MEETING NOTICE
The City of Cedar Rapids Historic Preservation Commission will meet at:
4:30 P.M.
Thursday, April 14, 2016
in the
Training Room, City Hall
101 First Street SE, Cedar Rapids, Iowa

AGENDA

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

3. Action Items
   a) Certificate of Appropriateness
      i. 1803 Ridgewood Terrace – replacement of front and side steps
   b) Demolition Applications Under Review
      i. Private property - 1010 3rd Street SE, Hold expires May 10, 2016
         A. Consideration to Release Demolition Hold
         B. Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness to Remove Façade

4. Discussion Items
   a) Requests for Resolutions of Support for Historic Preservation Tax Credit Applications
   b) Preservation Showcase 2016 Update
   c) MOA/LOA Project Updates – (if necessary)

5. Announcements

6. 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.
Call Meeting to Order

- Amanda McKnight-Grafton called the meeting to order at 4:33 p.m.
- Seven (7) Commissioners were present with four (4) absent.

1. Public Comment

- Justin Wasson, Local Historic District homeowner, shared pictures of his garage addition that was approved by the Commission last year. Mr. Wasson shared his experience working with the Commission and thanked them for their help and expertise.
- Jennifer Pruden, Executive Director of the Czech Village/New Bohemia Main Street District, would like the owners of 1010 3rd Street SE to know that the Czech Village/New Bohemia Main Street District is here as a resource to help to define alternate solutions instead of demolishing the building.

2. Approve Meeting Minutes

- Tim Oberbroeckling made a motion to approve the minutes from February 25, 2016. Todd McNall seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Demolition Applications

a) 2002 Williams Boulevard SW – Private Property
• Jeff Hintz stated that this property was built in 1949, is 913 square feet, and is placarded “Do Not Enter”. This property is not recommended for further study and staff recommends immediate release. The property was acquired by a bank and the value of home and cost to repair is not economical. The structure lacks architectural detail and modern materials are installed.
• Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that he was unable to find any evidence of historic persons associated with the house or anything else from a historic standpoint. Mr. Stoffer Hunter has also done photo documentation.
• Mark Stoffer Hunter made a motion to approve the demolition of 2002 Williams Boulevard SW. Todd McNall seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

b) 1010 3\textsuperscript{rd} Street SE – Private Property
• Jeff Hintz stated that this property was built in 1880 and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places as a key contributing structure to the Bohemian Commercial Historic District. This structure is eligible because of events that have taken place there and for architecture. The owner has explored tax credits, renovation, and reuse. Professional documentation has been done through a structure report. If this structure is demolished, salvage of materials is planned. Mr. Hintz shared the options to explore, which can be found on pages two (2) and three (3) in the PowerPoint presentation attached to the minutes.
• Jeff Hintz stated that a structure report is in the draft stages. Demolition of the building will not impact report completion or the fulfillment of the LOA. Demolition of the building was not the owner’s intention at the onset of the report. Demolition and the report are separate actions that are not associated with one another.
• Jeff Hintz stated that new construction information from NPS and the Czech Bohemia Design Manual has been provided to the owner. It is required that the owner submit a redevelopment plan prior to the issuance of a demolition permit.
• Jamey Stroschine, part owner of 1010 3\textsuperscript{rd} Street SE, presented all of the owners’ efforts to save this building over the last three (3) years (presentation is attached to the minutes). The owners have worked with the City and Main Street as well as individuals interested in historic preservation, they have tried for grants and have not received them, there were no tax credits available for the size and scope of the project, rehabilitating with mandatory flood-proofing is cost prohibitive, and SHPO has been unresponsive even with the help of the City. Mr. Stroschine stated that the only options the owners see are to have the structure moved or demolished. There are individuals who have shown interest in taking all or parts of the structure, but there are no formal agreements in hand.
• The Commission and the owners discussed the 60 day hold and the urgency for the owners to open their business. The owners plan to build a structure that is in kind with the existing structure with the same square footage and floor plan, if demolished.
• Todd McNall asked that staff follow up with SHPO.
• Mark Stoffer Hunter made a motion to place a 60 day hold on 1010 3\textsuperscript{rd} Street SE to give the Commission a final opportunity to find individuals interested in moving the building or saving the façade. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed with Todd McNall opposing.
• Tim Oberbroeckling stated that if all options have been exhausted before the 60 day period then the Commission can vote to release the property earlier.
• Amanda McKnight Grafton requested that this property be placed on all future agendas until the expiration of the hold.
4. Update from the Department of Parks & Recreation
   • Sven Leff, Parks and Recreation Director, provided an update to the Commission on Greene Square and Ambroz.
   • Mr. Leff stated that there will be a ribbon cutting ceremony for Greene Square on May 20, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. The time capsule will be opened that day as well. Mr. Leff has met with Mark Stoffer Hunter to discuss the historic aspects of Greene Square. The diagonal path is staying and 12-14 historical elements will be placed back into the park.
   • Mr. Leff stated that the Ambroz Building will be maintained until the future owner takes over. The reason that city staff will no longer be in the building is because it is not ADA compliant and it is too cost prohibitive to fix it up to code. The Commission expressed its interest in touring the building.

