Call Meeting to Order

1. Public Comment
   Each member of the public is welcome to speak and we ask that you keep your comments to five (5) minutes or less. If the proceedings become lengthy, the Chair may ask that comments be focused on any new facts or evidence not already presented.

2. Approve Meeting Minutes

Action Items

3. Demolition Applications (30 minutes)
   a) 2002 Williams Boulevard SW – Private property
   b) 1010 3rd Street SE – Private property

Discussion Items

4. Update from the Department of Parks & Recreation (20 minutes)

5. Update on the Flood Control System (5 minutes)

6. Preservation Showcase 2016 Update (5 minutes)

7. MOA/LOA Project Updates – (if necessary) (5 minutes)

8. Announcements

9. Adjournment

Anyone who requires an auxiliary aid or service for effective communication, or a modification of policies or procedures to participate in a City program, service, or activity, should contact the Community Development Department at (319) 286-5041 or email communitydevelopment@cedar-rapids.org as soon as possible, but no later than 48 hours before the event.
MINUTES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING,
Thursday, February 25, 2016 @ 4:30 p.m.
Training Room, City Hall, 101 First Street SE

Members Present: Amanda McKnight-Grafton  Chair
Todd McNall
Bob Grafton
Ron Mussman
Tim Oberbroeckling
Mark Stoffer Hunter
BJ Hobart
Sam Bergus
Caitlin Hartman

Members Absent: Barb Westercamp
Pat Cargin

City Staff: Jeff Hintz, Planner
Anne Russett, Planner
Jennifer Pratt, Community Development Director
Kevin Ciabatti, Building Services Director
Anne Kroll, Administrative Assistant

Call Meeting to Order
• Amanda McKnight Grafton called the meeting to order at 4:33 p.m.
• Nine (9) Commissioners were present with two (2) absent.

1. Public Comment
• No public comment

2. Approve Meeting Minutes
• Amanda McKnight Grafton asked that moving forward the staff presentations be attached to the meeting minutes.
• Tim Oberbroeckling made a motion to approve the minutes from February 11, 2016. BJ Hobart seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Historic District Signage
• Jeff Hintz stated that the following three (3) questions were asked of staff:
  1) Will signage at 3rd Avenue and 19th Street SE Intersection be relocated?
     o Yes, a plan was formulated in December to relocate the signage to the correct location.
  2) Possibility of adding entryway signage at Grande Avenue?
Not at this time because the project has been closed, signage was installed in all approved locations. This would also be an anomaly because there are not entryway signs between the local districts, only when you enter.

3) What will be done when the one-way to two-way street conversions take place?
   - Two extra signs were ordered for this specific purpose and will be placed once conversions happen.

   - Jeff Hintz shared a map of the where the signage is within the Local Historic Districts.
   - Amanda McKnight Grafton stated that she thought that additional signs were purchased in case current signs were damaged or faded. Jeff Hintz stated that is true, but they are reserved for those purposes only and not to add more signs in the district.
   - Bob Grafton stated that not all of the funding for signage was used and asked where the rest of the money went. Jeff Hintz stated that money was used towards the structure reports.
   - Bob Grafton stated that there was an entry sign at Grande Avenue up until 2014, but due to an accident that sign was removed. Jeff Hintz will talk to the Traffic Department and see if they are able to put another sign there.

4. Knutson Building
   - Jennifer Pratt stated that Council approved up to $167,500 to stabilize the building, but there was the issue of the asbestos and abatement. Construction firms said that they would not go in to stabilize the building until the asbestos is dealt with. The asbestos contractor came in and estimated the asbestos removal would cost approximately $370,000; however, they will not do the work because the building is not stable enough. Ryan Companies gave staff four (4) different national firms that specialize in these projects. Another four (4) firms were also identified. Unfortunately, staff has not received any estimates back from these groups. It has been a combination of them not able to do that type of work, the project is too expensive, or unresponsiveness. Staff is recommending reuse or incorporation of the existing façade in a new construction project and taking to City Council a recommendation to go out for a request for proposals (RFP) not only for the Knutson Building but with the addition of the two vacant properties that the City owns adjacent to the Knutson Building. One of the evaluation criteria will be to incorporate some part of the façade to best retain the historic character of the building in the project. The key is to not get too prescriptive because there may be an idea out there that has not been thought of.
   - BJ Hobart stated that Hobart Restoration is one of the contractors that looked at the building and presented a solution to the city that Hobart thinks is a viable solution. Hobart has subcontractors lined up that will do all of the work and Hobart is willing to purchase the building for $1 and put $4 million into it to save the building. Hobart has presented that they need the $167,500 that Council authorized, but there is still a $400,000 gap.
   - Jennifer Pratt stated that by doing the RFP, Hobart Restoration has the opportunity to submit their proposal.

