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 (30 minutes)
      i. 1638 3rd Avenue SE – Construction of a single-family home and accessory structure
   b) Funding Consideration- Historic Rehab Program (5 minutes)
      i. 209 Park Court SE – Painting of the structure
   c) Section 106 Review – Right-of-way adjacent to 1972 B Avenue NE (10 minutes)
   d) Demolition Applications Under Review (5 minutes)
      i. Private Property - 909 16th Avenue SE

4. Discussion Items (15 minutes)
   a) Infill Opportunities and Design Considerations in the Local Historic Districts

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.
MINUTES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING,
Thursday, March 9, 2017 @ 4:30 p.m.
Five Seasons Conference Room, City Services Center, 500 15th Avenue SW

Members Present: Amanda McKnight-Grafton Chair
Bob Grafton
Tim Oberbroeckling
Mark Stoffer Hunter
Barb Westercamp
Sam Bergus

Members Absent: BJ Hobart
Ron Mussman
Todd McNall
Caitlin Hartman

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 4:30 p.m.
• Six (6) Commissioners were present with four (4) absent.

1. Public Comment
• There was no public comment.

2. Approve Meeting Minutes
• Tim Oberbroeckling made a motion to approve the minutes from February 23, 2017. Barb Westercamp seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Item 3.c.i was considered next to accommodate guests.

3. Action Items
c) Demolition Applications
i. 1307 O Avenue NW – Private Property
• Jeff Hintz stated that this property was built in 1919 and the general area is not recommended for intensive survey. This is a poor candidate for a local landmark and there have been numerous alterations to the property. Staff recommends immediate release.
• Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that he has taken photo documentation of the inside and this home does not have historic integrity.
• Bob Grafton stated that he has volunteered to do salvage on the property and will be allowed to do so.
• Tim Oberbroeckling made a motion to approve the demolition at 1308 O Avenue NW. Sam Bergus seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

a) Certificate of Appropriateness
i. 216 15th Street SE – replacement of side door, chimney repair
• Jeff Hintz stated that this project is for the installation of a salvaged wood door on the alley side of the dwelling unit and for chimney work to install a new cap, repair masonry, and re-flash. Mr. Hintz shared photos of the door and chimney and reviewed the Historic District Guidelines for doors and chimneys. Staff recommends approval of the project because it is consistent with District Guidelines, there is no impact on defining features, it adds a period piece to the home, and this project keeps the structure in use and good repair.
• The Commission discussed which materials the applicant should use for the chimney.
• Sam Bergus made a motion to approve the COA for the replacement of a side door and chimney repair at 216 15th Street SE. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

b) Funding Consideration – Historic Rehab Program
i. 216 15th Street SE – Painting house, removal of lattice work, replacement of side door, installation of screen door and chimney repair
• Jeff Hintz stated this project is for painting the house, removal of lattice work, replacement of the side door, installation of the screen door, and chimney repair. 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 the program, architectural detailing is not being removed, there is no impact on defining features, and this project keeps the structure in use and good repair.
• Tim Oberbroeckling made a motion to approve funding for painting the house, removal of lattice work, replacement of the side door, installation of the screen door, and the chimney repair at 216 15th Street SE. Mark Stoffer Hunter seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

d) Demolition Applications under Review
i. 909 16th Avenue SE – Private Property
• Cindy Hadish wanted the Commission to know that after Save CR Heritage wrote an article about this property there was a lot of interest in it.
• Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that there are three (3) parties interested in moving this property and that the applicant is interested in donating the funds that were originally intended for demolition to go towards moving the home.
• The Commission decided to keep the hold on the property located at 909 16th Avenue SE.

4. Discussion Items
a) Wood siding product – paulownia
• Bob Grafton shared a paulownia siding product that is a less expensive substitute for historic properties that would help keep the cost down for future applicants. It is available
at CR Lumber. The Commission would like to see properties in Cedar Rapids where this product has been used.

5. Announcements
   • Jennifer Pratt asked if any Commission members would like to be a liaison for a citizen who would like assistance in researching their property that has a possible connection to the Wright Brothers. Mark Stoffer Hunter and Bob Grafton volunteered.

   Amanda McKnight Grafton left the meeting at 5:10 p.m.

   • Bob Grafton asked to have discussion about infill of vacant properties and an update on the ROOTs Program on a future agenda.

6. Adjournment
   • Barb Westercamp made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 5:14 p.m. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anne Kroll, Administrative Assistant II
Community Development
To: Historic Preservation Commission Members
From: Anne Russett, Planner III and Jeff Hintz, Planner II
Subject: COA Request at 1638 3rd Avenue SE
Date: March 23, 2017

Applicant Name(s): Cedar Valley Habitat for Humanity
Local Historic District: Second and Third Avenue Historic District
Address: 1638 3rd Avenue SE
Year Built: Not applicable.

Description of Project: The applicant is proposing to construct a new single-family home with a detached garage [Attachments 1 & 2]. The proposed project is located on an infill lot that has been vacant since the previous historic structure was demolished in 2012 after being destroyed by a fire. In terms of materials, the applicant proposes LP SmartSide on the home and garage, vinyl windows, and a fiberglass front door.

