MEETING NOTICE

The City of Cedar Rapids Historic Preservation Commission will meet at:

4:30 P.M.
Thursday, April 27, 2017
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. Action Items
   a) Certificate of Appropriateness
      i. 1310 3rd Avenue SE – installation of siding on alley facing attic dormer
   b) Funding Consideration- Historic Rehab Program
      i. 1720 3rd Avenue SE – painting of home and garage
      ii. 1620 Park Avenue SE – painting of home
   c) Demolition Applications
      i. 530 Cobban Court SE – Primary Structure, Private Property
      ii. 1601 Greene Avenue NE – 14x20 Accessory Structure, Private Property
      iii. 2136 20th Street NW – 39x29 Accessory Structure, Private Property

4. Discussion Items
   a) Flood Control System Update
   b) Update to historic district guidelines

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.
### Call Meeting to Order
- Amanda McKnight-Grafton called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m.
- Eight (8) 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 March 23, 2017. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

### 3. Action Items
#### a) Consideration of a letter of support for historic tax credit project at 207 3rd Avenue SW
- Clint Twedt-Ball of Matthew 25 stated that they are looking for a letter of support from the Commission for their building at 207 3rd Avenue SW. Mr. Twedt-Ball shared photos of the updated space and plans for the remaining area.
- Todd McNall made a motion to approve a letter of support for historic tax credit project at 207 3rd Avenue SW. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
b) Consideration of Local Historic Landmark Applications

i. 42 7th Avenue SW – Mott Building

- Jeff Hintz stated that this building was listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) in 2012 based on events and architecture and shared the Criteria for Consideration. Staff recommends that the HPC advance the application to SHPO for formal review and comment on the proposal. Following the SHPO review the application will go to the City Planning Commission (CPC) for recommendation and the City Council for consideration.
- Mary Ottoson of Hobart Historic Restoration stated that the building is finished and has received historic tax credits because the work was done to standards.
- Tim Oberbroeckling made a motion to advance the application for the Mott Building to SHPO for formal review and comment on the proposal. Sam Bergus seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

ii. 525 Valor Way SW – Knutson Building

- Jeff Hintz stated that this building is eligible for listing on the NRHP and the HPC recommended it for the NRHP in January 2017. Mr. Hintz shared the Criteria for Consideration. Staff recommends that the HPC advance the application to SHPO for formal review and comment on the proposal. Following the SHPO review the application will go to the City Planning Commission (CPC) for recommendation and the City Council for consideration.
- The Commission discussed whether or not they should wait to advance the application until the work on the building is completed and what the consequences of that action would be. Amanda McKnight Grafton and Mark Stoffer Hunter both stated that they trust that Hobart Historic Restoration will restore the building correctly based on their history with the Mott Building.
- Tim Oberbroeckling made a motion to advance the application for the Knutson Building to SHPO for formal review and comment on the proposal. Todd McNall seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3.c.ii, 3.d.i, 3.c.iii, 3.d.iii, and 3.c.i were considered next to accommodate guests.

c) Certificate of Appropriateness

ii. 1831 Ridgewood Terrace SE – reconstruction of porch

- Jeff Hintz stated that this project is for the removal of metal columns from the porch and replacement with wood columns; removal of the wood landing and skirting; and reconstruction with concrete steps and brick masonry to match the existing foundation. Mr. Hintz shared pictures of the current porch and the proposed porch as well as the Historic District Guidelines for porches and other entrances and the criteria for the decision. Staff recommends approval of the project because it meets all criteria in Chapter 18 for approval, it is consistent with the Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts, the restoration enhances a defining feature, and it keeps the structure in use and in good repair.
- Tim Oberbroeckling made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the reconstruction of a porch at 1831 Ridgewood Terrace SE. Todd McNall seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
d) Funding Consideration – Historic Rehab Program  
   i. 1831 Ridgewood Terrace SW – reconstruction of porch  
      • Jeff Hintz stated that this project is for the removal of the front stoop and metal columns and reconstruction of the stoop and columns in a manner and materials which are consistent with when the home was built. The reconstruction would use bricks, concrete and wood columns. Two (2) bids were obtained. Staff recommends approval of the project because the project is eligible for program, it is consistent with the District Guidelines, architectural detailing will not be removed, there is no impact on defining features, and it keeps the structure in use and good repair.  
      • Bob Grafton made a motion to approve the funding application for the reconstruction of a porch for 1831 Ridgewood Terrace SE. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