Kevin Ciabatti arrived at the meeting at 4:56 p.m.

   - The Commission discussed the RFP process and timeframe and the scope of work.
• The Commission expressed concern that it would be difficult to compare and evaluate proposals that may range from full restoration to retaining only a portion of the building’s façade.
• BJ Hobart recused from voting.
• Tim Oberbroeckling made a motion to recommend that City Council approve an RFP process that would be solely to save the entire Knutson Building and to make City Council aware that there is a developer that has already prepared a new proposal. Todd McNall seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with BJ Hobart recused from voting.

5. Preservation Showcase 2016 Update
• Amanda McKnight Grafton gave an update on the progress for the 2016 Preservation Showcase.
• Todd McNall encouraged the Commission to spread the word about the showcase to the other groups they are involved in.
• Amanda McKnight Grafton stated that she is in the process of getting approval for continuing education credits for architects and real estate agents that attend the showcase.
• Anne Russett stated that staff is now taking applications for the awards and asks that the Commission help spread the word.

6. MOA/LOA Project Updates
• Anne Russett stated that the spring semester Kirkwood Preservation series is starting up. The scholarship program is available again and the applications are due March 18, 2016. Staff needs a volunteer to help review the applications. Please email staff if interested. The first four (4) classes are free.

7. Announcements
• Bob Grafton stated that Amanda McKnight Grafton received her certificate from Kirkwood for the preservation series.

BJ Hobart left the meeting at 5:32 p.m.

• Jeff Hintz stated that there is a demolition application for the next meeting for 2002 Williams Blvd. SW. The foundation has collapsed, so you cannot go into it. There is no salvage possibility, but photo documentation can be done from the right-of-way. Kevin Ciabatti stated that this property has flash flooding damage form a couple years ago, but it was not reported, so Building Services was unaware of the damage.

Ron Mussman left the meeting at 5:35 p.m.

• Anne Russett stated that staff is having a public workshop on March 8, 2016 about the Chapter 18 update. Commissioners are welcome to come and observe or to volunteer at the event. Staff will attend a SaveCR Heritage meeting to speak about Chapter 18 on March 3, 2016 and the Wellington Heights Neighborhood Association meeting on April 12, 2016.

8. Adjournment
• Todd McNall made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 5:37 p.m. Sam Bergus seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anne Kroll, Administrative Assistant II
Community Development
Historic District Signage

1. Will signage at 3rd Avenue and 19th Street SE Intersection be relocated?
   - Yes, a plan was formulated in December to relocate the signage to the correct location.

2. Possibility of adding entryway signage at Grande Avenue?
   - Not at this time, the project has been closed, signage was installed in all approved locations. This would also be an anomaly, there are not entryway signs between the local districts, only when you enter.

3. What will be done when the one-way to two-way street conversions take place?
   - Two extra signs were ordered for this specific purpose and will be placed once conversions happen.
Historic Preservation Commission Agenda Item Cover Sheet

Meeting Date: March 10, 2016

Property Location: 2002 Williams Boulevard SW
Property Owner/Representative: Wells Fargo Bank North America – Colleen Brady
Owner Number(s): 515-443-0245
Year Built: 1949

Description of Agenda Item: ☒ Demolition Application ☐ COA ☐ Other

Background and Previous HPC Action: This property was recently acquired by Wells Fargo Bank. The intent after the demolition is to market this as a vacant lot for sale. The building currently has code violations and is not livable at this time.

The building has suffered from a foundation collapse and is not safe to enter; the structure has been placarded “Do Not Enter.” The owner of the property has determined the best course of action is demolition as repairs and updating the property for sale would not be economical.

