City of Cedar Rapids

Historic Preservation Commission

Community Development & Planning Department, City Hall, 101 First Street SE, Cedar Rapids, IA 52401, 319-286-5041

MEETING NOTICE
The City of Cedar Rapids Historic Preservation Commission will meet at:
4:30 P.M.
Thursday, October 27, 2016
in the
Five Seasons Room, City Services Center
500 15th Avenue SW, 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. Discussion Items
   a) Flood Control System
      i. Lot 44 Pump Station & Sinclair Site Pump Station
   b) ReZone Cedar Rapids Project Update

4. Action Items
   a) Demolition Applications
      i. 3204 Circle Drive NE – Private Property
      ii. 3711 Wilson Avenue SW – Private Property
      iii. 3721 Wilson Avenue SW – Private Property
      iv. 1315 O Avenue NW – Private Property
      v. 481 Wilson Avenue Drive SW – Private Property

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 cd-plan@cedar-rapids.org as soon as possible, but no later than 48 hours before the event.
MINUTES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING,
Thursday, October 13, 2016 @ 4:30 p.m.
Five Seasons Conference Room, City Services Center, 500 15th Avenue SW

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

Members Absent: Caitlin Hartman

City Staff: Jeff Hintz, Planner
Anne Russett, Planner
Jennifer Pratt, Community Development Director
Rob Davis, Flood Control Program Manager
Anne Kroll, Administrative Assistant

Call Meeting to Order
• Amanda McKnight Grafton called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.
• Nine (9) Commissioners were present with one (1) absent.

1. Public Comment
• There was no public comment.

2. Approve Meeting Minutes
• Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that on point two (2) on page two (2) is should be was and on
item 4a Green should be Greene.
• Barb Westercamp made a motion to approve the minutes as amended from September 8,
2016. Todd McNall seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Discussion Items
a) Programmatic Agreement
• Melissa Tiedemann from Stanley Consultants, Inc. presented on the cultural resources
investigation for Lot 44 Pump Station and Sinclair Levee for the Cedar Rapids Flood
Control System. Ms. Tiedemann shared the project background and cultural resources
investigations and findings. BCA recommends that adverse effects from proposed
construction on the cultural resources investigations have been adequately mitigated and
no further investigations are warranted.
• Amanda McKnight Grafton asked when the design of the levee will be ready to view. Rob Davis stated that the design is not being focused on yet, right now, the effort is going into closing the underground pipes. The timeframe for the design is five (5) to eight (8) years.

• Ron Mussman stated that, according to the PA, the design for the pump station at Lot 44 should have been reviewed by the HPC and SHPO. The HPC has not looked at the design, so what is the status? Melissa Tiedemann stated that SHPO has been sent the design as part of the submittal package by the Army Corps of Engineers as they are the lead agency on the project and they have not received any comments back from SHPO yet.

• Todd McNall noted that DRTAC should have reviewed the design also.

• Amanda McKnight Grafton stated that she would think that SHPO would like to see the HPC’s comments submitted with the design, so it should have come to the HPC first.

• Tim Oberbroeckling stated that the HPC does not want a building put in next to the historic Czech School that looks out of place and not harmonious. If it is too late for the HPC to give their comments this time at least it sets precedence for better understanding for future projects.

• Todd McNall noted that DRTAC members were disappointed that an image for the pump station that they had not reviewed had been shown to the public.

• Jennifer Pratt stated that this is complicated because staff has been focusing on this as part of the Flood Control System, so this is new to everyone. It went to the Flood Control Committee, so it went to a Council committee first which is unusual because of the nature of it. Staff has to figure out the timing. Typically, any other City Council appointed board or commission would see it first and then take that recommendation to a Council committee.

• Ron Mussman asked if there is City staff in charge of administering the PA and seeing that it is followed. Jennifer Pratt stated that there is, but the City is not the lead agency so the City is not in charge. Rob Davis added that the City consults with the Army Corps of Engineers what items remain to be done.