c) Certificate of Appropriateness  
   iii. 1714 3rd Avenue SE – remodeling of rear sunroom on home  
      • Jeff Hintz stated that this project is for a reconfiguration of the rear sunroom on the property to include the removal of a sliding deck door; installation of a window in this location; installation of a fiberglass, wood grain finished appearance door on the wall; installation of wood windows with wood trim on the west elevation of the sunroom; installation of a salvaged decorative window on the east elevation of the property; beveled cedar siding to close any openings to match that of the dormers on the house; and installation of a new set of stairs with railing off the rear entrance. Mr. Hintz shared pictures of the property; pictures of the proposed products; the Historic District Guidelines for doors, walls, exteriors, and windows; and the criteria for the decision. Staff recommends approval of the project because it meets all criteria in Chapter 18 for approval; it is consistent with the Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts; the fiberglass, wood simulating door mitigates for adverse impacts due to proposed location; there is no impact to defining features; and it keeps the structure in use and in good repair.  
      • Bob Grafton made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the remodeling of the rear sunroom on the home at 1714 3rd Avenue SE. Mark Stoffer Hunter seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

d) Funding Consideration – Historic Rehab Program  
   iii. 1807 2nd Ave SE – Painting of dwelling unit  
      • Jeff Hintz stated that this project is for painting the exterior of the home and any necessary prep work. Two (2) bids were obtained. Mr. Hintz shared pictures of the property. Staff recommends approval of funding for the project because the project is eligible for program, it is consistent with District Guidelines, architectural detailing is not being removed, there is no impact on defining features, and it keeps the structure in use and good repair.  
      • Bob Grafton noted that a power washer should not be used on the wood siding and asked if the garage is going to be painted to match the house. The applicant stated that she and her husband will paint the garage to match the house.  
      • Barb Westercamp made a motion to approve the funding application for painting the house at 1807 2nd Ave SE. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
c) Certificate of Appropriateness
   i. 1818 Ridgewood Terrace SE – tuck-pointing of chimney
      • Jeff Hintz stated that this project is for the tuck-pointing of the chimney, re-flashing the chimney, and general water protection of the chimney area. Mr. Hintz shared pictures of the chimney, the Historic District Guidelines for chimneys, and the criteria for the decision. Staff recommends approval of the project because it meets all criteria in Chapter 18 for approval, it is consistent with the Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts, and keeps the structure in use and in good repair.
      • Tim Oberbroeckling made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for tuck-pointing of the chimney at 1818 Ridgewood Terrace SE. Todd McNall seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

d) Funding Consideration – Historic Rehab Program
   ii. 1818 Ridgewood Terrace SE – tuck-pointing and maintenance of chimney
      • Jeff Hintz stated that this project is for the tuck-pointing of the chimney, re-flashing the chimney, and general water protection of the chimney area. Two (2) bids were obtained. Staff recommends approval of funding for the project because the project is eligible for program, it is consistent with District Guidelines, architectural detailing is not being removed, there is no impact on defining features, and it keeps the structure in use and good repair.
      • Todd McNall made a motion to approve the funding application for tuck-pointing and maintenance of the chimney at 1818 Ridgewood Terrace SE. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

e) Demolition Applications
   i. 4120 18th Avenue SW – Primary Structure, Private Property
      • Jeff Hintz stated that this property was built in 1953 and the general area is not recommended for intensive survey. Staff recommends immediate release because it has code violations, is currently uninhabitable, and is a poor candidate for local landmark designation.
      • Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that he has done photo documentation and that this property has no historic value.
      • Todd McNall made a motion to approve the demolition of 4120 18th Avenue SW. Ron Mussman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

ii. 2713 Union Drive SW – Primary Structure, Private Property
    • Jeff Hintz stated that this property was built in 1948 and the general area has never been surveyed, but this property is not believed to be historically significant. Staff recommends immediate release because rehabilitation or integration with new construction is not economical.
    • Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that he has done photo documentation and that this property has no historic value. The wrought iron fence on the property is historic and he will speak with the owner about that.
    • Ron Mussman made a motion to approve the demolition of 2713 Union Drive SW. Barb Westercamp seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

iii. 251 33rd Avenue SW – Metal Shop and Store Building, Private Property
Jeff Hintz stated that this property was built in 1966 and the general area has not been surveyed, but this property is not believed to be historically significant. Staff recommends immediate release because rehabilitation or integration with a new gas station is not economical.

