

SOUTH DAKOTA CODIFIED LAW 1-19A-11.1 - ARSD 24:52:07:03 CASE REPORT FORM



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:

260617008S

PROJECT LOCATION

Address

901 6th Street

City

Brookings

County

Brookings

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.

The proposed project consists of the replacement of six existing non-original replacement windows (three pairs) on the upper floor of the residence located at 901 6th Street, Brookings, SD, within the University Historic District. The scope of work is limited solely to the replacement of these existing windows. No changes are proposed to the building footprint, roof line, exterior siding, trim, architectural detailing, foundation, or other character-defining features of the structure. The replacement windows will be installed in the same location, and overall configuration of each window opening will remain unchanged. The proposed replacement windows have been selected to closely match the existing appearance by maintaining similar size proportions, sight lines, operation, and exterior color compatible with the existing residence. The existing windows have reached the end of their practical service life due to failed seals, deteriorated wood components with areas of rot, broken glazing, air infiltration resulting in drafts, missing parts and operational deficiencies that affect their functionality. The replacement windows will improve weather resistance, energy efficiency, occupant comfort, security, and long-term durability while preserving the overall appearance of the building.

The project is limited to replacement of the identified windows only. No additions, demolition, relocation, or alterations to the building's historic architectural character are proposed.

Additionally, the project does not damage or destroy the historic property because it is a limited rehabilitation project that preserves the continued use and appearance of the building while replacing deteriorated, failed windows in-kind.

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

The planning is done. I have two potential contractors to complete this project. Both local companies aware of the historical review process that we are current wading through.

When/if this project is approved, window replacement will happen as soon as it is possible to get either of those companies schedule. My hope, is to get this project completed with as little disruption to our current tenants as possible. The majority of the tenants are out of town until the fall semester begins at SDSU

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.

The affected property is a single-family residential dwelling located at 901 6th Street, Brookings, South Dakota, within the University Historic District. The residence was constructed circa 1900. The structure is a wood-frame residential building, aligned with typical twentieth-century residential construction. The home retains its original massing, scale, roof form, and relationship to the surrounding neighborhood. Exterior architectural elements remain consistent with the historic character of the property and surrounding district.

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?

A) The project is limited to the replacement of six existing non-original replacement windows (three pairs). The existing windows have deteriorated to the point that replacement is the most practical long-term solution. Existing conditions include failed seals, deteriorated wood components with areas of rot, broken glazing, noticeable air infiltration resulting in drafts, and operational deficiencies that prevent several windows from opening, closing, or locking properly. These conditions reduce the energy efficiency, weather resistance, security, and overall functionality of the home.

B) The project was intentionally limited in scope to replacing only six deteriorated non-original replacement windows. No changes are proposed to the building's footprint, architectural design, exterior trim, or other character-defining features. The selected replacement windows have been chosen to maintain the existing window openings, preserve the existing configuration, provide similar sight lines, and utilize exterior colors compatible with the home. Limiting the work to necessary replacement while maintaining the building's overall appearance supports the continued preservation and use of the property as a contributing structure within the historic district. Furthermore, prior to our purchase of the home, it appears that similar vinyl replacement windows were used in the west windows of the dining room on the main floor. Those didn't encroach on the historical nature of the property

C) The project has been designed to minimize any visual impact on the surrounding historic district. The work does not alter the building's scale, massing, architectural style, or relationship to neighboring historic properties. Because only non-original replacement windows are being replaced, and because the proposed windows will closely match the existing appearance through similar proportions, sight lines, and exterior color, the project is not expected to adversely affect the character of adjacent historic resources or the overall historic street scape.

D) The decision was based on evaluation of the existing condition of the windows and contractor estimates for replacement options. Alternatives including repair, replacement with wood windows, replacement with vinyl windows, and no action were considered. The existing windows exhibit failed seals, deteriorated wood, broken glazing, air leakage, and operational deficiencies. These conditions indicate that replacement is a more practical long-term solution than repair. Comparable wood replacement windows were also evaluated but were determined to substantially increase project costs while providing limited additional preservation benefit because the windows proposed for replacement are not original historic features. Furthermore, the city, or previous owners or previous review boards already allowed for the vinyl window replacement on the main floor

E) Yes, we've studied, considered and weighed this project multiple times now, often times making minor repairs to the existing windows but they have reached a point at which minor repairs are no longer providing a reliable, safe, energy efficient window for our tenants

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>