Amanda McKnight Grafton left the meeting at 5:53 p.m.

5. Update on the Flood Control System
   • Ron Mussman stated that he would like to see the agreement with the Army Corps that was executed in 2010 that deals with flood control and historic issues as well as the other two documents from SHPO and the advisory council on historic preservation related to the draft proposal on a future agenda. Anne Russett stated that staff will look into those documents.
   • Jeff Hintz shared a map of the properties affected by the Flood Control System. A list of those properties is included in the packet.

6. Preservation Showcase 2016 Update
   • Jeff Hintz stated that quotes have been gathered for a sign for the showcase award winners. The signs are comparable to real-estate yard signs and are reusable. The signs will cost around $169 each and ten (10) to twelve (12) will be ordered.

7. MOA/LOA Project Updates
   • There were no updates.

Ron Mussman left the meeting at 6:04

8. Announcements
   • Jennifer Pratt stated that staff is working on updating the Zoning Code and that Sam Bergus is representing the HPC on the Project Steering Committee.

9. Adjournment
   • Since there was no longer a quorum, the remaining HPC members ended the meeting at 6:08 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anne Kroll, Administrative Assistant II
Community Development
Historic Preservation Commission
March 10, 2016

Demolition Review
2002 Williams Boulevard SW

2002 Williams Blvd. SW

• Built 1949
  – 913 square feet
  – Placarded “Do Not Enter”
• Not recommended for further study-
  Citywide Survey
• Immediate release

2002 Williams Blvd. SW

• Acquired by bank
• Value of home and cost to repair, not economical
• Lacks architectural detail, modern materials installed

Historic Significance

Defined by 18.02 (l) – “Historically significant building: A principal building determined to be fifty (50) years old or older, and;
1. The building is associated with any significant historic events;
2. The building is associated with any significant lives of persons;
3. The building signifies distinctive architectural character/era;
4. The building is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
5. The building is archeologically significant.”

Demolition Review Process

1. Determination of Historic Significance
2a. Not Historically Significant
   Release Property
   2b. Historically Significant
   Explore options
   Reuse property
   2c. Not significant
   Reuse property
   2d. Not significant
   Reuse property
   If HPC does not
   wish to explore options
   Release property
Demolition Review
1010 Third Street SE

1010 Third Street SE
• Built 1880
• Listed on NRHP as a key contributing structure to Bohemian Commercial Historic District
• Eligible under Criteria A (events) and C (architecture)

Historic Significance
Defined by 18.02 (l) – “Historically significant building: A principal building determined to be fifty (50) years old or older, and;
1. The building is associated with any significant historic events;
2. The building is associated with any significant lives of persons;
3. The building signifies distinctive architectural character/era;
4. The building is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
5. The building is archeologically significant.”

Demolition Review Process

Options to Explore
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.

1010 Third Street SE
• Owner has explored tax credits, renovation and re-use
• Professional documentation done through structure report
• If demolished, salvage of materials is planned

Options to Explore
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.
Options to Explore

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 redevelopment.
   The owner has indicated to staff that he is not interested in selling the property.

Options to Explore

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 demolition.
   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.

Structure Report

- Report is in draft stages, review by SHPO and IEDA is the next step.
- Demolition of building will not impact report completion or the fulfillment of the LOA.
- Demolition of building was not the owner’s intention at the onset of the report.
- Demolition and report are separate actions, not associated with one another.