• Rón Mussman asked if the west side will be considered under the PA. Rob Davis stated that, at this time, it is not a federal project and because of that SHPO will not review the west side. Mr. Davis asked SHPO if there could be an agreement for the west side that excludes a federal entity and what those terms would be and SHPO will not get involved with the west side without federal funding. Melissa Tiedemann added that the City has pushed really hard for SHPO to review the west side.

• Amanda McKnight Grafton asked that for items on the west side that are historic to the City the HPC be included to have that review and offer comments so that the public is aware that the HPC was involved even though SHPO was not. Rob Davis stated that, if the Chair would like, he and Melissa Tiedemann could come back to an HPC meeting with a presentation of the investigations done on the west side.

• Ron Mussman stated that the HPC has been left out of this project completely since day one (1) and this agreement has been in place since 2010. The HPC has not received any documentation including the annual reports and that is unacceptable. Rob Davis stated that the Corps is the lead agency and they did not do any of the annual reports, so the City has not seen documents that the HPC has not.

• Amanda McKnight Grafton stated that there was a letter sent in September 2016 and as far as signatories and entities involved there was no member of the HPC listed. The Chair
had been taken off completely. Jennifer Pratt stated that names were sent for correction and they still have not been corrected, but staff will continue to work on it.

- Amanda McKnight Grafton asked what will become of the artifacts found. Melissa Tiedemann stated that the artifacts are under the ownership of the City of Cedar Rapids and the University of Iowa was suggested as a place to house them. Members of the Commission suggested that they could also be housed at Linn County, the History Center, or the Masonic Library for public viewing.

4. Action Items
   a) Certificates of Appropriateness
      i. 1328 3rd Avenue SE – Renovation of a 1962 addition to St. Paul’s United Methodist Church
         - Jeff Hintz shared a map of where the church is located in the Local Historic District as well as pictures of where on the building the renovation will take place and pictures of what the renovation will look like. Mr. Hintz shared the District Guidelines and the rules when rehabilitating a building. Staff recommends approval of the project because it is consistent with District Guidelines; consistent with Preservation Brief 14 from SOI; consistent with the COA review process; and the project seeks historic tax credits, which ensures SHPO review.
         - BJ Hobart asked if the church will continue with the project even if they are denied the historic tax credits. Dale Moore, St. Paul’s United Methodist Church representative, stated that they would still move ahead with the project.
         - Tim Oberbroeckling asked about the design of the overhang that is proposed on the north elevation and if it could be changed to incorporate brick or make it look less like a gas station. Dave Zahradnik of Neumann Monson Architects stated that they are taking the purest approach which is what the hyphenated connection is all about and they are also incorporating all the items that are important to SHPO in this renovation.
         - Todd McNall stated that the design is a really good example of trying to meet the Preservation Briefs, but he agrees that the overhang could use some help. Dave Zahradnik stated that originally there was a more elaborate design, but it bid out $600,000 over budget. Mr. McNall stated that there needs to be something added so that it is not so gas station like.
         - Bob Grafton asked if the south elevation entrance doors are recessed to protect the occupants entering from the weather elements. Dave Zahradnik stated that they are not. Dale Moore stated that the south entrance is more of a ceremonial entrance. The two (2) entrances that will be used the most are the new north entrance and 14th Street entrance.
         - Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that the biggest concern is whether there are any negative impacts to the original structure and it does not look like there is. Mr. Stoffer Hunter does not see any specific concerns with these designs and plans on the exterior for historic preservation.
         - Todd McNall made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the renovation of a 1962 addition to St. Paul’s United Methodist Church at 1328 3rd Avenue SE. Tim Oberbroeckling noted that the overhang on the north entrance should be softened and seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
         - Amanda McKnight Grafton asked if city staff has met with the church on any occasion. Jeff Hintz stated that Community Development has not, but the church may have consulted with Building Services about the Building Code, but there was no other type of review that was conducted by City staff on behalf of the HPC. Amanda McKnight Grafton asked that, because of the scope of the church’s future plans, that if they reach
out to staff about their campus ideas that HPC gets that as a discussion item on the agenda as soon as possible to reach out to the church to ask for a preview to keep dialogue open. The church’s view of a campus does include other buildings that the HPC would have a lot of questions about.

