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

4:30 P.M.
Thursday, November 30, 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 (45 Minutes)
   a) Certificate of Appropriateness Applications
      i. 1815 Blake Boulevard SE – Replacement of windows
      ii. 1816 Park Avenue SE – Replacement of windows
   b) Demolition Applications
      i. 3010 Center Point Road NE – Primary structure, Private Property

4. Discussion Items (10 minutes)
   a) Historic District Guideline Update

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
- Mark Stoffer Hunter called the meeting to order at 4:33 p.m.
- Seven (7) Commissioners were present with two (2) absent.

1. Public Comment
- Cindy Hadish would like the Commission to be proactive on protecting area elementary schools. A plan for the elementary schools will be presented at the December 11, 2017 School Board meeting. Mark Stoffer Hunter would like this to be a future HPC discussion item.
- Bob Grafton would like to know what the plan is for possible demolition of buildings at Usher’s Ferry and hopes that the Commission can place a stop order like what was done for the Bever Park Pedestrian Bridge. Mr. Grafton would like an update on the RFP for the Ambroz Building. Jeff Hintz stated that there is not new information on the RFP. Staff is still working with the one proposal that was received.

2. Approve Meeting Minutes
- Barb Westercamp made a motion to approve the minutes from October 26, 2017. Ron Mussman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion item 4.a. was moved up on the agenda to accommodate guests.

4. Discussion Items
a) Alleyway Vacation between 4th and 5th Avenue SW between 1st and 2nd Streets SW
- Jeff Hintz stated that the Commission has asked to be notified when brick streets/alleyways are going through the vacation process. This alleyway has a small amount of bricks and staff is bringing this to the Commission for their comments related to the historic significance/value of the bricks.
• Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that there are brick streets with areas that were patched up with concrete after demolitions had taken place after the 2008 Flood and he would like to see these bricks used for those spots instead of the concrete.

• Ron Mussman asked if the City still has a stockpile of bricks. Jeff Hintz stated that the City does still have bricks and that they could be given to a private contractor to replace bricks that were damaged when taken out.

• Amanda McKnight Grafton asked if a security gate could be put up in the alleyway. Carol Morgan of Public Works stated that once they have the title to the land they can do what they want to; however, they will have to make the area available for emergency vehicles. Jeff Hintz noted that the owner will not be able to build anything in the alley because of the sewer lines, but they could put up a security fence.

• Ron Mussman would like to see the HPC’s involvement in this process to continue. Carol Morgan stated that whenever there are bricks associated with these vacations she will keep staff informed.

3. Action Items

a) 2018 Historic Preservation Commission Work Plan

• Jeff Hintz stated that the HPC is required annually to develop a work plan. Staff has made changes to the draft 2018 work plan based on initiatives in Historic Preservation Plan. Mr. Hintz reviewed the goals within the work plan.

• Todd McNall noted that the list of commissioners needs to be updated. Jeff Hintz stated that he saw the error and fixed it, but not before it went out in the agenda packet.

• Ron Mussman asked for clarification about working with economic development partners under Goal 1 and shared concerns with the IEDA calling the Skogman and Bever Buildings dilapidated and he does not feel that the buildings are in that bad of shape. Mr. Mussman has shared his concerns with Paula Mohr at SHPO and would like to see the Commission work with owners of buildings that are threatened by demolition before the demolition comes to the Commission for review. Amanda McKnight Grafton stated that the Commission has asked for a preview from the owners in situations like this and would like to figure out a way for that to happen. Jeff Hintz stated that staff encourages owners to do that, but since it is not a requirement they do not have to give a preview. Tim Oberbroeckling stated that as members of the HPC they can reach out to owners themselves.

• Todd McNall suggested that, in response to this discussion, the Commission agree to change to a 1st quarter due date to work with economic development partners to include historic resources in redevelopment policies and economic development plans and the change to 2nd quarter to consider developing a Neighborhood Conservation District program for neighborhoods that may not be eligible for historic district designation. The Commission agreed.