City Assessor Information on the parcel:

Historic Eligibility Status: Eligible ☐ Not Eligible ☒ Unknown ☐ N/A ☐

Explanation (if necessary):

The 2014 Cedar Rapids Citywide Historic and Architectural Reconnaissance Survey does not indicate this property to be historic, or located within a potentially historic neighborhood recommended for further study.

The State Historic Preservation Office has reviewed and concurred with the survey, finding the property not historic.

If eligible, which criteria is met:
☐ Associated with significant historical events (Criteria A)
☐ Associated with significant lives of person (Criteria B)
☐ Signifies distinctive architectural character/era (Criteria C)
☐ Archaeologically significant (Criteria D)

Other Action by City: Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A ☐

Explanation (if necessary):
Recommendation: Immediate release.

Rationale: The structure lacks defining features, a rehab is not economically feasible and structure is a poor candidate for local landmarking.
Historic Preservation Commission Agenda Item Cover Sheet

Meeting Date: March 10, 2016

Property Location: 1010 3rd Street SE
Property Owner/Representative: Jamey Stroschine
Owner Number(s): 319-286-5098 Demolition Contact: Not yet determined
Year Built: 1880
Description of Agenda Item: ☒ Demolition Application ☐ COA ☐ Other

Background and Previous HPC Action: The property located at 1010 3rd Street SE is commonly referred to as the White Elephant Building. In 2015, the HPC identified this building as a candidate for a historic structure report, which is currently underway and anticipated to be completed in June of 2016. The structure report is a thorough documentation of the property done by a preservation professional, with photos and investigation done both inside and outside of the structure.

The structure is listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) District Nomination Form as "Key Contributing" to the Bohemian Commercial Historic District.

The property owner has been working for the past couple of years to renovate the building and make use of the historic structure. The owner investigated moving the structure to a different location on the same lot, but this was not viable. Next, the owner reached out to a preservation group to see if they would be willing to take the structure, but this was not feasible.

Options or Alternatives to Demolition: Municipal Code Section 18.10 (g) outlines options available to the Commission if the property is determined to be historically significant AND the Commission wishes to explore any of the following with the owner of the structure:

1. The building can be considered for landmark designation.
The owner of the property is not interested in a local landmark for the building because local landmarking does not come with additional funding to make the project financially feasible.

2. Rehabilitation the building with the assistance of State or Federal tax incentives or other private financial assistance.
The owner has investigated tax credits and incentives with both the City and SHPO, but the owner determined that the restoration and re-use of the building was not financially feasible.

3. Adapting the building to a new use.
The owner has worked with both City staff and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) Staff regarding restoration and rehabilitation of the structure. However, the owner has determined that the restoration and re-use of the building was not financially feasible.

4. Finding a new owner who is interested in preserving/rehabilitation the building.
The property itself is not currently for sale and the property owner has indicated to City staff that he is not interested in selling the property. However, the property owner did indicate that he is willing to consider offers to purchase and relocate the building.
5. **Incorporating the building into the owner/applicant's redevelopment plans.**
The owner has been pursuing incorporation of the building in redevelopment plans on the
property; however, the owner has determined that this is not feasible.

6. **Assisting in finding a different location for the owner's redevelopment.**
The owner has indicated to staff that he is not interested in selling the property.

7. **Moving the building to an alternative location.**
The owner has indicated to staff that he would be willing to consider offers to purchase and
relocate the structure with the caveat that this move be completed within the 60 day demolition
review period.

8. **Salvaging building materials if the structure is to be demolished.**
The owner has indicated that he will be salvaging materials from the building and use those
materials in the new development for the property.

9. **Documenting the building prior to the issuance of a demolition permit.**
The property has been documented inside and out as part of a structure report. The structure
report includes thorough interior and exterior documentation of the property completed by a
preservation professional.

City Assessor Information on the parcel:

**Historic Eligibility Status:**
- Eligible ☒
- Not Eligible ☐
- Unknown ☐
- N/A ☐

**Explanation (if necessary):**
The structure is listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) District Nomination
Form as “Key Contributing” to the Bohemian Commercial Historic District. This property is
contributing to an active NRHP District.