b) Demolition Applications
   i. 1408 27th Street SE – Private Property
      • Jeff Hintz stated that this property was built in 1924 and the general area is not recommended for intensive survey by the Citywide Survey. Mr. Hintz spoke with Mark Stoffer Hunter and this property is not historically significant. The owner is not interested in making this a local landmark and rehab is not economical. Staff recommends immediate release.
      • Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that he has not done photographic documentation, but would like to in the next few days.
      • Jeff Hintz stated that the owner would like to eventually build a new house on the property, but for now it will be maintained as green space.
      • Barb Westercamp made a motion to approve the demolition of 1408 27th Street SE. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

   c) Update to Chapter 18 – Historic Preservation of the Municipal Code
      • Anne Russett stated that the HPC Subcommittee discussed changes to Chapter 18 and recommended that the changes to go to the full Commission. Ms. Russett reviewed the proposed changes to the COA/CNME process for the Local Historic Districts and the demolition process in the Local Historic Districts and National Register of Historic Places-Listed Districts and Properties.
      • Amanda McKnight Grafton asked that when this is being presented in the future that the presentation explains why the HPC picked the date of 1943 or earlier for accessory structures and why the demolition review is fifty (50) years or older.
      • Todd McNall would like to see modifications to a masonry façade be addressed so that pieces of the façade are not taken off.

Bob Grafton left the meeting at 5:43 p.m.

   • Mark Stoffer Hunter asked if there is still an exception for HPC review of demolition for fire damaged properties that Building Services deems condemned and will the HPC be notified of the demolition of these properties. Jeff Hintz stated that those properties will not go through the HPC, but staff can make the HPC aware when these properties come up.

Todd McNall left the meeting at 5:46 p.m.

   • Anne Russett reviewed the proposed changes to the local designation process and clarifying the materials for local designation applications. Ms. Russett also reviewed additional staff recommended changes for HPC Membership, demolition of accessory structures, and removal of provision that requires site plans.
   • Tim Oberbroeckling asked if a Commissioner is no longer in compliance with HPC membership provisions will they be asked to leave the Commission. Anne Russett stated that they would have to leave the Commission. BJ Hobart asked for that to be clarified
and addressed in the ordinance that if they are no longer in compliance then they either have to finish their term or leave their seat immediately.

- Tim Oberbroeckling asked how long a Commission member needs to be off of the Commission after they have served their three (3) terms. Jeff Hintz clarified that a Commission member shall wait one (1) three (3) year term before rejoining the Commission.
- The Commission shared their concerns with the removal of the provision that requires site plans and asked that it is kept just for the Local Historic Districts and Local Landmarks. Staff will make that change.

BJ Hobart left the meeting at 6:01 p.m.

- Anne Russett shared the outreach and engagement that has taken place as well as the next steps for the Chapter 18 update. Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission recommend the approval of the draft Historic Preservation Ordinance including staff’s additional changes.
- Amanda McKnight Grafton asked what leverage the HPC has if someone does not come forward and get a COA for ornamentation since it is not a permit. Anne Russett stated that if we can prove that they did not get a COA then they would not be eligible for funding.
- Mark Stoffer Hunter made a motion to approve the draft Historic Preservation Ordinance with the following changes: façade structure modifications apply to masonry buildings, clarify that if an HPC member no longer meets the Commission requirements then they are automatically off of the Commission, and that the provision that requires site plans stay and only apply to Local Historic Districts and Local Landmarks. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Announcements