Tim Oberbroeckling made a motion to approve demolition of a metal shop and store building at 251 33rd Avenue SW. Barb Westercamp seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

iv. 5001 East Road SW – 10X20 Garage Structure, Private Property

Jeff Hintz stated that this garage was built in 1930 and the general area has not been surveyed, but this property is not believed to be historically significant. Staff recommends immediate release because the intent of Chapter 18 is not to target garages lacking ornate features and the building style and character are not consistent with other carriage houses in the City.

Mark Stoffer Hunter would like to have the picture from the presentation for documentation, but recommends demolition of this garage.

Barb Westercamp made a motion to approve the demolition of a garage at 5001 East Road SW. Todd McNall seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

f) Demolition Applications under Review

i. 909 16th Avenue SE – Private Property

Amanda McKnight Grafton recommended that the property remain on hold because the owner is working with a private party to have the structure moved.

4. Discussion Items

a) Update to Historic District Guidelines

Amanda McKnight Grafton gave an update about the Historic District Guidelines and stated that they will be shared with staff soon.

Jeff Hintz stated that once staff has reviewed the Guidelines they will go out for public input, SHPO will have thirty (30) days to review them, the Development Committee will review them, and then they will go to City Council for consideration.

b) City Demolition Bids

Jeff Hintz stated that there was a question from the Commission about demolition bids because there were some properties that did not come to the Commission and staff wanted to clarify. There were a couple of nuisance properties that staff emailed to the Commission on March 2, 2017. There was a miscommunication among staff on a couple other nuisance properties that would not have come to the Commission, but the Commission should have been made aware of for photo documentation. Another property was a shed and that was done at a time when that would have not been reviewed (before the updated Chapter 18). The other two demolitions were for a right-of-way acquisition and staff has worked to close that gap because there are different departments in the City that acquire properties and they were not sent to the Commission for review.

5. Announcements

There were no announcements.

The Commission had discussion about a former project and different types of windows.
6. Adjournment
   • Barb Westercamp made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:19 p.m. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anne Kroll, Administrative Assistant II
Community Development
To: Historic Preservation Commission  
From: Jeff Hintz, Planner II  
Subject: COA Request 1310 Third Avenue SE  
Date: April 27, 2017

Owner Name: J Z Properties  
Applicant: Northern Construction  
Address: 1310 Third Avenue SE  
Local Historic District: Second and Third Avenue Historic District  
Year Built: 1900  
Description of Project: Installation of grey, vinyl siding on alley facing attic dormer.

Information from Historic Surveys on property: The 1995 Site Inventory Form from the District Nomination survey lists the property as “good.” The defining features listed include: side-gable roof with a steeply pitched, center-gable attic dormer; modillions along deep front eave projects over a 2-story bay at right and oriel at the left corner; hipped roof porch extends across left half with single slender columns and a closed balustrade; clapboard cladding with horizontal tongue-and-groove boards in attic gable; cottage windows on first floor with double-hung elsewhere; pediments over windows in right projecting bay. The dwelling unit is individually eligible for the National Register and contributes to the district.

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

Criteria* for Commission decision on application:
   i. If any defining features of the building or structure as indicated, but not limited to those included on the Site Inventory Form(s) are proposed to be modified as a result of the proposal indicated on the application for Certificate.
   ii. If the proposal is consistent with the Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts and/or the most recent edition of the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings.
   iii. If the proposal mitigates adverse effects on the aesthetic, historic, or architectural significance of either the building or structure or of the local historic district or local historic landmark.

*See 18.08.C.2.a of the Cedar Rapids Municipal Code
Walls and Exteriors

**Recommended:**
- Replace wood exterior siding with like materials
- Repairing the existing siding
- Removing of synthetic siding
- Retaining the width of the original paneling

**Not Recommended:**
- Synthetic siding (this includes products that try to mimic historic patterns)
- Horizontal paneling
- Siding that does not match the existing paneling pattern

**Guideline Text, Page 26:** “Synthetic siding is allowed in the rear of homes and on accessory buildings, although the paneling patterns must be maintained.”

**Analysis:** This project would occur in a location which the [Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts](https://example.com/guidelines) afford the Commission the most flexibility. Pages 6-7 of the Guidelines discuss evaluation of projects and the intent of this section as Step 1 and Step 2 are applied to projects is to afford flexibility and where this flexibility is appropriate. The image below, taken from the alleyway, shows the project location, the siding would be installed where the foam is temporarily keeping the water and other elements from penetrating into the dwelling.