**If eligible, which criteria is met:**
- ☒ Associated with significant historical events (Criteria A)
- ☐ Associated with significant lives of person (Criteria B)
- ☒ Signifies distinctive architectural character/era (Criteria C)
- ☐ Archaeologically significant (Criteria D)

**Other Action by City:**
- Yes ☐
- No ☒
- N/A ☐

**Explanation (if necessary):**

**Recommendation:** Consider placing a hold if the Commission is interested in working to help
move the structure from the lot to a new location within the 60 day demolition review period.

**Rationale:** The applicant has explored all options available to the Commission as part of 18.10
(g) of the Cedar Rapids Municipal Code on his own, prior to applying for demolition of the
structure. Due to the financial complications and economic infeasibility of the project, the
applicant has submitted this demolition application.

At this point, if the Commission is aware of someone, or willing to locate an interested
group/individual and with the proper finances to move the structure from the lot (option 7) a
hold should be considered. Note, the applicant has indicated this option was investigated with a
local preservation advocacy group. The applicant also indicated to City staff if the Commission
knew of someone interested in moving the structure, he would be willing to have it relocated
from the site within the 60 day demolition review period.
To: Historic Preservation Commission
From: Jeff Hintz, Planner II
Subject: List and Map of all structures impacted by Flood Control System
Date: March 10, 2016

Background:
At the February 11, 2016 Historic Preservation Commission meeting it was requested that a list of properties be provided to the Commission of structures that would be impacted by the Flood Control System (FCS) that were not surveyed as historic. Previously, City Staff had shared a map of historic properties impacted by the FCS with the commission in June of 2015. The attachments include a listing of all properties that will be impacted by construction FCS, both historic and non-historic. Note, properties already reviewed by the HPC, but not yet demolished are not included on this list or map. These include 43 20th Avenue SW, 63 17th Avenue SW and 57 18th Avenue SW; again, these properties will be impacted but have already had demolition review by the HPC.

Attachments:
1. Address list of structures impacted by Flood Control System.
2. Location map of those structures impacted by Flood Control System.
### List of Structures Impacted by Flood Control System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPN Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>142125200800000</td>
<td>1311 3RD ST NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141745101100000</td>
<td>1855 ELLIS BLVD NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141745100900000</td>
<td>1865 ELLIS BLVD NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142018400400000</td>
<td>1337 4TH ST NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142018100600000</td>
<td>1413 5TH ST NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142847600100000</td>
<td>1805 A ST SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142735300100000</td>
<td>20 22ND AVE SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142135300100000</td>
<td>90 F AVE NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141745100100000</td>
<td>1927 ELLIS BLVD NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141745100200000</td>
<td>1925 ELLIS BLVD NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141747600300000</td>
<td>1821 ELLIS BLVD NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142010100300000</td>
<td>1729 ELLIS BLVD NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142010101300000</td>
<td>1733 ELLIS BLVD NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141745100700000</td>
<td>1869 ELLIS BLVD NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142040600100000</td>
<td>1124 1ST ST NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142047601300000</td>
<td>308 H AVE NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141745101000000</td>
<td>1861 ELLIS BLVD NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142010101000000</td>
<td>604 PENN AVE NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142735200200000</td>
<td>2204 A ST SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142010100800000</td>
<td>1701 ELLIS BLVD NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141745101500000</td>
<td>1831 ELLIS BLVD NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141745101400000</td>
<td>1841 ELLIS BLVD NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142735400500000</td>
<td>65 20TH AVE SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141745101200000</td>
<td>1851 ELLIS BLVD NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142010100900000</td>
<td>608 PENN AVE NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142017700400000</td>
<td>1523 5TH ST NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141745101300000</td>
<td>1845 ELLIS BLVD NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142132601300000</td>
<td>1232 1ST ST NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142132600200000</td>
<td>1231 2ND ST NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142132600100000</td>
<td>1250 2ND ST NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142040202200000</td>
<td>1238 3RD ST NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142010101200000</td>
<td>590 PENN AVE NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141745100800000</td>
<td>1867 ELLIS BLVD NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142040301700000</td>
<td>1222 4TH ST NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142018501200000</td>
<td>1308 4TH ST NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142010400200000</td>
<td>1671 6TH ST NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142125100200000</td>
<td>1426 1ST ST NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142018501600000</td>
<td>1326 4TH ST NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141747600600000</td>
<td>1805 ELLIS BLVD NW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>