 1970s.

**Project Representative**  
Justin VanDeBerg, Sales Consultant ABC Seamless

**Neighbor Notification**  
No

**Board Action**  
Required

**Photos & Plans**  
See attached.
Above and Below: Historic images provided by Siouxland Heritage Museums
Above: West Elevation. Replace five “highlighted” wood windows with grids to Andersen Renewal Fibrex windows without grids

Below: West Elevation/Front Entrance. Replace one “highlighted” wood window with grids to Andersen Renewal Fibrex Windows without grids.
Above: South Elevation at Sunroom and Driveway. Replace second story, four “highlighted” wood window with grids to Andersen Renewal Fibrex Windows without grids.
Above: 1202 S. 2nd Ave., north of applicant property.
Below: 1205 S. 2nd Ave., west of applicant property.
Above: 1201 S. 2nd Ave., northwest of applicant property.
Below: 1203 S. 2nd Ave., northwest of applicant property.
In 1958, Renewal by Andersen’s parent company Andersen Corporation, tested and rejected aluminum as a framing material. It conducted heat and cold, plus it could pit and corrode. Also in the 1950’s, Andersen developed the first hollow vinyl window in the U.S. We liked the low maintenance feature of vinyl, but concluded that it didn’t have enough structural integrity. In 1966, Andersen created the “wood-clad” window and door category with the Perma-Shield line of products.

In the 1970’s, Andersen began experimenting with reclaimed wood fibers. In 1991, after decades of development and testing, Andersen patented and introduced Fibrex material, a composite of wood fibers and polymer. Fibrex material combines the strength and stability of wood with the low-maintenance benefit of vinyl. Renewal by Andersen windows made with Fibrex material also meet the strictest indoor air emission standard in the U.S.* and contain certified recycled content.**

After the reign of aluminum windows in the 1960s, it was thought that vinyl windows (polyvinylchloride or PVC) would be the next best thing, forever. Plastics brought the promise of windows that never had to be maintained: no scraping, no painting. And while vinyl is still a hugely popular material for making cheap, effective windows, one industry leader, Andersen Windows, reduces its use of vinyl. Instead, Andersen favors the use of a proprietary composite called Fibrex. Since Fibrex is a price-point competitor with vinyl, how do the two materials compare in consumer-level replacement and new-construction windows?

**What Are Fibrex Windows?**

Fibrex is Andersen’s patented PVC-wood composite material that it uses for a majority of its windows as a structural member. By weight, Fibrex is composed of 40-percent recycled Ponderosa pine wood fibers and 60-percent polyvinylchloride. Fibrex was initially developed to lower Andersen’s costs by reusing sawdust obtained from the production of its wood windows. One concern of exposed wood is rot. However, since each of Fibrex’s wood fibers is surrounded and coated with PVC, it rots at a far slower rate than pure wood.

In developing Fibrex, Andersen sought a fiberglass-like product that could be extruded (extruding means to push a soft material through a shaping filter) or injection molded. Fiberglass cannot be extruded or injection-molded, resulting in simpler lines and shapes.
Project Review            March 10, 2021

Property Address         707 E. 21st Street

Property Owner           Alex Halbach

Year Built               1930

Category                 McKennan Park Historic District

Project                  The home will be lifted off the foundation, a new foundation poured, and an
                          addition added to the home along with a 3 car attached garage. The
                          driveway from 21st Street will be removed to add green space to the front
                          yard and increase the distance between the project and the adjacent home
                          to the west. The addition will be completed in brick and the original stucco
                          on the home will be preserved. The horizontal cedar shake roof banding
                          will be recreated when the home is re-roofed and the preference would be
                          that the home is re-roofed with cedar shakes. The leaded glass picture
                          window will be restored and a casement window with similar cross detail
                          will be added in the addition facing 21st Street. The single-detached garage
                          will be removed, but the outside wall of the garage on the west will be
                          maintained and incorporated into the addition in order to preserve the
                          original historic side yard setbacks. A new second floor will be added to the
                          home, using the existing space under the 12/12 roof pitch and over the
                          addition using dormers and gable roof features. The gables and dormers
                          will use shake siding with over-hangs to match the original structure. Much
                          of the dormers and additions will not be visible from the 21st street
                          elevation. The intent is to keep intact the original historic charm of the
                          property, keeping in mind the cottage feel of the property.