• Todd McNall made a motion to approve the 2018 Historic Preservation Commission Work Plan with the updated Commission member list as well as the change to a 1st quarter due date to work with economic development partners to include historic resources in redevelopment policies and economic development plans and the change to 2nd quarter to consider developing a Neighborhood Conservation District program for neighborhoods that may not be eligible for historic district designation. Amanda McKnight Grafton seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

• Todd McNall asked if the Commission can make changes to the document later on or if the motion today is final. Jeff Hintz stated that there is no penalty for making changes during the year.
4. Discussion Items  

b) Bever Park Bridge Subcommittee Update  
- Jeff Hintz stated that the subcommittee met on November 2, 2017 to clarify options for the Bever Park Bridge. At the meeting, BJ Hobart stated that she has someone that agreed to take a look at the bridge and will coordinate that with staff.
- Tim Oberbroeckling stated that the subcommittee did not talk about fundraising options because they need to decide on what option they will pick for the repair of the bridge first.
- Jeff Hintz clarified that the City will have to go out for bid for the project before a company can be picked to complete the project.
- Todd McNall suggested sending a mailing out to the neighborhood surrounding Bever Park because the residents in the area feel strongly about preserving the park.
- Todd McNall stated that Riverside Casino has grants that can be applied for and that they are encouraged to have some of the funding go to Linn County.

c) Historic District Guideline Update  
- Jeff Hintz stated that staff is ninety-five (95) percent finished with formatting the Guidelines. Staff hopes to hold a small stakeholder feedback meeting in December 2017. After HPC approval, the Guidelines will go to Development Committee and City Council.

5. Announcements  
- Mark Stoffer Hunter asked that the Commission hold November 30, 2017 for a meeting in case staff receives demolition or COA applications before the next scheduled meeting.
- Jeff Hintz stated that the hold on 213 2nd Street SE was released on November 8, 2017 because Mark Stoffer Hunter finished his documentation.

6. Adjournment  
- Barb Westercamp made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 5:53 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 at 1815 Blake Boulevard SE
Date: November 30, 2017

Owner Name: John Wooff
Address: 1815 Blake Boulevard SE
Local Historic District: Redmond Park-Grande Avenue Place Historic District
Year Built: 1912
Description of Project: Replacement of six west-facing (2 in stairway to attic, 1 in stairway to 2nd floor, 1 in 2nd floor bathroom, 1 in kitchen over sink and 1 in breakfast nook), two south-facing (rear of house, 1 in breakfast nook and 1 in 2nd floor rear bedroom) and two east-facing (1 in breakfast nook and 1 in 2nd floor rear bedroom) windows with Pella 250 Series vinyl windows.

Information from Historic Surveys on property: The 1995 Site Inventory Form from the District Nomination survey lists the property as “fair.” The defining features listed include: hipped roof with hipped dormers; narrow clapboard siding; hipped roof porch across full front with columns resting on ashlar concrete block pedestals; vertical board design in porch skirting; windows are double-hung with entrance off-center; original oval light door in entrance. The home is not individually eligible for the National Register, but does contribute 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
Analysis: This project would occur in a location which the Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts 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 ranking for prioritization of the most architecturally significant features is as follows:

1. Those features that face the street or face the alley where it intersects the street. Buildings on corner lots, lots which are located at the intersection of two streets, or at the intersection of a street and an alley, are considered to have two street faces.
2. Features on sides of buildings that are visible from the street but don’t directly face the street.
3. Other exterior features not in direct view from the street such as at the rear of buildings.

The Commission has approved requests of a similar nature in the past, which is why the applicant has proposed these locations and not all the windows on the structure. The owner of the property spoke with staff about the use of the guidelines and how locations of significant features would be prioritized; as a result of this discussion, the applicant has been approved to install wood windows in locations not being considered in this application. The windows which are proposed to be replaced would fall under prioritization category two and three (see above and page 6 of the Guidelines). The windows at the rear of the property are the least significant and are not practically visible from any street.

