MINUTES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING,
Thursday, February 11, 2016 @ 4:30 p.m.
Training Room, City Hall, 101 First Street SE

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

Members Absent: BJ Hobart
Pat Cargin

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

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

1. Public Comment
- No public comment

2. Approve Meeting Minutes
- Ron Mussman asked that the Knutson PowerPoint presentation be attached as part of the minutes when posted online since some of that information was not in the packet.
- Barb Westercamp made a motion to approve the minutes from January 28, 2016 with the addition of adding the PowerPoint slides requested. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Action Items
   a) Certificates of Appropriateness
      i. 1744 2nd Avenue SE – replacement of five windows on house
         - Jeff Hintz shared pictures of the property and stated that this project is for the replacement of three windows on the first floor on the west side of the house. The windows proposed are vinyl and 6-7 inches shorter for a kitchen remodel. The existing
trim will be cut then reused and the gap below the windows will be filled with vinyl siding that matches existing walls. This project also includes the replacement of two windows on the mudroom at the rear of the structure on the northwest corner with white vinyl. Mr. Hintz shared the District Guidelines for windows. Staff recommends approval as submitted for both applications because they are consistent with past approvals of the Commission, the change to side elevation is at the rear which is not readily noticeable to passersby, three windows would all be installed at the same height, replacement wall material matches the existing, the mudroom is not original to the house, the original window trim is being cut and reused, no character defining features are being modified, and this project keeps the property maintained and in use. The Commission has the following alternative actions: approve with modifications agreeable to the applicant, deny the application, or defer to a future meeting.

- Kim Wallace, the applicant, stated that this is a nonprofit organization so the Board of Directors has to approve everything. The vinyl is the best choice for the use of donor’s money. The wood windows were much more expensive. The storm windows will also be replaced.
- Bob Grafton stated that the countertop height is above the lower window sash by about two inches. Mr. Grafton noted that the window width needs to stay the same size. Ms. Wallace stated that the width will stay the same size.
- Tim Oberbroeckling asked Ms. Wallace if she looked into what it would cost to shorten the lower sash and keep the same windows. Ms. Wallace stated that no because from the inside looking out it looks unsightly and needs replacing. Todd McNall stated that you can do what Mr. Oberbroeckling suggested, but you cannot guarantee the integrity of the window.
- Todd McNall asked about the panel next to one of the windows. Bob Grafton stated that it is an ice door. Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that is for ice block delivery. Todd McNall asked if that is seen from the inside. Bob Grafton stated that it is covered up by the countertops on the inside. Ms. Wallace stated that the ice door is staying and there are no plans to remove it.
- Tim Oberbroeckling noted that the siding from the mud porch could be used on the side of the house so that it matches the existing. Since the mud porch is in the back the new siding could be placed there. Ms. Wallace thought that was a great idea.
- Todd McNall made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness at 1744 2nd Avenue SE for the replacement of five windows on the house as presented. Sam Bergus seconded the motion. The motion passed with Tim Oberbroeckling opposing because the windows should be wood when they are visible from the street.

b) Demolition Applications

i. 57 18th Avenue SW – City owned property
- Jeff Hintz stated that this property was built in 1890 and has vinyl siding, no windows, and is not livable. This property is not eligible per the 2010 intensive level survey. The house has been vacant since the flood and has caught on fire three or four different times. There is nothing in the house except for debris. Staff recommends immediate release. This property is within the Flood Control System (FCS) alignment. Mr. Hintz shared photos of the property along with the definition of historic significance and the demolition review process chart.
- Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that this is the last house on 18th Avenue SW and he did not find anything historical about this property. Photo documentation has already occurred.
• Tim Oberbroeckling made a motion to approve demolition for 57 18th Avenue SW. Todd McNall seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

• Mark Stoffer Hunter asked if staff could send the Commission the addresses of all the properties along the FCS alignment that will come before the Commission in the future. Anne Russett stated that a map was discussed at a prior meeting, but staff will email out those addresses.

• Jennifer Pratt stated that the City has not yet had to acquire a property for the FCS alignment. This twenty year project will happen in phases and these properties may not need to be acquired for 10-15 more years. All property owners have been contacted and have had discussions with the City. These property owners are protected and there is a set process.

• The Commission discussed demolitions and which ones would be appropriate for administrative review instead of coming before the HPC. The Chapter 18 sub-committee has been having this conversation.

• Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that when demos come to the HPC it gives an opportunity for research. The surveys done are not 100% intensive and there could be a piece of historical information that only local people would know.

• Amanda McKnight Grafton stated that this house has been burned several times and is not in a condition that is livable and windows have been altered from the original. This is not something that can be moved, but if it turned out that it meets one of the criteria because someone historically famous was there then is it just that we are making sure that it is noted?

• Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that there were three houses where the Wright Brothers lived in Cedar Rapids and this community let them go because they did not keep track of where they lived. That historic connection was lost. Going forward we do not know what historical people who are important locally or nationally might be associated properties that are around 50 years old or younger now that might be important down the road.

• Amanda McKnight Grafton spoke about this fire damaged home and the fact that it cannot be moved or saved and how that would be a candidate for administrative review. Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that it depends on the amount of damage. There have been fires in other buildings that gutted the inside, but they were saved because the façade was still there. In 1916, there was an old four story building that burned and was completely gutted out, but only half of it was torn down. It was redone as a two story building. There are probably different criteria for commercial then for residential.

• The Commission discussed houses in Cedar Rapids that were built in the 60s that are 50 years and older that could be gone before any historic findings. Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that there are varying degrees of how thorough the research is on the surveys.