Information from Historic Surveys on property: Not Applicable.

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.

Background: The proposed project was previewed with the Historic Preservation Commission at the February 23, 2017 meeting. At this meeting the Commission:
1. Expressed concern regarding the use of vinyl siding and recommended that the applicant explore other materials;
2. Supported the detached garage design; and
3. Noted the importance of contextual front-yard setbacks.
Excerpts from the *Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts*: The following excerpts related to streetscape and accessory structures are applicable to the proposed project.

**Streetscapes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Not Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• New construction that matches the style of the neighborhood</td>
<td>• Blank facades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flexibility in contemporary building materials and technologies</td>
<td>• Uneven setbacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contemporary designs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not retaining components of the original structure (a porch or dormers for example)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accessory Structures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Not Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Wood siding</td>
<td>• Metal siding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Double wide door (if accessed from an alley)</td>
<td>• Sheet siding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rear yard location</td>
<td>• Paneled siding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Disproportionate roof pitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Disproportionate building mass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the section related to Walls & Exteriors notes on page 26 that: “Synthetic siding is allowed in the rear of homes and on accessory buildings, although the paneling patterns must be maintained.”

**Guidance from the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation:** The Secretary of the Interior’s (SOI) Standards for Rehabilitation are not geared for new, infill construction. Instead, they focus on preserving and maintaining existing historic resources. That being said, there is some guidance that can be taken from standards nine and ten that are applicable to the proposed project.

“9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”

**Analysis:** Staff analyzed the proposed project and considered the massing, form, and design of the building, as well as the materials. Since the proposed project will not contribute to the historic district the staff review focused on the proposed project’s fit within the historic neighborhood.

**Massing, Form, & Site Design**
The single-family home is a two-story design similar to the adjacent homes. The home also features a front porch, which is a common feature throughout the historic districts. In addition, the garage is detached from the main housing unit and placed at the rear of the property. This is
consistent with adjacent properties, which all have alley access. The proposed project also incorporates a contextual front-yard setback, which is consistent with the adjacent homes. In addition, the proposed project fills in a gap and creates an intact block. All of these features help the home fit into the surrounding historic context and match the style of the neighborhood, which is recommended by the Guidelines related to streetscape.

Materials
The applicant has proposed LP Smart Side on the home and garage, vinyl windows, and a fiberglass front door. The applicant has addressed the Commission’s concern regarding vinyl siding and has instead proposed LP Smart Side. Furthermore, the Guidelines related to streetscapes provide the Commission with flexibility related to the use of alternative types of materials. Specifically, the Guidelines recommend “flexibility in contemporary buildings materials and technology.” In addition, the materials proposed help to differentiate the new construction from the older, historic structure, which is recommended by the SOI standards.

Comprehensive Plan Consistency: Goal one of the GrowCR component of the City’s Comprehensive Plan, EnvisionCR, encourages infill and mixed use development. The proposed project is able to utilize existing infrastructure (water, sewer, utilities) and is in an area of the city serviced by the City (Fire protection, Police service, waste collection etc.). Infill development helps the city grow, while not requiring the removal of productive farmland and environmental resources. Furthermore, infill development does not require the construction of new roads or installation of new infrastructure to service a development. In other words, infill development is sustainable, which aligns with Goal 1 if the Historic Preservation Plan: A sustainable community supported by preservation efforts.

Conclusion: Overall, the proposed project is in line with the standards set forth by the SOI, as well as in the Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts. The design, form, style, massing, and setbacks match that of the existing neighborhood. While this home is unlikely to add historical value to the neighborhood, it does not detract from the historical value of the neighborhood where it is built. Instead, it addresses a gap within an otherwise intact block and strengthens the historic streetscape.

Staff Recommendation: Approve as submitted.

Attachments:
1. Proposed Elevations and Renderings
2. Site Layout-Detached Garage
To: Historic Preservation Commission  
From: Jeff Hintz, Planner II  
Subject: Historic Rehab Program Application – 209 Park Court SE  
Date: March 23, 2017

Owner Name: Mission of Hope  
Address: 209 Park Court SE  
Local Historic District: Second and Third Avenue Historic District  
Year Built: 1910

Description of Project: Painting the exterior of the structure, including the trim. Painting project includes preparation work: scraping, washing 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: CertaPro Painters - $3,814.07
- Bid 2: Kevin’s Painting - $4,815.00

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.
CEedar RAPIDS
Historic Rehabilitation Program Application
Community Development Department, 101 First Street SE, Cedar Rapids, IA 52401, Phone 319-286-5041

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</td>
<td>Name/Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission of Hope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200 B Ave NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Rapids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip 52403</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone 319-365-1782</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext 501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email <a href="mailto:dca4.moh@gmail.com">dca4.moh@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Zip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Address of Property where work will occur: 209 Park Ct SE

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

Project description: Paint the exterior of the home.

^Location: Describe where (what part of building, or where on property) work will be done:
The soffit, wood siding, windows, doors, door frames and post

^Existing Material(s): Wood siding

^Materials Proposed: The painter will wash the siding to remove dirt and mildew. Caulk and scrape peeling paint. Use appropriate exterior paint.