The windows on the sides of the home would fall under prioritization category two; they are visible from the street, but don’t directly face the street. The windows on the west side of the dwelling unit are approximately seven (7) feet from the adjacent dwelling unit and are essentially hidden from passersby, given the vegetation. Even without the vegetation, a passerby would have to stop in exactly the correct spot to see this side of the home. Even then, the windows which would be replaced are over 35 feet from the sidewalk and 50 feet from where a parked vehicle would be sitting. Given these distances, the fact the adjacent home is concealing the west elevation from view, and the locations of installation are not directly facing the street, it is unlikely the synthetic material of the window would be noticed.
The east facing elevation does have a greater setback from the adjacent dwelling unit and these windows are a bit more visible from the street. However, they are still on the side of the dwelling unit and fall under prioritization two within the adopted Guidelines. The windows which would be replaced are at the rear half of the home and approximately 60 feet from the sidewalk and 80 feet from a parked vehicle. While it is doubtful anyone would look at these windows from this distance and notice they are a synthetic material, they are a bit more visible than on the west elevation (the other side elevation).

There are no grille (or muntin) patterns present on the existing windows, and none are noted on the site inventory form; the applicant is not proposing to add grille patterns with this project. As such, the Commission has discussed shadowing and depth of windows at length when synthetic windows are used on properties. This distance from the right-of-way, coupled with the fact there are no grilles in the windows, the differences in depth and shadowing would be minimized in these locations. The applicant has studied previous approvals and the Guidelines when making this application to make improvements on the property. The application indicates these windows would help to offset some of the remodeling costs on the property. Additionally, since grille patterns are not present, there should be less concern about all the windows in the home matching as all the windows on the front half of the side elevations and the front elevation would remain wood. The applicant does not intend to resize the openings of the windows with this proposal.

This proposal is consistent with past approvals, and is occurring on locations which are lower priorities in terms of the streetscape, since none of the windows which would be replaced, are directly facing a street right-of-way. As the proposal relates to the criteria for consideration, no defining features are being changed; the commission has discussed the look of double-hung vs single hung windows in the past, aside from how the window actually functions, the look is the same. The proposal is consistent with the guidelines for where flexibility should be granted by the Commission, as none of the new windows would face the street, the material is not consistent however; the material not being consistent with the Guidelines is why the application is being considered by the Commission. Given there is no grille pattern that has to be matched with the replacement windows, the proximity of adjacent properties/rear elevation location, and the distance these windows are from the right-of-way staff finds that adverse impacts have been mitigated with this proposal.

**Staff Recommendation:** Approval of the application as submitted.

**Attachments:** Application from applicant with materials sample.
**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</td>
<td>Name/Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Zip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Address of Property where work will occur:** 1815 Blake Blvd SE

**Project Type:**
- ✔ House
- □ Garage
- □ Shed
- □ Fence
- □ Other ____________________________

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

Replacement of six west-facing (2 in stairway to attic, 1 in stairway to 2nd floor, 1 in 2nd floor bathroom, 1 in kitchen over sink and 1 in breakfast nook), two south-facing (rear of house, 1 in breakfast nook and 1 in 2nd floor rear bedroom) and two east-facing (1 in breakfast nook and 1 in 2nd floor rear bedroom) windows with Pella 250 Series vinyl windows.

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

Wood windows

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

Pella 250 Series vinyl windows.

**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 ☑**

If Yes, describe what architectural detailing/ornamentation you are removing and why:-

John Wooff
1815 Blake Blvd SE
Cedar Rapids, IA 52403
319-981-0580
jwooff4kam@gmail.com

**Replacement of six west-facing (2 in stairway to attic, 1 in stairway to 2nd floor, 1 in 2nd floor bathroom, 1 in kitchen over sink and 1 in breakfast nook), two south-facing (rear of house, 1 in breakfast nook and 1 in 2nd floor rear bedroom) and two east-facing (1 in breakfast nook and 1 in 2nd floor rear bedroom) windows with Pella 250 Series vinyl windows.**
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:

Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts recommend wood windows. Due to locations/street-view of the above-stated windows, personal finances and economics of replacement windows I am unable to completely replace all windows with wood. These vinyl windows will provide energy-efficiency and will enhance our home.