- Ron Mussman asked Mark Stoffer Hunter if he agrees that the Hubbard Ice facility has no eligibility requirements. Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that it has an eligible story, but architecturally they are brick buildings that replaced older wooden buildings. Mr. Hunter understands why they are not historically architecturally intact because of the way they were built and pieced together, but there is great historic significance there with their story of ice harvesting. Mr. Hunter does not know where the City is with these properties, but if they are demolished he hopes there will be a green space support structure or at least a historic marker about Hubbard Ice. Mr. Mussman is concerned because the PA does not address the west side and the HPC is being left out of all conversations.
- Mark Stoffer Hunter asked for clarification of the Hubbard Ice buildings and if they are city-owned. Jennifer Pratt stated that they are city-owned, but there are still tenants in some of the buildings. We are years away from the Flood Protection System construction in that area.
- Jennifer Pratt clarified that the hope is that there will eventually be federal funding on both sides of the river. The City is following all of the same steps on the west side even though we are not getting federal help. If the federal money does come in the City does not want to become ineligible for the funding because those same steps were not followed. Anything done on the west side will include archeology and the same things done with any potential demolition on the east side. Ron Mussman stated that the PA does talk in great deal about documentation of demolition on any eligible property.
• Jeff Hintz stated that the contracts have been executed for the bus tours on November 5, 2016. Staff will send out a schedule of the tours.
• Anne Russett stated that the videotaped sessions of the window workshop start Friday, October 14, 2016. Amanda McKnight Grafton asked if the workshop would be for the public to attend. Anne Russett stated that they were sessions that would be videotaped and added to the website, but she could check and see if there could be a public workshop added.

6. Adjournment
• Barb Westercamp made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:22 p.m. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anne Kroll, Administrative Assistant II
Community Development
Cultural Resources Investigation
Lot 44 Pump Station and Sinclair Levee
Cedar Rapids Flood Control System
Cedar Rapids Historic Preservation Commission
October 13, 2016

Project Background
- In October 2003, Cedar Rapids, with the RI District, initiated Flood Control Study.
- Study completed in 2004. Recommended improvements to Time Check Neighborhood Levee.
- May 2006 - District & City enter into cost share agreement to study alternatives for Time Check Neighborhood.
- Post 2008 flood, the USACE prepared a Feasibility Study Report with Integrated Environmental Assessment, November 2010, Revised 2011.
- finding of No Significant Impact
- Programmatic Agreement among Corps, USACE, Iowa SHPO, City of Cedar Rapids, and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation in 2010.

Cultural Resources Investigation - 13LN1034
- Poor potential for preserved and intact materials and does not continue to the potential significance of unevaluated portions of 13LN1034.
- BCA makes a recommendation of no adverse effect for the portion of 13LN1034 located outside of the pump station project area.

13LN1035 - Findings
- Site identified by BCA during the Phase I in 2010.
- Data recovery of both prehistoric and historic components.
- Phase I testing indicated at least two prehistoric components.
- Late Woodland near the historic surface and a buried older component thought to date to the Middle Woodland period.
- 13LN965 and 13LN1077 - Historic cisterns investigated.

13LN1035 - Findings
- Examples of Early Woodland Pottery.
BCA Recommends that adverse effects from proposed construction on 13LN1035, 13LN965, and 13LN1077 have been adequately mitigated and no further investigations are warranted.
Historic Preservation Commission

October 13, 2016

COA: 1328 3rd Avenue SE

South Facing Elevation

Proposed South Elevation

North Facing Elevation
District Guidelines

Rules When Rehabilitating a Building:

#8. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.” (Also consistent with Preservation Brief 14)

#9. “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.”

Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of project
1. Consistent with District Guidelines;
2. Consistent with Preservation Brief 14 from SOI;
3. Consistent with COA review process; and
4. Project seeks historic tax credits which ensures SHPO review.
Demolition Review
1408 27th Street SE

• Built 1924
• General area not recommended for intensive survey by Citywide Survey

1408 27th Street SE

• Owner indicated:
  – No interest in local landmark
  – Rehab is not economical
• Immediate release

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
  • HPC wishes to explore options (e.g., photo doc) with property owner
  • HPC does not wish to explore options

10/21/2016
Update to Chapter 18-Historic Preservation of the Municipal Code

Presentation Outline

- Review Proposed Changes
  - COA/CNME
  - Demolitions
  - Other
- Additional Staff Recommended Changes
- Summary of Outreach & Engagement
- Next Steps
- Staff Recommendation

Proposed Changes to Chapter 18

- COA/CNME Process in Local Historic Districts
  - Added review criteria for COAs and CNMEs (e.g. impact on defining features per SIF, consistency with Guidelines)
  - Identifies specific types of projects that require HPC review (e.g. additions, new construction)
  - Added language to help preserve architectural detailing
  - Require complete applications, which includes support materials

