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 (60 Minutes)
   a) Demolition Applications
      i. 400 Wright Brothers Boulevard E – Primary Structure and 20’x36’ Wood Barn, Private Property
      ii. 800 3rd Avenue SE – Primary Structure, Private Property
      iii. 824 3rd Avenue SE- Primary Structure, Private Property
      iv. 4607 F Avenue NW- Primary Structure and 1938 garage accessory structure, Private Property
   b) Certificate of Appropriateness Applications
      i. 1816 Park Avenue SE – Replacement of windows

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 4:35 p.m.
- Five (5) Commissioners were present with three (3) absent.

1. Public Comment
- Cindy Hadish reminded the Commission that the School Board meets on December 11, 2017 for a presentation on a plan for Cedar Rapids school buildings.

2. Approve Meeting Minutes
- Barb Westercamp made a motion to approve the minutes from November 9, 2017. Ron Mussman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Barb Westercamp noted that for attendance two (2) absent should be one (1) absent.

3. Action Items
a) Certificates of Appropriateness
i. 1815 Blake Boulevard SE – Replacement of windows
- Jeff Hintz stated that this project is for the installation of vinyl windows on the rear elevation of the house and on the side elevations for a total of ten (10) windows. No existing windows facing the street will be replaced. Mr. Hintz shared pictures of the elevations of the property and the materials that will be used. There will be no resizing of the window openings. Mr. Hintz shared the Historic Preservation Guidelines for windows, Guideline prioritization, and the criteria for the decision. Staff recommends approval of the application because the project does not alter any defining features of the structure, the view of the windows is somewhat masked by surrounding properties and tree cover, and the application does mitigate for any adverse impacts.
• The Committee discussed the cost of wood windows versus vinyl and the historic rehabilitation program with the applicant.
• Todd McNall noted that the depth of the windows is different between the types of windows and SHPO prefers the wood windows because of the depth.
• Heather Sundermann noted that she does not agree with the philosophy that vinyl windows could be approved on historic homes regardless of their location on the home.
• Todd McNall made a motion to approve the COA for replacement of windows at 1815 Blake Boulevard SE. Barb Westercamp seconded the motion. The motion passed with Heather Sundermann opposing.

ii. 1816 Park Avenue SE – Replacement of windows
• Iván Gonzalez stated that this project is the replacement of eleven (11) existing windows from the side and rear of the house. No existing windows facing the street will be replaced. Mr. Gonzalez shared pictures of the elevations of the property and the materials that will be used. This property has three (3) existing vinyl windows. There will be no resizing of the window openings. Mr. Gonzalez shared the Historic Preservation Guidelines for windows, Guideline prioritization, and the criteria for the decision. Staff recommends approval of the application because the project does not alter any defining features of the structure, the view of the windows is somewhat masked by surrounding properties and tree cover, and the application does mitigate for any adverse impacts.
• The Commission had questions for the applicant about the color of the proposed windows and what the plan is for the storm windows. Because the applicant was not in attendance, the Commission decided to table the discussion until the applicant could attend a meeting.
• Amanda McKnight Grafton made a motion to table the discussion until the applicant can attend a meeting to answer the Commission’s questions. Todd McNall seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

b) Demolition Applications
i. 3010 Center Point Road NE – Primary Structure, Private Property
• Jeff Hintz stated that this property was built in 1915. The area was surveyed in the 2014 Citywide Survey and was not recommended for further study. Staff recommends immediate release because renovation is not economical for owner, the house is currently inhabitable, and the area is not recommended for intensive survey. The applicant relayed to staff that the home has extensive termite damage and is held together with one (1) by fours (4) instead of two (2) by fours (4).
• Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that he has not had time to finish his historic research as well as photo documentation and asked staff what the applicant’s timeline is. Jeff Hintz stated that he is unsure of the timeline, but with the winter months approaching it is likely that the applicant will want to do demolition as soon as possible. The Commission can place a hold on the property for any amount of time up to sixty (60) days. Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that he could complete the research within a week.
• Amanda McKnight Grafton made a motion to place a hold on 3010 Center Point Road NE until December 7, 2017 so that Mark Stoffer Hunter can finish historic research and photo documentation. Todd McNall seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
4. Discussion Items
   a) Historic District Guideline Update
      • Jeff Hintz stated that the Guidelines are completed and will be sent to the Commission for review before a stakeholder meeting takes place.
      • The Commission discussed an article in the appendix of the Guidelines and decided to keep the article, but to remove the photos that accompany the article.

5. Announcements
   • Jeff Hintz stated that staff has been in contact with the Cedar Rapids School District and that they are willing to present their plan to the Commission at a meeting in December 2017.
   • Mark Stoffer Hunter noted that the Commission could meet on December 28, 2017 if the school district is unable to attend the December 14, 2017 meeting.

6. Adjournment
   • Barb Westercamp made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 5:28 p.m. Heather Sundermann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anne Kroll, Administrative Assistant II
Community Development
Historic Preservation Commission Agenda Item Cover Sheet

Meeting Date: December 14, 2017

Property Location: 400 Wright Brothers Boulevard E
Property Owner/Representative: College Community School District –Duane (319)848-5214
Owner Number(s) (319)848-5214 Demolition Contact: Dave Schmitt Construction
Year Built: Home – 1900 Barn - 1920
Description of Agenda Item: ☒ Demolition Application ☐ COA ☐ Other

Background and Previous HPC Action: Assessor data indicates the home to be in poor condition and the barn to be in below normal condition. A single family residence and farmstead is not in the future plan of the School District.