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: John W. Wooff

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 Members
From: Iván Gonzalez, Planner
Subject: COA Request at 1816 Park Avenue SE
Date: November 30, 2017

Applicant Name(s): Bart Woods

Address: 1816 Park Avenue SE

Local Historic District: Redmond Park – Grande Avenue Place

Year Built: 1915

Description of Project: Removal of eleven (11) existing wood windows from the sides and rear of house. Installation of eleven (11) vinyl windows located on the east, west, and north sides of house. There are three (3) existing vinyl windows that had been installed prior to the current owner. The existing vinyl windows are located on the west and north side of the house. No existing windows facing the street (South) will be replaced.

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 single hipped attic dormer centered on front; medium width siding-lower and narrow siding-upper with belt course between; hipped roof front porch centered on front; porch has piers extending to ground level; balustrade has two narrow, square balusters alternating with a wide boards; porch skirting pattern has vertical boards narrowly spaced; windows are 1/1 double-hungs of various sizes; entrance is off-center in projecting vestibule. The home 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:
1. 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.
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.

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

**Excerpt(s) from Design Guidelines Applicable to Project:**

- **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 only at the rear of the 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

**Analysis:** This project would occur in locations in which the Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts (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 ranking for prioritization of the most architecturally significant features is as follows:

1. Those features that face the street or face the alley where it intersects the street. Buildings on corner lots, lots which are located at the intersection of two streets, or at the intersection of a street and an alley, are considered to have two street faces.
2. Features on sides of buildings that are visible from the street but don’t directly face the street.
3. Other exterior features not in direct view from the street such as at the rear of buildings.

The windows which are proposed to be replaced would fall under prioritization category two and three (see above and page 6 of the Guidelines). The windows at the rear of the property (north elevation) are the least significant and are not practically visible from any street, but are partially visible from the alleyway. This is the rear of the property as indicated on the diagram on page 8 of the Guidelines.

The windows on the east and west side of the home would fall under prioritization category two; they are visible from the street, but don’t directly face the street. While one can see the windows from the street, set back is approximately 30 feet from the sidewalk; the distance is approximately 60 feet from someone travelling by in a vehicle. It is unlikely that passersby will notice the difference in materials at this distance. While the tree may not live forever in the side yard, for the foreseeable future, the tree to the south of the home is anticipated to further mask
the visibility of this window from convenient view. This is a location, along with the rear near the alleyway, is where the Commission is afforded flexibility from the Guidelines.

There are no grille (or muntin) patterns present on the existing windows, and none are noted on the site inventory form; the applicant is not proposing to add grille patterns with this project. As such, the Commission has discussed shadowing and depth of windows at length when synthetic windows are used on properties. This distance from the right-of-way, coupled with the fact there are no grilles in the windows, the differences in depth and shadowing would be minimized in these locations. The application indicates these windows are in disrepair right now and 2 are not functional. Additionally, since grille patterns are not present, all of the windows will match. The applicant does not intend to resize the openings of the windows with this proposal.

This proposal is occurring on locations which are lower priorities in terms of the streetscape, since none of the windows which would be replaced, are directly facing a street right-of-way. The proposal is consistent with the guidelines for where flexibility could be granted by the Commission, as none of the new windows would directly face the street, the material is not consistent however; the material not being consistent with the Guidelines is why the application is being considered by the Commission. Given there is no grille pattern that has to be matched with the replacement windows, the overall location of the installation, previous replacement of vinyl windows, and the distance these windows are from the right-of-way, staff finds that adverse impacts have been mitigated with this proposal.

**Staff Recommendation:** Approve as submitted

**Attachments:** Completed application from applicant and images of the proposed windows
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: BECKWOODS LLC</td>
<td>Name/Company: BART LWOODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 1816 1701 2ND AVE. S.E.</td>
<td>Email: SAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Cedar</td>
<td>Address: &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State: IA.</td>
<td>City: &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip: 52403</td>
<td>State: &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: (319) 533-2687</td>
<td>Zip: &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: bart.prime-companics.com</td>
<td>Phone: &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Address of Property where work will occur: 1816 PARK AVE. S.E.

