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.

- Ron 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.

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.

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.

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 2008 - 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
- 13LN1034 - Findings
  - Poor potential for preserved and intact materials and does not continue to the potential significance of unexplored portions of 13LN1034
  - BCA makes a recommendation of no adverse effect for the portion of 13LN1034 located outside of the pump station project area.

Cultural Resources Investigations - 13LN1035
- 13LN1035 – Findings
  - Field 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
  - 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.”

Demolition Review

1408 27th Street SE
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
   - 2b. Historically Significant

   Release Property

   Release property if HPC does not wish to pursue options (e.g. photo doc) with property owner

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 (Public Review))</td>
<td>Exterior modifications: - Windows - Siding - Fencing - Building</td>
<td>Modification or removal of architectural detailing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COA (HPC Review)</td>
<td>- Additions to primary and accessory structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- New construction of primary and accessory structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Demolition of primary and accessory structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 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>HPC reviews demolition of barns, garages, greenhouses, and summer kitchens built in 1943 or earlier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register of Historic Places Listed Districts &amp; Properties</td>
<td>Demolition of accessory structures</td>
<td>HPC reviews façade structure modifications on primary structures 50 years or older. Façade 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, add-ons.</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>Local Historic Districts &amp; Landmarks</td>
<td>Demolitions</td>
<td>Review required by HPC for demolition of primary and accessory structures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Designation Process

- Increased requirement for property owner signatures from 51% to 60%
- Clarifies materials for local designation applications:
  - Justification
  - Boundary/Map
  - Inventory

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

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></td>
<td>- Economic Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Czech Village/New Bohemia Main Street Design Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- AHRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Wellington Heights Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Save Cedar Rapids Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Facilitated public workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Office hours and meeting with key stakeholders groups regarding key issues and changes proposed in the draft ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ongoing meetings with HPC Sub-committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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.