



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.

Continuence Project # 250829002S Facade Renovation
☒ 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: Laura Guza - Antony

Date: 10-1-25

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

Graye LLC

Contact Person

Laura Guza-Antony

Mailing Address

1306 Pinehurst Road

City, State, ZIP

Marshall, MN 56258

Email Address

Shopgraye@gmail.com

Phone Number

507-828-9503

PROPERTY OWNER, IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE

Name

Helen Jones Trust c/ Dave Jones

Mailing Address, City, State, ZIP

1505 Parkview Blvd Brandon, SD 57005

Email Address

Jonesdave1505@proton-mail.com

Phone Number

605-310-3554

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.

See Attached

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

See Attached

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.

See Attached

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?

See Attached

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>**

Question 1 & 2: Project Description

Project Description:

The building located at 315 Main Avenue in Brookings, South Dakota, required significant façade stabilization and renovation due to deterioration of the original brick materials. The lower storefront brick was crumbling and missing in areas, and modern steel columns had been installed in the past to support the structure. These changes made it infeasible to replicate the original masonry construction method.

To stabilize and preserve the façade, the project included:

- Replacement of deteriorated brick with Arizona Dry Stack stone along the storefront base. The selected stone closely resembles a buff tone that was widely used in historic architecture across the Midwest during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Importantly, buff-colored masonry has a proven record of blending naturally into historic districts: as time passes, the stone's surface weathers and patinas in a way that becomes visually continuous with older materials, making it feel like a natural extension of the original building fabric.
- The use of buff-toned replacement materials is consistent with solutions used on other historic buildings where original brickwork could not be restored due to structural or material failure. This ensures the building is not the “first” or only example of such a renovation approach, but rather part of an accepted pattern of practical preservation.
- Installation of a black fabric awning to provide weather protection, visual definition, and to enhance pedestrian-scale interest. The awning dimensions were selected to fit the existing storefront without overpowering historic elements.

Supporting Materials (attached):

1. Photographs of existing façade conditions prior to renovation (showing missing and crumbling brick).
2. Photographs/renderings of the completed façade with the Arizona Dry stack stone and black fabric awning.
3. Awning dimensions and placement specifications.

Summary:

The purpose of the project was not to modernize or erase the building's history, but to prevent further deterioration, restore structural integrity, and contribute positively to the Brookings Historic Commercial District. The chosen stone and awning represent a practical balance between historic compatibility and the structural limitations of the building as it exists today. Over time, the natural aging of the buff stone will further integrate the new materials into the historic streetscape, ensuring the building remains a cohesive part of downtown Brookings.



Awning: 52” tall with a 6” solid valance that is 280” wide and has a 32” projection – traditional style with an open bottom.

3. Planning and Approval Schedule for the Project

The initial application for this project was submitted on August 25. Since that time, planning has continued with adjustments to align with the historic district's character and board feedback. According to the property owner, necessary brick restoration work was carried out ahead of formal approval due to the urgent timing with the masonry contractor and the need to stabilize areas of the building where there were structural concerns and visible holes. This was not intended as an oversight, but as a good-faith effort to protect the building. We recognize the importance of the Commission's review and all other exterior elements under its jurisdiction. Specifically, the awning remains pending approval and will not be installed until authorization is received. Pending approval, the awning installation is expected to be completed within 30–45 days, in strict accordance with historic preservation guidelines.

5. Physical Description of the Affected Historic Property

The property is a two-story brick commercial building located on Main Avenue within the Brookings Historic District. The upper story retains its original dark brickwork and three evenly spaced windows, while the lower level has been repaired with buff-tone masonry to address structural deterioration and fill areas where holes had developed in the façade. The storefront features a traditional early 20th-century commercial layout, characterized by a recessed entry door flanked by large display windows.

The building contains approximately 3,300 usable square feet of commercial space. It has historically served retail, and service uses and is currently being prepared for renewed occupancy as a boutique retail business. The recent masonry work was carried out to stabilize the structure and preserve its viability as a contributing property within the historic district. Future exterior updates include the installation of a new awning, pending approval from the Historic Preservation Commission. The project's intent is to ensure the building's continued functionality while maintaining compatibility with the district's historic character.

7. Feasible and Prudent Alternatives Considered

Several alternatives were evaluated before proceeding with the work. Leaving the façade in its deteriorated state was not feasible due to the visible holes and gaps that already allowed rain and moisture to penetrate. Without intervention, this would have led to further deterioration and long-term damage to the building. Temporary patching was also considered but rejected because it would not have provided adequate protection and would have required repeated disturbance of the façade.

The work was reviewed for delay, but due to the property owner's direction, the timing of the masonry contractor, and the urgent need to prevent continued water damage, restoration could not be postponed. Because of the structural bars in place across the façade, the only practical solution was to use a modern facing brick. An exact match to the original historic brick was not available, and attempting replication would not have provided a structurally sound installation. The buff-tone masonry chosen was therefore the most prudent option, given its durability, its ability to weather naturally into the building, and its precedent within the district as seen in other contributing properties such as King's Pizza, *which I believe is also a historic building*.

The awning, which remains subject to Commission approval, was selected as the least intrusive solution for enhancing the storefront. It preserves the original proportions, provides functional shade, and can be removed or modified in the future without permanent impact to historic features.

Overall, the approach reflects a good-faith effort to balance preservation principles with the urgent need to stabilize and protect the property from further weather-related deterioration, ensuring it remains structurally sound and visually compatible with the historic district.