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:
The 1254 square foot home was restored last year on the inside using existing materials when possible. We would like to maintain the original 1910 look.
To: Historic Preservation Commission Members  
From: Jeff Hintz, Planner II  
Subject: Section 106 Review – Right-of-way adjacent to 1972 B Avenue NE  
Date: March 23, 2017

**Background:** On March 2, 2017 the City of Cedar Rapids received invitation to comment as a consulting party for a proposed communications facility to be mounted on an existing utility pole. Review is requested pursuant to Section 106 as part of the Terracon’s efforts to comply with the Historic Preservation Act. All involved parties are aware the utility pole lies within the B Avenue NE Historic District which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and that there are numerous listed and potentially eligible resources in close proximity to the location.

**Project Description:** Installation of small cell communication equipment on an existing utility pole as depicted in the attachments.

**Analysis:** To ensure historically significant buildings in this district or potentially eligible buildings nearby are not adversely affected by the project, this review is required. The proposal here is not unique to Cedar Rapids; the HPC reviewed a similar proposal in the NewBo area within the bounds of the Bohemian Commercial Historic District on January 8, 2015. For that particular proposal, the HPC choose to make no comment.

The rendering of the facility indicates it is much like the appearance of electrical equipment which is commonly mounted on utility poles in the right-of-way. This type of facility has the least intrusion on adjacent properties which is of the utmost importance in any area with historical resources. Due to the design and mounting on the utility pole, this facility is likely to be unnoticeable to those in the area and those passing through.

**Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) Role:** If the HPC would like to formally comment on the undertaking, the Commission may do so. Staff will handle the notification to Terracon if the HPC chooses to comment on the project.

**Recommendation:** Make comment to Terracon that the project be completed as presented.

**Attachments:** Site plan and rendering of the facility.
Photo of the utility pole taken from 20th Street NE looking towards B Avenue NE
Renderings of the facility on the utility pole
To: Historic Preservation Commission Members  
From: Jeff Hintz, Planner II and Anne Russett, Planner III  
Subject: Vacant Lots in the Local Historic Districts  
Date: March 23, 2017

**Background:** On February 23, 2017 at the end of the meeting, it was asked if a discussion regarding vacant lots in the Local Historic Districts could be discussed on a future agenda.

**Current Vacant Lots:** As of March 13, 2017 the following lots in the Local Historic Districts do not have any structures on them:

- 1422 3rd Avenue SE
- 1638 3rd Avenue SE (Previewed with HPC on February 23 by Cedar Valley Habitat for Humanity for possible construction)
- 211 15th Street SE – demolished due to fire which left structure unsafe
- 124 Park Court SE
- 1815? 2nd Avenue SE – no address currently assigned, owned by adjacent property owner
- 1853? 2nd Avenue SE – no address currently assigned, owned by adjacent property owner

**Discussion:** Below is an overview of the regulations and guidelines that apply to the development of vacant lots, as well as the Commission’s role in reviewing new construction/infill development within the Local Historic Districts.

**Chapter 18-Historic Preservation of the Municipal Code**
The update to Chapter 18 (adopted on May 14, 2017) stipulates that new construction within a Local Historic District must be reviewed by the Commission. More specifically, for building permits to be issued the Commission must approve a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA).

**Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts**
In reviewing new construction projects within the Local Historic Districts the Commission should turn to the Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts (Guidelines) for guidance in the decision making process. Currently, the Guidelines mention very little about infill development. However, infill is generally discussed in the streetscape section of the Guidelines (page 22). While there is some guidance about setbacks and discouraging demolition, there is not much listed about what makes infill compatible with the neighborhood.

Updating the Guidelines is an initiative in the Historic Preservation Plan (HPP). The HPP provides guidance on what a good set of historic preservation design guidelines should include. Specifically, the HPP recommends the inclusion of context-specific guidelines for infill in historic districts. The inclusion of this guidance should be explored as part of the update to the Guidelines.
Chapter 32-Zoning of the Municipal Code
Chapter 32-Zoning of the Municipal Code outlines what can be built and where, identifies what types of uses (e.g. residential, commercial) are allowed, influences how projects look (e.g. landscaping), and specifies bulk and height requirements. The zoning code also outlines the powers and duties of the City Planning Commission, which is responsible for providing recommendations to the City Council on a variety of issues, including planning initiatives, zoning regulations, requests to rezone land, site development plans, conditional use requests, and the subdivision of land. The City’s Development Services Department would review any applications for new construction within the Local Historic Districts to ensure compliance with the City’s zoning code. The Development Services Department would also facilitate any non-administrative review processes, such as a review by the City Planning Commission.

The City is currently working on a comprehensive update to the zoning code, known as ReZone Cedar Rapids.

Conclusion: The HPC relies on the Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts to make informed decisions. Since the current Guidelines do not provide much guidance for new construction and infill projects, staff would like to the HPC’s thoughts and comments related to design, materials (including alternate materials), and other considerations that would enhance the guidance related to new construction.

Attachments: Map of currently vacant lots in the Local Historic Districts.