While the vinyl siding proposed by the applicant is not listed specifically as recommended, the text on page 26 of the Guidelines is clear that this proposal is in line with something that is allowed, as such, this is something the Commission needs to strongly consider. The location of the project is at the rear of the home. The height of the attic dormer also makes it less likely that the vinyl siding would be readily noticeable when compared to other locations on the dwelling unit. In this location, there is little cover for the rear of the home as the rear of this property currently looks over a surface parking lot. This property is at the very edge of the Second and Third Avenue Historic District and aside from the adjacent properties, this project location is not visible to other properties within the historic district.
The location of the dormer is such that there are no walls on the third floor on this elevation to blend in with; the dormer is the only protruding element on the third floor facing the alleyway. If there were elements which had siding on the third floor on this façade elevation, it would be difficult to blend the wood and synthetic siding harmoniously. This dormer siding is the only non-roofing material at this façade elevation on the home, so siding it with synthetic siding is something that could work, but only in this location on the home, and if the paneling width on the house is maintained with the synthetic material. Any other location on the home would likely be far less inconspicuous for this type of an installation.

The material submitted by the applicant can be ordered in a correct width, so the paneling pattern would match the existing wood lap siding currently on the home. While the Commission has not previously approved synthetic siding on a primary structure, the Commission has approved synthetic siding on accessory structures in the past. Approving synthetic siding in this location is something the Guidelines would allow the Commission to do. Given the overall height of the installation, rear yard location and limited scale of the project, the combination of these factors, on this property should be considered by the Commission when making a determination about this particular project.

**Attachments:** Application from applicant.
# LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICT/LANDMARK EXTERIOR WORK APPLICATION

Cedar Rapids Municipal Code, Section 18.08

The following information is necessary for all requests for exterior modifications to local historic landmarks or buildings within a designated local historic district as per Chapter 18, Historic Preservation in the Cedar Rapids Municipal Code. Please answer all questions. Failure to provide accurate and complete information will delay review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Information</th>
<th>Applicant Information (skip if owner)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: JZ Properties</td>
<td>Name/Company: Northern Constr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 1316 Stony Point Rd SW</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:mike.peltz37@gmail.com">mike.peltz37@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Cedar Rapids</td>
<td>Address: 5001 East Rd SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State: Iowa</td>
<td>City: Cedar Rapids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 319-721-1918</td>
<td>State: Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td>Zip: 52405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Address of Property where work will occur: 1316 3rd Ave SE

Project Type: House ☐ Garage ☐ Shed ☐ Fence ☐ Other ☐ 5-Family Conversion

Project Description and Location on the property/structure (please be as detailed as possible):

Siding Repair

Description of existing materials (e.g. wood, metal, asphalt shingles):

Description of proposed materials (e.g. wood, metal, asphalt shingles):

Will you be permanently removing architectural detailing/ornamentation from the exterior of the structure (e.g. corbel(s), trim, molding, newel post caps)? Yes ☐ No X

If Yes, describe what architectural detailing/ornamentation you are removing and why:
Description of how project meets the Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts or rationale for why the project is not consistent with the Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts:


Supplemental Materials Required:

For all projects, include at least one of the following applicable materials:

- Physical Material(s) Sample
- Product Catalog, indicating chosen product
- Photo of exact product which will be installed

For new construction only, include at least one of the following:

- Sketches
- Renderings
- Construction Drawings

I, the owner or designated representative of the property, have read the application and acknowledge the Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts, as they relate to my project will be used to determine if my project is approved. If the area where the work on the project is not readily visible from a public right-of-way (alley or street), I also authorize a staff member of the Community Development Department to come onto the property to obtain photo(s) of the area where the work will occur.

I acknowledge that the information provided in this application, including all attachments, are accurate and correct, and that an incomplete application will not be accepted.

I have included the required applicable attachments with this application: □ Yes □ No

Owner/applicant signature: [Signature]

For staff use only:

Date and time completed application received:

City of Cedar Rapids Community Development Department
101 First Street SE, Cedar Rapids, IA 52401
Phone: 319-286-5041 | Web: www.cityofcr.org/hpc

Revised 3/2017
To: Historic Preservation Commission  
From: Jeff Hintz, Planner II  
Subject: Historic Rehab Program Application – 1720 3rd Avenue SE  
Date: April 27, 2017

Applicant Name(s): Timothy and Julia Bickel  
Address: 1720 3rd Avenue SE  
Local Historic District: Second and Third Avenue Historic District  
Year Built: 1921

Description of Project: Painting the exterior of the home and garage.