National Register        This picturesque one-story cottage is designed in the arts and craft style.
                          The building has a swirled stucco finish, and rusticated quartzite forms the
                          arch around the recessed entryway. The massing of this structure is
                          irregular, with the front façade bearing three projection: a mullioned glass
                          window, the center entrance and a bay window. The shallow pitched
                          wooden shingle roof contributes to the character of this cottage.

                          The first residents were Richard B. Thomas, of Thomas Heating and
                          Ventilating Company, and his wife Mae, and they lived here until 1936.

Project Representative   Alex Halbach

Neighbor Notification    Yes

Board Action             Required

Photos & Plans           See attached.
                          Additional drawings will be provided at the board meeting.
Above and Below: Images of the historic home at 707 E. 21st Street

Images provided by the Siouxland Heritage Museums.
Above: Image of the historic home at 707 E. 21st Street

Below: 707 E. 21st Street and adjacent homes
Above and Below: Adjacent home at 705 E. 21st Street
Above and Below: Adjacent home at 709 E. 21st Street
This is a very late example of a Richardsonian Romanesque styled building. The building is characterized by its deeply recessed windows, rock-faced stone construction, slate roof, and by its pedimented gabled wall dormers with finials. The cruciform shaped jail ranges from two to three stories in height, is constructed from a pinkish-purple variety of Sioux quartzite, and has an overall dimension of 65’ x 75’. Each section of the cruciform served a different function and each wing was given a slightly different architectural details. The front section of the building was designed as sheriff’s residence, the transept contained a kitchen, offices, and juvenile and female detention cells, and the rear portion of the structure contained the main cell block. The front portion of the building is two-stories tall, has a hip roof with parapeted gabled wall dormers, and walls with alternating thick and thin courses of stone. The sheriff’s residence has a symmetrical façade with a central entry bay with flanking side bays and is 52’ wide and 40’ long. The entrance is recessed into an opening supported by a round compound arch, and is flanked by composite columns that support an entablature that supports part of the arch over the door. Two large, paired windows are located on the peripheral bays. The second floor is delineated by two string courses interspersed by a course of polychromatic stone. The second story has an oriel above the entrance and a window directly above each first floor opening. The cornice consists of a simple stone moulding. Two dormers complete the façade. The east and west facades of the sheriff’s residence continue the decorative treatment found on the principal façade. Small stoops are located on both the east and west sides of the building, where the sheriff’s residence and the transept intersect. The three-story cross-section has a gable roof with a pedimented parapet. Both ends (east and west) have two recessed bays that each contain a first and second story window. The third floor also has two windows, however they are flush with the wall. An oculus and finials complete the parapet. The extant rear section of the building is two stories tall, 51’-6” wide, 10’ deep, has a flat roof, and continues the decorative treatment of the front portion of the building. All but approximately 10’ of the north wall of this section of the building was constructed in 1988 with stone salvaged from the cell block that was destroyed by fire.

Although the Richardsonian Romanesque style had been out of vogue for nearly a decade when architect Joseph Schwartz designed this building, his intent was to create a structure that was
complementary to the adjacent county courthouse building, with the goal of creating a harmonious county government campus. The structure served as the county jail from 1912 until 1978. The jail sat vacant for nearly a decade before renovations began in 1987. During the restoration, workers using a blowtorch accidentally started the cell block on fire. The cell block was extensively damaged and had to be razed. In 1988, VanDeWalle and Associates of Sioux Falls prepared a stabilization project design, which included using stone from the cell block to create a north wall for the remaining structure. Since May 1990, the former jail has served as the Minnehaha County Extension Service office.

**Project Representative**  
Lynn Remmers, JLG Architects

**Neighbor Notification**  
No

**Board Action**  
Required

**Photos & Plans**  
See attached.