City Assessor Information on the parcel: http://cedarrapids.iowaassessors.com/parcel.php?parcel=192235100100000

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

The City of Cedar Rapids does not currently have survey information on this property; it has never been surveyed for historic significance. Given the criteria below, it is not believed historical events or persons are associated with the structures or the site.

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: Farmstead is not in the future plans of the school district. Home has been prepared for demolition and is poor condition; interior finishes have been completely removed. The barn is not the type of construction that would allow it to be moved.
Historic Preservation Commission Agenda Item Cover Sheet

Meeting Date: December 14, 2017

Property Location: 800 3rd Avenue SE
Property Owner/Representative: MedQ – Phil Wasta
Owner Number(s): (319) 361-8620 Demolition Contact: DW Zinser (319) 846-8090
Year Built: 1940 (1983 addition)
Description of Agenda Item: ☒ Demolition Application ☐ COA ☐ Other

Background and Previous HPC Action: The future plan is to develop a park on the property once the current structure is demolished. The property was acquired on November 21, 2017 by the MedQ after working with staff at the History Center to complete some initial documentation on the building. Interior investigation has shown significant historical integrity has been lost as hardly any of the original structure remains.

City Assessor Information on the parcel: http://cedarrapids.iowaassessors.com/parcel.php?parcel=142147700100000

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

The property is listed as contributing to the 2nd Avenue SE Automobile Row Historic District, which was added to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) in September of 2015. This district is not listed for architectural significance, but for events. In a discussion with SHPO about this property it was confirmed the property is indeed contributing; since the property is in a district, the threshold to be a contributing structure is lower. This property would not be individually eligible for the NRHP.

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: Substantial modifications to the structure; it looks nothing like a 1940 automobile era building, which would tie the property to the historic events related to the district. No single event of historic importance is associated with this individual property. While not ideal to lose contributing structures in a historic district, there are several surviving buildings associated with the historical events and broad patterns of history related to the automobile in Cedar Rapids and this historic district.
Historic Preservation Commission Agenda Item Cover Sheet

Meeting Date: December 14, 2017

Property Location: 824 Third Avenue SE
Property Owner/Representative: St. Luke's Methodist Hospital
Owner Number(s) Demolition Contact: D.W. Zinser Company
Year Built: 1885
Description of Agenda Item: ☒ Demolition Application ☐ COA ☐ Other

Background and Previous HPC Action: The structure subject to demolition is a 2-story, 1,949 sq. ft. house built in 1885 per the City Assessor. Assessor data indicates the home to be in below normal condition.

City Assessor Information on the parcel:

Historic Eligibility Status: Eligible ☒ Not Eligible ☐ Unknown ☒ N/A ☐
Explanation (if necessary):
The City of Cedar Rapids does not currently have survey information on this property; it has never been surveyed for historic significance. Given the criteria below, it is not believed historical events or persons are associated with the structures or the site.

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: Consider placing a demolition hold if historically significant.

Rationale: Rebuilding a house is not in the future plans of the hospital. House has been prepared for demolition and is below normal condition; interior finishes have been completely removed.
Historic Preservation Commission Agenda Item Cover Sheet

Meeting Date: December 14, 2017

Property Location: 4607 F Ave NW
Property Owner/Representative: Diane Spicer
Owner Number(s): (319)929-0599  Demolition Contact: Charley Stark – 319-551-0174
Year Built: 1928
Description of Agenda Item: ☒ Demolition Application ☐ COA ☐ Other

Background and Previous HPC Action: The structure subject to demolition is a 1-story, 873 sq. ft. house built in 1928 per the city assessor. Assessor data indicates the home to be in below normal condition. Detached accessory structure is also subject to demolition built in 1938 per the assessor. Assessor data indicates the accessory structure to be in below normal condition.

City Assessor Information on the parcel: http://cedarrapids.iowaassessors.com/parcel.php?parcel=132433100100000

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

The City of Cedar Rapids does not currently have survey information on this property; it has never been surveyed for historic significance. Given the criteria below, it is not believed historical events or persons are associated with the structures or the site.

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 structure is in poor condition and has sustained major water damage from the topographical orientation of the area. Property owner’s opinion is that it is not habitable. Future plans for the parcel is not to rebuild but to landscape in order to mitigate the water drainage issue.
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.
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

**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
**Owner Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>BECKWOODS LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>1245 1701 2ND AVE, S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>C.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>52403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>(319) 923-2487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bart@prime-companies.com">bart@prime-companies.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Applicant Information (skip if owner)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Company</th>
<th>BART WOODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>SAME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Address of Property where work will occur:** 1916 PARK AVE, S.E.

**Project Type:**
- [x] 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):**

W O O D F R A M E D  W I N D O W S - D O U B L E H U N G

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

V I N Y L  I N S U L.  W I N D O W S - D O U B L E H U N G

**Will you be permanently removing architectural detailing/ornamentation from the exterior of the structure (e.g. corbel(s), trim, molding, newel post caps)?**

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

If Yes, describe what architectural detailing/ornamentation you are removing and why:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I BELIEVE THE HISTORIC REQUIREMENTS HAVE BEEN CHANGED TO ALLOW VINYL REPLACEMENT WINDOWS ON THE SIDES &amp; BACK OF A HOUSE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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
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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 (WOCOD) option available
• Project Type: new construction and replacement
• Warranty: limited lifetime

Back to Top ▲