Project Type: [ ] House  [ ] Garage  [ ] Shed  [ ] Fence  [ ] Other

Project Description and Location on the property/structure (please be as detailed as possible):
REPLACES EXISTING SIDE AND BACK WINDOWS W/ SAME SIZE VINYL WINDOWS - APPROX. 9

Description of existing materials (e.g. wood, metal, asphalt shingles):
WOOD FRAMING, WINDOWS - DOUBLE HUNG

Description of proposed materials (e.g. wood, metal, asphalt shingles):
VINYL INSUL, WINDOWS - DOUBLE HUNG

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:

I believe the historic requirements have been changed to allow vinyl replacement windows on the sides & back of a house.

### 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:**

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
CLASSIC DESIGN

A modern take on traditional design. A wide frame offers the appearance of a wood window, while the narrow sash design allows for maximum daylight.

WINDOW OPENING CONTROL DEVICE (WOCd)

WOCd limits the sash opening to less than four inches.
Double-Hung Windows

UNIVERSALLY APPEALING

Double-hung windows are best suited to traditional architectural styles. They feature an upper and lower sash that slide vertically past each other in a single frame. Both sashes tilt in for convenient cleaning.
PREMIUM VINYL DOUBLE-HUNG WINDOW

Premium Vinyl Double-Hung Window

Price Range: $$

MODEL

EXTERIOR

GRILLE DESIGNS

TOP DOWN GRILLE

EXTERIOR COLOR OPTIONS

ALMOND

WAYS TO BUY THIS PRODUCT

▷ FIND A STORE (EN-US/FINDASTORE?URI=)

Double-hung windows are best suited to traditional architectural styles. They feature an upper and lower sash that slide vertically past each other in a single frame. Both sashes tilt in for convenient cleaning.

FEATURES

- **Color Options**: 10 exterior colors, 3 interior colors
- **Divided Lites**: simulated divided lites, grilles between the glass, 3 grille designs
- **ENERGY STAR® Qualified Options**: yes
- **Exterior Color Options**: Almond; Arctic Silver; Black; Chestnut Bronze; Dark Chocolate; Desert Sand; French Vanilla; Hartford Green; Mesa Red; White
- **Glass Options**: energy efficient, protective, textured, tinted
- **Hardware Options**: Window Opening Control Device (WOCD) option available
- **Project Type**: new construction and replacement
- **Warranty**: limited lifetime

Back to Top ▲

RELATED PRODUCTS
Historic Preservation Commission Agenda Item Cover Sheet

Meeting Date: November 30, 2017

Property Location: 3010 Center Point Road NE
Property Owner/Representative: Curt and Phyllis Krambeer
Owner Number(s): (319)395-7634 Demolition Contact:
Year Built: 1915
Description of Agenda Item: ☒ Demolition Application ☐ COA ☐ Other

Background and Previous HPC Action: At this time the future plan is to develop a new home on the property once the current structure is demolished. The dwelling is not habitable and has not has gas service since 2015; the electrical service has also been disconnected at this time. The home has termites and is currently gutted of nearly everything at this time and also has animal damage. The dwelling is valued at $4,800 and was acquired in August of 2017 by the current owner.

City Assessor Information on the parcel:

Historic Eligibility Status: Eligible ☐ Not Eligible ☒ Unknown ☐ N/A ☐
Explanation (if necessary):
The 2013 Citywide Survey is a windshield survey that looked at this particular area for properties of architectural significance. This property and the general area was not recommended for further study. See the map on PDF page 23 of the survey for the map of areas which have a general narrative and were recommended for further study.

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

If eligible, which criteria is met:
☐ Associated with significant historical events (Criteria A)
☐ Associated with significant lives of person (Criteria B)
☐ Signifies distinctive architectural character/era (Criteria C)
☐ Archaeologically significant (Criteria D)

Other Action by City: Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A ☐
Explanation (if necessary):
Recommendation: Immediate release.
Rationale: The general area where the property is was determined not worthy of additional study and restoration is not economically viable for the owner. Given the current assessor's condition value on the dwelling, coupled with the fact it is not habitable, significant investment would be required if it were renovated.