Communication

- New construction information from NPS and Czech Bohemia Design Manual provided to owner
  - Massing, materials, scale, street presence
  - Fitting in with the area, not trying to recreate or artificially create historic fabric and buildings
- 18.10 (j) requires a redevelopment plan prior to issuance of a demolition permit

Flood Control System

Impacted Structures
To: Historic Preservation Commission (HPC)  
From: Anne Russett, Planner III  
Subject: COA Request at 1803 Ridgewood Terrace SE  
Date: April 14, 2016  

**Applicant Name(s):** Mary Cheseboro  
**Owner Name:** Mary Cheseboro  
**Address:** 1803 Ridgewood Terrace SE  
**Local Historic District:** Redmond Park Grande Avenue Historic District  
**Legal Description:** GRANDE AVENUE PLACE N 100' STR/LB 7 5  
**Year Built:** 1915  

**Project Description:** The applicant proposes to replace the front steps along Ridgewood Terrace SE and the side steps along 18th Street SE to provide access to two porches. The applicant proposes to replace the existing wood steps with a composite deck material known as fiberon horizon symmetry decking. A sample of this material will be provided to the Commission at the meeting.

**Information from the 1995 Site Inventory Form:** The site inventory form identifies the home as a contributing property to the historic district and individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under criteria C (i.e. embodies distinctive characteristics).

The defining features of the home identified in the site inventory form include the following:

- Broad side-gable roof;
- Single gable dormer with exposed rafter tails centered on front;
- Brick;
- Right half of front porch enclosed with windows above balustrade;
- Porch has brick piers and closed brick balustrade extending to ground level in lieu of skirting;
- Entrance centered with groups of narrow 2/2 windows;
- Second entrance facing 18th Street SE has small gable porch with matching piers and balustrade and exposed rafter tails; and
- Shed awning over group of small 4/4 windows also faces 18th Street SE.

**Options for the Commission:**

1. **Approve** the application as submitted;
2. **Modify, then Approve** the application – only if applicant agrees to modifications made;
3. **Disapprove** the application; or
4. **Continue the item to a future, specified meeting date** in order to receive additional information.

**Excerpt(s) from Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts Applicable to the Project:**
The guidelines related to porches and other entrances are as follows:

**Recommended:**
- Opening an enclosed porch
- Repairing the existing porch or balcony
- Replacing wood elements with wood elements (wood elements should be painted)
- Replacing masonry elements with masonry elements
- Rebuilding a porch with original materials
- Screening
- Painted, not treated wood

**Not Recommended:**
- Enclosing porches visible from the street
- Modern straight-edged railings
- Columns made of modern materials (fiberglass for an example)
- Plywood panel flooring on entrances facing the street
- Carpeted flooring on entrances facing the street
- Concrete steps that are visible from the street
- Unpainted treated lumber elements (recommended for hidden supports)

**Historic Preservation Plan:** Initiative 7.2.b of the Historic Preservation Plan recommends updating the Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts to address the allowance of new materials, such as the one proposed by the applicant.

**Excerpt(s) from the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation Applicable to the Project:**
Related to entrances and porches, the SOI standards recommend the following:
- Identifying, retaining, and preserving entrances--and their functional and decorative features--that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as doors, fanlights, sidelights, pilaster, entablatures, columns, balustrades, and stairs.

Related to wood materials, the SOI standards recommend the following:
- Identifying, retaining, and preserving wood features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as siding, cornices, brackets, window architraves, and doorway pediments; and their paints, finishes, and colors.

**Analysis:** Based on the SOI standards, retaining and preserving wood features is important on features that are important in defining the historic character of the building. Per the Site Inventory Form, the steps are not identified as a defining feature of the home and the applicant is not proposing any modifications to the home’s defining features. Furthermore, the Historic Preservation Plan recommends exploring the use new materials.

**Staff Recommendation:** Option One, Approve the application as submitted.

**Attachments:** Application from applicant.
CEDAR RAPIDS
HISTORIC DISTRICT APPLICATION
Community Development Department, 101 First Street SE, Cedar Rapids, IA 52401, Phone 319-286-5041

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Information</th>
<th>Applicant Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Mary Chesbro</td>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 1803 Ridgewood Ter.</td>
<td>Company: Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Cedar Rapids</td>
<td>Address: Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State: IA</td>
<td>City: Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip: 52403</td>
<td>State: Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 319.363.9639</td>
<td>Zip: Same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Address of Property: where work is to be done:
1803 Ridgewood Ter. SE.