Removing Architectural Detailing: ☑ Yes ☐ No

Eligible Project under the Historic Rehabilitation Program: ☑ Yes ☐ No

Consistency with Historic District Guidelines: While painting does not have its own section within the Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts, painting is mentioned throughout as a way to protect and preserve surfaces. The Walls and Exteriors section on page 25 does discuss importance of paint to keep wood surfaces in good repair.

Bid Summary:  
Bid 1: Kevin’s Painting - $5,415.00  
Bid 2: CertaPro Painters - $13,346.75

Options for the Commission:  
1. Approve the application for funding; or  
2. Deny the application for funding.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of funding for the project.

Attachments: Application from applicant.
The following information is necessary for all those interested in participating in the Historic Rehabilitation Program. Please answer all questions and provide all attachments. Incomplete applications will not be accepted. Sections beginning with \( \wedge \) may be skipped if a Certificate of Appropriateness has previously been obtained for the work AND the work has not begun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Information</th>
<th>Applicant Information (skip if owner)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Name/Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy J. Bickel</td>
<td>Email <a href="mailto:julia_bickel@verizon.net">julia_bickel@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720 1/2 AVE SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Rapids</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319-364-4419</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:eternaelixir70@gmail.com">eternaelixir70@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Zip, State, Phone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Address of Property where work will occur: Same as above

Project type: House \( \checkmark \) Garage \( \checkmark \) Shed \( \square \) Fence \( \square \) Other \( \square \)

Project description: Paint Exterior of 2 story attic top and stand alone garage

\( \wedge \) Location: Describe where (what part of building, or where on property) work will be done:
4 sides of house 4 sides of garage, soffits trim

\( \wedge \) Existing Material(s): Wood Exterior of 1921 built house

\( \wedge \) Materials Proposed: Sherwin-Williams Paint

Will you be permanently removing architectural detailing/ornamentation? Yes \( \square \) No \( \checkmark \)

If Yes, please explain why: 

Description of how project meets the Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts or rationale for why the project is not consistent with the Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts:

House was built in 1921 and is within Historic District of Cedar Rapids
To: Historic Preservation Commission  
From: Jeff Hintz, Planner II  
Subject: Historic Rehab Program Application – 1620 Park Avenue SE  
Date: April 27, 2017

Owner Name: Caleb Gates  
Address: 1620 Park Avenue SE  
Local Historic District: Redmond Park – Grande Avenue Historic District  
Year Built: 1909

Description of Project: Painting the exterior of the home and porch including the trim. Painting project includes preparation work: scraping and priming the structure prior to painting.

Removing Architectural Detailing: ☐ Yes ☒ No

Eligible Project under the Historic Rehabilitation Program: ☒ Yes ☐ No

Consistency with Historic District Guidelines: While painting does not have its own section within the Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts, painting is mentioned throughout as a way to protect and preserve surfaces. The Walls and Exteriors section on page 25 does discuss importance of paint to keep wood surfaces in good repair.

Bid Summary:  
Bid 1: Connerly Construction - $14,568.00  
Bid 2: Beck's Painting - $17,400

Options for the Commission:  
1. Approve the application for funding; or  
2. Deny the application for funding.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of funding for the project.

Attachments: Application from applicant.
The following information is necessary for all those interested in participating in the Historic Rehabilitation Program. Please answer all questions and provide all attachments. Incomplete applications will not be accepted. Sections beginning with * may be skipped if a Certificate of Appropriateness has previously been obtained for the work AND the work has not begun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Information</th>
<th>Applicant Information (skip if owner)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Caleb Gates</td>
<td>Name/Company:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 1620 Park Ave SE</td>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Cedar Rapids</td>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State: IA</td>
<td>City:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip: 52403</td>
<td>State:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 515-201-9905</td>
<td>Zip:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:cdegexplore@gmail.com">cdegexplore@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Address of Property where work will occur: 1620 Park Avenue SE