Proposed Changes to Chapter 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Building Permit Required</th>
<th>Building Permit Not Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COA (HPC Review) or CNME (Admin Review)</td>
<td>Exterior modifications: Windows, Siding, Fences, Roofing</td>
<td>Modification or removal of architectural detailing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COA (HPC Review)</td>
<td>Additions to primary and accessory structures, New construction of primary and accessory structures, Demolitions of primary and accessory structures, Facade structure modifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Outreach Only</td>
<td>Exterior improvements: Paint, Gutters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Changes to Chapter 18

- Demolition Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Where Rule Applies</th>
<th>General Topic</th>
<th>Draft Ordinance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>- Demolition of primary structures</td>
<td>- HPC reviews demolitions of primary structures 50 years or older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Demolition of accessory structures</td>
<td>- ADFP, HPC reviews demolition of barns, garages, greenhouses, and summer kitchens built in 1943 or earlier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cedar Rapids Local Historic Districts and Landmarks
Proposed Changes to Chapter 18

• Demolition Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Where Rule Applies</th>
<th>General Topic</th>
<th>Draft Ordinance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Register of Historic Places - Listed Districts &amp; Properties</td>
<td>Demolition of accessory structures</td>
<td>✓ HPC reviews demolition of accessory structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modifications to facades</td>
<td>✓ HPC reviews façade structure modifications on primary structures 50 years or older. Facade structure modifications include permanent changes to the pitch of a roof or any of the following modifications on a façade wall facing the front or corner side yard: Adding floor area to the structure; Enclosure of façade wall; Removal of façade structures, such as columns, framing, stairs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Changes to Chapter 18

• Local Designation Process
  – Increased requirement for property owner signatures from 51% to 60%
  – Clarifies materials for local designation applications:
    • Justification
    • Boundary/Map
    • Inventory

Additional Staff Recommended Changes

HPC Membership
  • Sections 18.04.B.3 & 18.04.B.4: Staff proposes to alter the HPC membership provisions to ensure consistency with the CLG requirements as follows:
    – Up to 2 members of the HPC shall be allowed to reside outside the corporate limits of the City, but must own property within the corporate limits. All other members must reside within the City limits.
    – Require at least 1 member per Local Historic District
Additional Staff Recommended Changes

Demolition of Accessory Structures

• Section 18.10.A.1.b: Staff proposes no changes to the citywide provision, which requires the following:
  – Review of demolition of accessory structures citywide if the structure is built in 1943 or earlier and consists of one of the following development types: garage, summer kitchen, barn, or greenhouse.

• Staff proposes to change the provision related to NRHP-Listed Districts and Properties:
  – Review demolition of accessory structures required in NRHP-Listed Districts and Properties if constructed in 1943 or earlier.

Removal of Provision that Requires Site Plans

• Section 18.10.G: Staff proposes to remove the provision that requires the submission of site plans prior to the issuance of a demolition permit for structures determined to be historically significant:
  – This provision has not worked well in practice.
    • Developers can say it will be maintained as open space or submit plans that are never built.
    • Does not protect against vacant lots.
    • City cannot require property owners to develop properties.
  – Any proposed development will be required to go through the City’s land development process.
  – HPC continues to have approval and denial authority in Local Historic Districts.

Outreach & Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Outreach Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Held focus group meetings on historic review and demolition review processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Surveyed property owners in the local historic districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Attended meetings of key groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>- Developer’s Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>- Economic Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>- Czech Village/New Bohemia Main Street Design Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>- AHNI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>- Wellington Heights Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Facilitated public workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Office hours and meeting with key stakeholder groups regarding key issues and changes proposed in the draft ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Ongoing meetings with HPC Sub-committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Ongoing coordination with various City departments and staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Steps

• October 13: HPC recommendation
• October/November: SHPO review
• October 19: City Council Development Committee
• November 15: City Council Public Hearing

Staff Recommendation

• Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission recommend approval of the Draft Historic Preservation Ordinance, including staff’s additional proposed changes.
Date:          October 27, 2016  
To:            Cedar Rapids Historic Preservation Commission  
From:          Anne Russett, Planner III, Community Development Department  
Subject:       Flood Control System – Lot 44 Pump Station & Sinclair Site Pump Station  

At the Commission’s October 27 meeting, a representative from Anderson Bogert will be in attendance to provide the Commission with an overview of the Lot 44 Pump Station [Attachment 1] and the Sinclair Site Pump Station [Attachment 2].