• Amanda McKnight Grafton stated that this discussion will go back to the sub-committee where they will also discuss commercial versus residential.

4. Knutson Building

• Anne Russett stated that staff has reached out to firms to see if anyone is interested in stabilization. Staff is waiting to hear back from four (4) firms, and by the next Commission meeting staff will have an update. Staff reached out to David, who was someone that Pat Cargin recommended, and he is unable to do the work, but he recommended another group.

• Anne Russett stated that there was a question at the last meeting if staff has correspondence from SHIPO regarding the FCS and staff reached out to Public Works to
request that any correspondence they receive from SHIPO be sent to Community Development to be given to the Commission.

- Jennifer Pratt stated that she wanted to make the Commission aware that in the next fiscal year (starting in July 2016) that Parks and Rec will be looking to move the activities that are in the Ambroz facility on Mount Vernon Road, which is a very historic building. The biggest issue is ADA and to bring that building up to code it would cost $3 million.

Barb Westercamp and Caitlin Hartman left the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

- Todd McNall asked if there is someone interested in that building. Ms. Pratt stated that there is some interest and staff has reached out to Parks and Rec to work with Community Development on the ongoing maintenance of the building until the next use is in place. There will be plan in place on how to deal with the building until someone takes that over. Staff will update the HPC.
- Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that the official historic date for the Ambroz facility is 1919 to 1920 not 1902. There was a Buchanan school built there in 1902 and Mr. Hunter will show the documentation to staff.
- Amanda McKnight requested that the HPC be able to tour the building when it is put up for sale to take photographs and to help with marketing of the building.

5. Preservation Showcase 2016 Update

- Amanda McKnight Grafton gave an update on the progress for the 2016 Preservation Showcase.

Sam Bergus left the meeting at 5:36 p.m.

6. MOA/LOA Project Updates

- Anne Russett stated that Ed McMahon came to Cedar Rapids last week and there was a great turn out. Staff sent out a link to the video. Jeff Hintz stated that the slides from the presentation are attached to the video. Jennifer Pratt stated that the Development Committee will see the Ted Talk at their next meeting and the video link will be sent to City Council.

Ron Mussman left the meeting at 5:42 p.m.

7. Announcements

- Todd McNall would like an update from staff on what is going on with the Hubbard Ice Building since he heard that the City intends to tear it down because of the alignment of the FCS.
- Tim Oberbroeckling stated that he recently had a discussion with the Mayor about HPC updates. Jennifer Pratt stated that staff is planning to update Development Committee on the HPC more frequently. At the upcoming Development Committee meeting staff is giving them an update on Chapter 18.
- Anne Russett stated that Masayrek Park is one of the areas that was identified in the FCS alignment and was an area that the HPC was concerned about. Staff is working with the consultant on the historical aspects of the park and to identify some potential redesigns to relocate some of the monuments and sidewalk mosaics. Staff will have a few designs
from the consultant and open houses for people of the community to provide input on those designs.

- Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that he spoke with the Parks Department to meet about putting historic items back into Greene Square Park that were there before the renovation and opening up the time capsule.
- Amanda McKnight Grafton asked to put these two park items on future agendas for updating purposes.
- Tim Oberbroeckling asked that HPC also look into re-exposing High Water Rock. Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that High Water Rock has sunk into the river bed and is on the National Register of Historic Places, but who owns the river bed? Todd McNall stated that DNR would be a good place to start.

8. Adjournment

- Since there was no longer a quorum, the remaining HPC members ended the meeting at 5:55 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anne Kroll, Administrative Assistant II
Community Development
Historic Preservation Commission
February 11, 2016

COA: 1744 2nd Avenue SE

House from Street
Rear elevation West side elevation

Overhead View

Project Description
- Replacement of three windows, first floor, west side
- Vinyl, 6-7 inches shorter for kitchen remodel
- Existing trim, cut then reused and gap below windows filled with vinyl siding, matching existing walls.

Project Description
- Replacement of two windows on the mudroom at the rear of the structure on the northwest corner.
- White vinyl replacement windows
District Guidelines – Historic Windows

Recommended:
- Retain and repair historic window sashes and frames
- Replace windows with the home’s original window material (e.g., wood for wood)
- Replacement windows should match the originals as closely as possible
- Repair or install new storm windows
- Vinyl or aluminum products are allowed only at the rear of a house

Not Recommended:
- Windows constructed of modern building materials, such as vinyl or aluminum on the front and side of homes
- Decreasing the size of the window opening

Similar Approvals by HPC

Vinyl windows on a side elevation, towards the rear of the structure in 2015:
- 209 Park Court SE
- 217 Park Court SE
- 1820 2nd Avenue SE
- 1810 Park Avenue SE
- 1837 Grande Avenue SE
- 1841 Grande Avenue SE

Recommendation

Staff recommends approval as submitted
- Consistent with past approvals of the commission
- Change to side elevation at the rear, not readily noticeable to passersby
- Three windows would all be installed at same height
- Replacement wall material matches existing
- Mudroom is not original to the house
- Original window trim is being cut and re-used
- No character defining features are being modified
- Keeps property maintained and in use

Alternative Actions

1. Approve with modifications agreeable to the applicant
2. Deny the application
3. Defer to future meeting
57 18th Avenue SW

- Built 1890
  - Vinyl siding
  - No windows
  - Not livable
- Not eligible per 2010 intensive level survey
- Immediate release

Historic Significance

Defined by 18.02 (1) – “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

- Evaluate building
- Notify HPC
- 60-day hold for HPC to explore options (e.g., photo doc) with property owner
- Release property if HPC does not wish to explore options
- Release property if HPC does not wish to explore options