Project type: House, □ Garage □ Shed □ Fence □ Other □

Project description: exterior painting

*Location: Describe where (what part of building, or where on property) work will be done:

exterior painting on house: front porch, front, both sides and back

*Existing Material(s): painting

*Materials Proposed: painting

Will you be permanently removing architectural detailing/ornamentation? Yes □ No ☐

If Yes, please explain why:

Description of how project meets the Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts or rationale for why the project is not consistent with the Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts:

N/A
Historic Preservation Commission Agenda Item Cover Sheet

Meeting Date: April 27, 2017

Property Location: 530 Cobban Court SE
Property Owner/Representative: CR Community School District – Chris Gates
Owner Number(s): 319-558-1013  Demolition Contact: DW Zinser 319-846-8090
Year Built: 1895
Description of Agenda Item: ☒ Demolition Application  ☐ COA  ☐ Other

Background and Previous HPC Action: The City Assessor information indicates the property to be assessed at $46,900. The current owner does not have immediate construction plans, the lot will be grass. Any new development would comply with the current zoning or go through the land development process.

City Assessor Information on the parcel:

Historic Eligibility Status: Eligible ☐ Not Eligible ☒ Unknown ☐ N/A ☐
Explanation (if necessary): This property was looked at in 2006 as part of the Architectural History Survey and Update by the 106 Group. This survey took an in depth look at many of the properties originally identified in the 1994 Historical and Architectural Reconnaissance Survey Report for CDBG Neighborhoods in Cedar Rapids.

The 1994 survey did not recommend taking a further look at this area of the Oakhill Jackson neighborhood (classified as such by the 1994 Survey 12th was the dividing line between the Oakhill Jackson and Wellington neighborhood areas in this survey, see page 51 of the survey). The 2006 survey did however take an in-depth look at the general area and the property subject to this request. It was not eligible for any national register criteria; page 40 of the PDF document from the 2006 106 Group survey shows the property of 530 Cobban Court as not eligible.

The State Historic Preservation Office has reviewed and concurred with both of these surveys.

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 due to numerous alterations, property was not found to be historic. A single family house is not in the future plans of the school district.
Historic Preservation Commission Agenda Item Cover Sheet

Meeting Date: April 27, 2017

Property Location: 1601 Greene Avenue NE
Property Owner/Representative: Anthony Brandt
Owner Number(s): 431-5711
Demolition Contact: Jeff – Affordable Construction 373-2797
Year Built: 1900
Description of Agenda Item: ☑ Demolition Application ☐ COA ☐ Other

Background and Previous HPC Action: The structure subject to demolition is the 14x20 garage built in 1900 per the City Assessor. The future plan is to build a new garage on the lot once this existing garage is demolished.

City Assessor Information on the parcel:

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

The reconnaissance surveys the City has commissioned generally do not mention accessory structures. This area of the City was looked at in 1994 as part of the Historical and Architectural Reconnaissance Report for Community Development Block Grant Neighborhoods in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Page 52 of this 1994 reconnaissance survey shows a map of the Cedar Lake/Daniels area; the area east of Daniels Park was not recommended for intensive 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 intent of Chapter 18 was not to target garages lacking ornate features, but to target structures designed as carriage houses. The building style and character are not consistent with known historical carriage houses in the City.
Historic Preservation Commission Agenda Item Cover Sheet

Meeting Date: April 27, 2017

Property Location: 2136 20th Street NW
Property Owner/Representative: Jon Felstead
Owner Number(s): 540-2886
Year Built: 1927
Description of Agenda Item: ☒ Demolition Application ☐ COA ☐ Other

Background and Previous HPC Action: The structure subject to demolition is the 39x29 garage built in 1927 per the City Assessor. A future plan was not supplied for after the demolition; the space will be seeded or any development would go through the land development process.

City Assessor Information on the parcel:

Historic Eligibility Status: Eligible ☐ Not Eligible ☐ Unknown ☒ N/A ☐
Explanation (if necessary):
The reconnaissance surveys the City has commissioned generally do not mention accessory structures. This area of the City was looked at in 2014 as part of the Citywide Survey and was not recommended for intensive 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 intent of Chapter 18 was not to target garages lacking ornate features, but to target structures designed as carriage houses. The building style and character are not consistent with known historical carriage houses in the City.
At the Commission’s April 27, 2017 meeting, a representative from Stanley Consultants and the City’s Flood Control System Project Manager, Rob Davis, will be in attendance to provide the Commission with an update on the work done by Bear Creek Archeology.

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.