More details will be provided at the meeting, but should you have any questions please feel free to contact me at a.russett@cedar-rapids.org or (319) 286-5075.
Lot 44
Pump Station

Attachment 1
Sinclair Pump Station
Sinclair Pump Station
Location of Sinclair Site Pump Station
Date: October 27, 2016  
To: Cedar Rapids Historic Preservation Commission  
From: Anne Russett, Planner III, Community Development Department  
Subject: ReZone Cedar Rapids

Background
With the adoption of EnvisionCR in January 2015 the Community Development staff is moving forward with a comprehensive update to the City’s zoning code, known as ReZone Cedar Rapids. At the Historic Preservation Commission’s meeting on October 27, Community Development staff and a representative from the consultant team will provide you with an update on the project.

Project Website
Materials related to this project can be found at www.cityofcr.org/rezone. Currently, the website provides a video that helps explain the importance of zoning and how it impacts the built environment. It also includes outreach materials and reports. As new information becomes available City staff will post it here.

Project Status
In terms of the project schedule, draft sections of the code are being developed. Specifically, the project schedule breaks the drafting into four parts: 1) Administrative Procedures, 2) Districts/Forms/Uses, 3) Development Standards, and 4) General/Definitions. At this point, the focus is on drafting the administrative procedures.

In addition to your Commission, City staff and the consultant will update the City Planning Commission and the Steering Committee on the project during the October visit. In order to keep the development community informed a meeting has also been scheduled with representatives of the development community.

Conclusion
More details will be provided at your Commission’s October 27 meeting. Please feel free to contact me at a.russett@cedar-rapids.org or (319) 286-5075 with any questions.
Historic Preservation Commission Agenda Item Cover Sheet

Meeting Date: October 27, 2016

Property Location: 3204 Circle Drive NE
Property Owner/Representative: Larry and Debra Griffin
Owner Number(s): 319-826-5646
Demolition Contact: Koelker Excavating 319-373-2287
Year Built: 1922
Description of Agenda Item: ☒ Demolition Application ☐ COA ☐ Other

Background and Previous HPC Action: The City Assessor information indicates the structure is in below normal condition. The owner has submitted plans to build a home on the site and the construction of the new home has already begun on the lot.

City Assessor Information on the parcel:

Historic Eligibility Status: Eligible ☒ Not Eligible ☐ Unknown ☒ N/A ☐
Explanation (if necessary):

The City of Cedar Rapids does not currently have historical survey information on this property; it has never been surveyed. Given the criteria below, it is not believed historical events or persons are associated with the structure or site. Features on this building are not consistent with craftsman’s work distinctive with an architectural character or era, nor is the site believed to be archeologically significant. Examples of 1920’s construction within the local historic districts serve as a better example of features which would be associated with the work of a craftsman and architectural character of an era than this particular dwelling unit.

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: Renovation or reuse would not work with the future plans of the owner.
Historic Preservation Commission Agenda Item Cover Sheet

Meeting Date: October 27, 2016

Property Location: 3711 Wilson Avenue SW
Property Owner/Representative: Hills Bank and Trust
Owner Number(s): 319-365-9171
Demolition Contact: Rathje Construction (Terry) 319-377-3179
Year Built: 1956
Description of Agenda Item: ☒ Demolition Application ☐ COA ☐ Other

Background and Previous HPC Action: The City Assessor information indicates the structure is in normal condition. The current owner acquired the property in April 2016 and plans to hold onto this lot and the adjacent lot for future development potential. The future plans of the owner do not include a residence; a cleared lot is more appealing. The lot will be grass and any future development would need to comply with the current zoning or go through the land development process for any changes.