Project type: House ☑, Garage ☐, Shed ☐, Fence ☐, Addition ☐, other: ☐

Project description: Replace front + side stairs to porch.

Location: Describe where (what part of building, or where on property) work will be done:
Front stairs on Ridgewood Ter, side stairs on 18th St.

Materials: Type and design to be used: Stairs one between 1/2 height brickwails. WANT to USE Composite Decking Material. Stairs are not covered by eaves or porch roof. Old wood stairs cupped badly + held water + ice. ICE.

Estimates required: If you will not be using the same type of materials as already used on the building, then you must obtain two estimates using the existing material(s) and two estimates using the new material(s).

Samples: Applicant must bring a sample of the material(s) to HPC meeting if a COA is required.

Applicant's signature: Mary Chesbro

For Community Development Department use only:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Received:</th>
<th>Received by:</th>
<th>File No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redmond Park-Grande Avenue ☐</td>
<td>Contributing structure? ☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>CNME Issued? ☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second and Third ☐</td>
<td>Key structure? ☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>COA required? ☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MELT WENT THROUGH THE PAINT + WOOD + EATING INTO THE WOOD. USING WOOD WOULD REQUIRE PAINTING EVERY YEAR. REPLACING MORE OFTEN THAN THE COMPOSITE
TECHNICAL INFORMATION

- Board Profile Dimensions: Flat bottom .935 in. x 5.4 in. (2.37 cm x 13.7 cm)
- Boards are reversible.
- Board Weight: 2.36 lbs./linear ft.
- Material: Durable PermaTech outer surface is bonded on four sides; premium HDPE and wood composite core
- Square Edge Board Lengths: 20 feet
- Grooved Edge Board Lengths: 12 ft.; 16 ft.; 20 ft.
- Span Limitations: Perpendicular to joist 16 inches (40 cm); Up to 45° angle to joist 12 inches (31 cm); Stair stringer spacing 12 inches (31 cm)
- Fascia Boards: .75 in. x 11.25 in. x 12 ft.; all colors available
- Riser Boards: .75 in. x 7.25 in. x 12 ft.; all colors available
- Surface fasteners: Yes
- Hidden fasteners: Yes

Get installation instructions and technical bulletins
(https://www.fiberondecking.com/resources/literature)

FAQS

Design a Deck | Where to Buy Fiberon | Talk to a Fiberon Expert

https://www.fiberondecking.com/products/decking/horizon-symmetry-decking
To: Historic Preservation Commission (HPC)  
From: Jeff Hintz, Planner II and Anne Russett, Planner III  
Subject: COA Request at 1010 3rd Street SE  
Date: April 14, 2016

Applicant Name(s): Jon Jelinek  
Owner Name: TUSK LLC  
Address: 1010 3rd Street SE  
Local Historic District: Property is not within a local historic district  
Legal Description: CARPENTER'S 3RD SE 30' LOT 2-EX NW 3' & NW 18' STR/LB 3 20  
Year Built: 1880

Project Description: Removal of the façade from the building; renovation and installation of the façade on the inside of the Ideal Theater building for display purposes.

Background: The HPC placed a 60 day demolition review period (hold) on the structure at the March 10, 2016 meeting. During this hold, 18.10 (k) of the municipal code requires applications for building permits to be reviewed as if the property were designated as a landmark. As such, the application to remove the façade is an exterior change, which does require a building permit; therefore, the proposed work does require approval from the HPC up until May 10, 2016 when the 60 day hold expires.

Information from 2002 Site Inventory Form: “This building is a moderately well preserved example of a vernacular commercial building form known as “false front” that was popular in the decades prior to 1900. Its storefront remains largely intact and despite changes to the upper level of the front façade, the building retains most of its visual integrity. As a result, the building is considered a contributing structure to the potential Bohemian Commercial Historic District.”

Options for the Commission:
   1. Approve the application as submitted; or  
   2. Modify, then Approve the application – only if applicant agrees to modifications made; or  
   3. Disapprove the application; or  
   4. Continue the item to a future, specified meeting date in order to receive additional information; or  
   5. Release the property from the 60 day demolition review (hold).