Attachments: Summary of findings from Bear Creek Archeology
MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

The following report summarizes the results of Phase III archeological data recovery on 13LN1035 and cistern sites 13LN965 and 13LN1077 within the City of Cedar Rapids, Linn County, Iowa. Conducted on behalf of Stanley Consultants, Inc., Muscatine and Cedar Rapids (PO Number 331001-02), Bear Creek Archeology, Inc. (BCA), Cresco, Iowa, undertook these investigations in advance of planned flood control construction along the east bank of the Cedar River. Spread across alluvial terraces on the valley floor of the Cedar River, the site covers about 4½ city blocks, or 6.6 ha (16.4 ac) from 12th Ave SE to the former location of the Sinclair & Company meat packing plant. Originally identified and later tested by Bear Creek Archeology, the site encompasses the remains of Late Woodland and Early Woodland habitations as well as dozens of historic households originally established around the turn of the twentieth century. Many of the houses on these lots were extant at the time of the 2008 flood but most have been removed, leaving behind dozens of vacant lots within a few blocks of the modern river bank.

Prehistoric data recovery within a 212 m² block found evidence for five house loci in the form of poorly defined circular stains, interior hearths within three, and artifact patterning. One was identified in the Late Woodland component and four were exposed in the underlying Early Woodland component. Associated with the former is Burris ware pottery, two interior hearths, and a light scatter of artifacts. The more numerous Early Woodland loci are associated with a moderate artifact scatter (flaking debris, chipped stone tools, fire-cracked rock, and cobble tools), Liverpool ware pottery, and usually hearth and/or pit features. One locus contained no identified features and a second, identified by curving band of disturbance interpreted in the field as a diffused wall line where posts had been installed, is now considered problematic. In total, data recovery collected approximately 2,300 prehistoric artifacts with 170 identified as pottery, 93 chipped stone tools, 32 cores, and 49 cobble tools.

Data recovery on the historic component at 13LN1035 focused mostly on residential lots on a reach of 1st St SE where a machine removed overburden across backyards and exposed 13 historic features, including two ash/cinder vaults, a privy vault, and 10 pit features (some had evidence for in situ burning). One cluster of five set behind a former house at 1221 1st St SE removed in the mid-1970s yielded large numbers of artifacts (metals, ceramic, glass, including whole bottles), including over 3,800 pieces of faunal remains and fragments from several porcelain dolls. Collectively, more than 12,000 historic artifacts were found during data recovery. For lots where data recovery occurred, archival investigations reviewed city directories, U.S. and State of Iowa census records, marriage/death records, city assessor data, and other sources and identified the residents and their employment histories beginning in the late nineteenth century to 1950.

On 2nd St SE, Bear Creek Archeology exposed the remains of historic cistern previously identified by Louis Berger Group, Inc., Cedar Rapids. Assigned site numbers 13LN965 and 13LN1077, respectively, when exposed the former was at 1445 2nd St SE it was found to be heavily damaged, likely when previously backfilled. Consequently, because
of this instability and attendant safety concerns it was decided no additional investigations, other than recording some exterior attributes so that, along with data collected by the Berger investigation, the general dimensions and volume of the cistern could calculated, would be undertaken. The other cistern, on 1459 2nd St SE, also sustained some damage when the neck was likely removed during backfilling. Also, a brick-lined well near the cistern could not be relocated and it too must have been removed/destroyed during backfilling. However, the rest of the 1459 2nd St SE cistern was intact and stable, and it was fully exposed by machine and documented before being partially dismantled so the interior could be examined and dumped internal deposits be accessed. This work found the interior filled with a mixed mass of modern and late historic materials (bottles, jars, rugs, plastic and metal buckets, some ceramics, plastic objects/containers, wood, etc.). A sample of datable artifacts was collected but no evidence for stratification was found.

In light of the data recovery results, Bear Creek Archaeology recommends that adverse effects from proposed construction on 13LN1035, 13LN965, and 13LN1077 have been adequately mitigated through archeological data recovery and no further investigations are needed.

Information contained in this report relating to the nature and location of archaeological sites is considered private and confidential and not for public disclosure in accordance with Section 304 of the National Historic Preservation Act (54 U.S.C. § 307103); 36 CFR Part 800.6 (a)(5) of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation’s rules implementing Sections 106 and 110 of the Act; Section 9(a) of the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (54 U.S.C. § 100707) and, Chapter 22.7, subsection 20 of the Iowa Code.