Call Meeting to Order

- Amanda McKnight Grafton called the meeting to order at 4:31 p.m.
- Nine (9) Commissioners were present with two (2) absent.

1. Public Comment

- There was no public comment.

2. Approve Meeting Minutes

- Todd McNall made a motion to approve the minutes from April 14, 2016. Sam Bergus seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Caitlin Hartman arrived at the meeting at 4:33 p.m.

3. Presentation
   a) Flood Control System Update

- Rob Davis gave a presentation on the Flood Control System on both the east and west side of the Cedar River. The east side is considered a federal undertaking and the plan is to start the construction contract later this year. The west side of the river is considered independent of the east side and it is not considered a federal undertaking per the Army
Corp of Engineers and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The City is working with the Army Corp and SHPO during this process.

- Ron Mussman asked if documentation from the Army Corp and SHPO could be provided to the Commission. Rob Davis will share those documents.

- Ron Mussman shared concerns about Masaryk Park. Rob Davis stated that the historic tiles will go back in, but the levee itself is further back from the river so it does not get into that monument area.

- Amanda McKnight Grafton asked that Mr. Davis come back to future meetings for updates on the project.

Jennifer Pratt arrived at the meeting at 4:38 p.m.

Action item 4b was considered next.

4. Action Items

b) Demolition Applications Under Review

   i. Private Property – 1010 3rd Street SE, hold expires May 10, 2016

   A. Consideration to Release Demolition Hold

   B. Continuation of Discussion of Certificate of Appropriateness to Remove Façade

   C. Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness to prepare the building to be Moved and relocation of the building off the lot

   - Jeff Hintz stated that this property is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and is eligible under Criteria A (events) and C (architecture). On March 10, 2016 the HPC placed a 60-day hold on the demolition. Staff received an application for façade removal that was tabled by the HPC at the April 14, 2016 meeting. Staff received an application for moving the structure and associated preparation work. The property owners indicated a willingness to work with anyone interested in moving the structure, but expressed the need to have the structure moved no more than a few days after the expiration of the hold on May 10, 2016. The interested party is making progress on moving the structure. The Commission has the following options:

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

   - Note, choosing this option would not require HPC action on the COA applications.

2. Consideration of the application to remove the façade:

   a. Approve the application as submitted; or

   b. Modify, then Approve the application – only if applicant agrees to modifications made; or

   c. Disapprove the application.

3. Consideration of the application to prepare the building to be relocated and move the building from the lot:

   a. Approve the application as submitted; or

   b. Modify, then Approve the application – only if applicant agrees to modifications made; or

   c. Disapprove the application.

   - Jeff Hintz stated that staff recommends release of the demolition hold because that allows all parties to complete the work they hope to complete, a purchase agreement has been executed to move the structure from the lot, and the group interested in moving the structure has indicated they could complete the move prior to the May 10, 2016 demolition hold deadline.
• Todd McNall asked what the complication is to approve the COA to move the building. Jennifer Pratt stated that if the hold is released then a COA is not necessary. Mr. McNall stated that he understands that there are complications if the HPC approved a COA to move the building. Jeff Hintz stated that the current owners would have to submit a COA to make any changes to their land once the building is removed if the hold is not released.
• Tim Oberbroeckling made a motion to release the 60-day hold of 1010 3rd Street SE. Bob Grafton seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

a) Demolition Applications
i. 141 34th Street Drive SE (large open warehouse in back) – private property
• Jeff Hintz stated that this building was constructed in 1932, is partially enclosed, and is the middle warehouse on the property. This building is not recommended for further study and staff recommends immediate release. It has been assessed a poor condition and lacks architectural detail. The area is planned to be used for outdoor storage and parking. In talking with Mark Stoffer Hunter, he did not find this structure to be historic, but the building in the front of the lot has historic value.
• Tim Oberbroeckling made a motion to approve the demolition of the large open warehouse in the back of the lot at 141 34th Street Drive SE. Barb Westercamp seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

ii. 214 17th Avenue SW – private property
• Jeff Hintz stated that this structure was built in 1910, is not recommended for further study, and is also not eligible according to the 2009 Bowling Reconnaissance Survey. Staff recommends immediate release. This structure is not habitable or because it was not cleaned out from the 2008 flood and there is damage to the foundation; it has no assessed value at this time. A new house is proposed to be built on the site. Mark Stoffer Hunter sent a note that the house is not historically significant and has no architectural details that are noteworthy.
• Bob Grafton made a motion to approve the demolition of 214 17th Avenue SW. Todd McNall seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Discussion Items
a) Zoning Code Update
• Anne Russett shared the goal, project overview, community outreach, preliminary drafting topics, an explanation of form-based codes, and project committees for the Zoning Code Update.
• Amanda McKnight Grafton asked if the neighborhood plans would be utilized. Anne Russett stated that they will be and the consultants will be aware of where the historic districts are and where potential districts could be.
• Amanda McKnight Grafton stated that one concern is trying to reduce density in Wellington Heights. Currently, there is a policy in place that if a single family home turned 2-plex or 4-plex remained vacant for a year then the next owner has to revert it back to single family. That was very important during the Wellington Heights Neighborhood Plan and making sure that remained in place to help with the density issue.
• Amanda McKnight Grafton asked for an update after more meetings have been held.

b) MOA/LOA Updates
• Anne Russett stated that the press release for the showcase was rereleased today with the added information that the event is free and opened to the public. All of the award winners have been notified and a majority can attend. Amanda McKnight Grafton read through the awards and the winners.
• Jeff Hintz stated that he spoke with Hy-Vee to cater for the showcase so there will be food available for lunch.
• Amanda McKnight Grafton has a signup sheet for volunteers for the showcase. Staff will email out the list for Commissioners to sign up.
• Amanda McKnight Grafton provided an update on the showcase.