Excerpt(s) from Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts Applicable to Project: No applicable excerpts. The Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts do not include a section on Commercial properties or storefronts.
Analysis: On March 29, 2016, Community Development staff reached out to the multiple parties interested in saving the entire structure. Specifically, staff requested any updates on progress toward moving the entire building within the property owner’s timeframe. Specifically, the property owner has indicated a willingness to wait a few days beyond the expiration of the demolition hold, but anything beyond that is not acceptable. As of April 7, 2016, staff heard from one interested party that they were working with the property owner and investigating the feasibility of moving the structure within the timeframe allotted by the property owner.

At the HPC’s April 14 meeting, staff should have a better idea as to whether moving the structure within the allotted timeframe is feasible. Staff should know if the property owner is willing to continue working toward moving the structure and if the interested party has poured a foundation and acquired the necessary permits for the move. If these actions are not taken by the April 14 meeting it is not likely that the structure can be moved within the property owner’s timeframe.

*If progress has been made that demonstrates it is feasible to move the structure within the property owner’s timeframe, the staff would recommend the following:*

1. Maintaining the demolition review hold on the property, and
2. Continuing the request to remove the façade to the next meeting.

*If progress has not been made that demonstrates it is feasible to move the structure within the property owner’s timeframe, the staff would recommend the following:*

1. Release of the property from the 60 day demolition review (hold).

With the release of the property, no action by the HPC would be required regarding the façade application. Instead the applicant and property ownership group could work collaboratively to save the façade of the building.

By releasing the property from the demolition hold, the HPC would save the property owner the cost of stabilizing the building while the façade was removed, and the applicant the cost of a renovation permit. Furthermore, releasing the property would allow the property ownership group to meet their timeframe for redevelopment on the site while also saving the façade. Releasing the hold would also give the applicant, Jon Jelinek, more time to do the intricate work necessary to remove the façade prior to the demolition of the remainder of the structure.

Attachments: Application from applicant.
CEDAR RAPIDS
HISTORIC DISTRICT APPLICATION
Community Development Department, 101 First Street SE, Cedar Rapids, IA 52401, Phone 319-286-5041

Owner Information
Name T.U.S.K. LLC
Address 3627 Honey Hill Dr. SE
City Cedar Rapids
State IA Zip 52403
Phone 319-329-5098

Applicant Information
Name JOE SELIN
Company SELIN T. COMPELNS
Address 125 3rd St SE
City IA
State IA Zip 52401
Home Ph. 319-210-8639
Work Ph.

Address of Property where work is to be done:
1010 3rd St. SE

Project type: House ☐, Garage ☐, Shed ☐, Fence ☐, Addition ☐, other X

Project description: Facade removal
local business owner wishes to remove, restore and display original facade at his business.

Location: Describe where (what part of building, or where on property) work will be done:
Remove facade; external sheeting and woodwork from sidewalk level to top of parapet

Materials: Type and design to be used

Estimates required: If you will not be using the same type of materials as already used on the building, then you must obtain two estimates using the existing material(s) and two estimates using the new material(s).

Samples: Applicant must bring a sample of the material(s) to HPC meeting if a COA is required.

Applicant's signature:

For Community Development Department use only:
Date Received: Received by: File No.
Redmond Park-Grande Avenue ☐ Contributing structure? ☐ Yes ☐ No CNME Issued? ☐ Yes ☐ NO
Second and Third ☐ Key structure? ☐ Yes ☐ No COA required? ☐ Yes ☐ No
To: Historic Preservation Commission  
From: Anne Russett, Planner III  
Subject: Requests for Resolutions of Support for Historic Preservation Tax Credit Applications  
Date: April 14, 2016

The City recently received two requests for resolutions of support from the City Council for Historic Preservation Tax Credit applications. The requests were made for the following projects:

1. St. Paul’s United Methodist Church, 1350 3rd Avenue SE  
2. Monroe School, 2500 Edgewood Road NW  

Both of these projects aim to rehabilitate the structures to preserve the character of the buildings in accordance with historic preservation standards.

This information is provided as an informational update to the Commission. City staff will be taking these requests forward to the City Council for their consideration in the near future.