City Assessor Information on the parcel:

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

Explanation (if necessary):
The City of Cedar Rapids does not currently have historical survey information on this property; it has never been surveyed. Given the criteria below, it is not believed historical events or persons are associated with the structure or site. Features on this building are not consistent with craftsman’s work distinctive with an architectural character or era, nor is the site believed to be archeologically significant. Examples of 1950’s construction exist throughout the City; the building layout, design and materials are not rare or unique.

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: Renovation or reuse would not work with the future plans of the owner.
Historic Preservation Commission Agenda Item Cover Sheet

Meeting Date: October 27, 2016

Property Location: 3721 Wilson Avenue SW
Property Owner/Representative: Hills Bank and Trust
Owner Number(s): 319-365-9171
Demolition Contact: Rathje Construction (Terry) 319-377-3179
Year Built: 1956
Description of Agenda Item: ☒ Demolition Application ☐ COA ☐ Other

Background and Previous HPC Action: The City Assessor information indicates the structure is in normal condition. The current owner acquired the property in April 2016 and plans to hold onto this lot and the adjacent lot for future development potential. The future plans of the owner do not include a residence; a cleared lot is more appealing. The lot will be grass and any future development would need to comply with the current zoning or go through the land development process for any changes.

City Assessor Information on the parcel:

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

Explanation (if necessary):
The City of Cedar Rapids does not currently have historical survey information on this property; it has never been surveyed. Given the criteria below, it is not believed historical events or persons are associated with the structure or site. Features on this building are not consistent with craftsman’s work distinctive with an architectural character or era, nor is the site believed to be archeologically significant. Examples of 1950’s construction exist throughout the City; the building layout, design and materials are not rare or unique.

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: Renovation or reuse would not work with the future plans of the owner.
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Meeting Date: October 27, 2016

Property Location: 1315 O Avenue NW
Property Owner/Representative: Methwick Community
Owner Number(s): (319)365-9171
Demolition Contact: Rathje Construction (Terry)
(319)377-3179
Year Built: 1960
Description of Agenda Item: ☑ Demolition Application ☐ COA ☐ Other

Background and Previous HPC Action: Methwick recently acquired this property and their main campus is nearby. The plan is to expand in the area in the future, but that will not happen immediately. The property is typical of post-World War II construction throughout the late 50’s and into the 1960’s; there is nothing very noteworthy or defining about the architecture or style of this particular dwelling unit, nor is it associated with significant events or persons to the history of Cedar Rapids.

City Assessor Information on the parcel:

Historic Eligibility Status: Eligible ☑ Not Eligible ☒ Unknown ☐ N/A ☐
Explanation (if necessary):

This property was looked at through general level windshield survey as part of the Citywide Reconnaissance Survey. The area where this property is located was not deemed worthy of a narrative description, but document page 20 (PDF page 23) shows a map of what was surveyed. This area was reviewed as indicated by the red dashed line on the map; areas which were given a narrative are highlighted with black outlines and numbered.

The State Historic Preservation Office has reviewed and concurred with this survey.

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 single family dwelling it not feasible with future plans for property, and structure is a poor candidate for a local historic landmark status.
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Meeting Date: October 27, 2016

Property Location: 481 Wilson Avenue Drive SW
Property Owner/Representative: Frank Roman Estate
Owner Number(s): Demolition Contact: Not yet determined
Year Built: 1956
Description of Agenda Item: ☒ Demolition Application ☐ COA ☐ Other

Background and Previous HPC Action: The City Assessor information indicates the structure is in below normal condition. No plans for redevelopment have been submitted at this time, the lot will be grass.

City Assessor Information on the parcel: http://cedarrapids.iowaassessors.com/parcel.php?parcel=143430300200000

Historic Eligibility Status: Eligible ☐ Not Eligible ☐ Unknown ☒ N/A ☐
Explanation (if necessary):

This property was looked at through general level windshield survey as part of the Citywide Reconnaissance Survey. The area where this property is located was not deemed worthy of a narrative description, but document page 20 (PDF page 23) shows a map of what was surveyed. This area was reviewed as indicated by the red dashed line on the map; areas which were given a narrative are highlighted with black outlines and numbered.

The State Historic Preservation Office has reviewed and concurred with this survey.

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: Poor candidate for local landmarking.