6. Announcements
• Todd McNall asked for a Knutson Building update. Jennifer Pratt stated that a public hearing was held to open up the proposal process on Tuesday, April 26, 2016. Todd McNall requested that the HPC be notified when these items go to City Council.

7. Adjournment
• Barb Westercamp made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 5:36 p.m. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anne Kroll, Administrative Assistant II
Community Development
Historic Preservation Commission
April 28, 2016

141 34th Street Drive SE

- Built 1932
  - Partially enclosed
  - Middle warehouse on property
- Not recommended for further study-Citywide Survey
- Immediate release

Demolition Review
141 34th Street Drive SE

- Assessed as poor condition
- Lacks architectural detail
- Use the area for outdoor storage and parking

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
- Must be stored HPC wishes to explore options (e.g. photo doc) with property owner
- Release property if HPC does not wish to explore options
Demolition Review
214 17th Avenue SW

- Built 1910
- Not recommended for further study - Citywide Survey
- Not eligible - 2009 Bowling Reconnaissance
- Immediate release

Demolition Review Process
1. Determination of Historic Significance
   2a. Not Historically Significant
   2b. Historically Significant

   Release Property
   Make a 30-day
   HDR report, drop
   in a property
   ID with the city
   HPC
   Transfer property
   if HPC does not
   wish to explore
   options

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 Applications Under Review
1010 3rd 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)

Background
- On 3/10 the HPC placed a 60-day hold on the demolition
- Received application for façade removal – requires HPC approval during 60-day hold period
- Received application for moving the structure and associated preparation work

Background
- Property owners indicated a willingness to work with anyone interested in moving the structure
- Property owners expressed need to have property moved no more than a few days after the expiration of the hold
- Demolition hold expires on May 10, 2016

Background
- Interested party making progress on moving the structure:
  - Site: 1305 3rd Street SE
  - Secured financing
  - Identified home mover
  - Coordinating with City departments on necessary permits and requirements
  - Applied for COA to move structure to temporary location
- On 04/27/16 a purchase agreement was executed to purchase the building and move it from the 1010 3rd Street lot.
Options for Commission

1. Release the structure from the 60 day demolition review (hold).
   - Note, choosing this option would not require HPC action on the COA applications, options two and three below.

2. Consideration of the application to remove the façade:
   a. Approve the application as submitted; or
   b. Modify, then Approve the application – only if applicant agrees to modifications made; or
   c. Disapprove the application.

3. Consideration of the application to prepare the building to be relocated and move the building from the lot:
   a. Approve the application as submitted; or
   b. Modify, then Approve the application – only if applicant agrees to modifications made; or
   c. Disapprove the application.

Staff Recommendation

- **Recommendation:** Release the demolition hold.
- **Alternative Recommendation:** Approve the application to prepare and move of the structure and deny application related to salvage of the front façade.

Rationale

- Releasing the hold allows all parties to complete the work they hope to complete.
  - Structure will be saved and relocated
  - New development could occur on the 1010 3rd Street SE site
- A purchase agreement has been executed to move the structure from the lot.
- Group interested in moving the structure has indicated they could complete the move prior to the May 10, 2016 demolition hold deadline.
Our Goal
The purpose of the new Cedar Rapids Zoning Code is to support and promote:

- EnvisionCR
- Land Use Typology Areas (LUTAs)
- Strong Neighborhoods
- Infill Development
- Environmental Stewardship
- Economic Prosperity
- Community Connections
- Local Placemaking

Zoning Code Update Project Overview
Timeline / Schedule:
1. 18 month process
2. Adoption anticipated in Fall/Winter 2017

Project Approach:
1. Understand and define issues and opportunities
2. Develop a framework for the new zoning code
3. Draft the new regulations and processes and gather community thoughts and comments
4. Review, revise, and adopt the new zoning code and zoning map

Community Outreach
- Stakeholder Interviews
- Focus Groups
- mySidewalk (MindMixer)
- Public Open Houses and Workshops
- Social Media
- Developer Roundtable
- Beta Testing/Kicking the Tires

Preliminary Drafting Topics
- Residential development patterns and types of housing mix (i.e., single-family, multi-family)
- Downtown, Infill, suburban development, and redevelopment
- Complete streets (i.e., streets that accommodate all modes of transportation and all users)
- Commercial and corridor design standards
- Mixed-use (e.g., residential and commercial) development types
- Neighborhood preservation
- Parks, trails, and open spaces
- Sustainable development patterns
- Creating places that build upon a community’s strengths in order to promote community well-being, commonly referred to as placemaking

What are form-based codes?
A method of regulating development that emphasizes building form (scale, massing, relationship to the public realm) over building use, with the purpose of achieving a particular type of “place” of built environment based on a community vision.
What are form-based codes?
Rethinking development regulations

- A Tool for Placemaking...
  - Compatible Infill
  - Evolving/transforming corridors
  - Transit-oriented

Understanding Cedar Rapids
- Walkable Urban
- Drive-able Suburban

LUTA: Guiding Framework
Land Use + Intensity + Compatibility
Existing context + vision
Rules for Form & Character
Place-making

Any place vs. some place

All Districts
What is the plan for the area?
- Preserve
- Enhance
- Transform

Project Committees

Project Management Team
- Internal stakeholder group
- Ensure all relevant City departments are included in the process and are not surprised by any proposed changes
- Focus on the feasibility/implementation of proposed changes
- Identify and address any issues related to implementation
- Address any technical issues

Steering Committee
- External advisory body
- Advisors throughout the development of the update
- Provide recommendations on the stakeholder outreach and communications strategy
- Provide feedback on proposed changes and help identify any potential issues