City of Cedar Rapids  
*Historic Preservation Commission*

Community Development & Planning Department, City Hall, 101 First Street SE, Cedar Rapids, IA 52401, 319-286-5041

---

**MEETING NOTICE**

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

4:30 P.M.  
Thursday, August 24, 2017  
in the  
Five Seasons Room, City Services Center  
500 15th Avenue SW, Cedar Rapids, Iowa

---

**AMENDED 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) Demolition Applications (30 minutes)  
      i. 1708 4th Avenue SE – Primary Structure, *Private Property*  
      ii. 1869 Ellis Boulevard NW - Primary Structure, *City Owned Property*  
      iii. 2120 E Avenue NE – 12x24 Accessory Structure, *Private Property*  
      iv. 1919 Park Avenue SE – 16x20 Accessory Structure, *Private Property*  
      v. 1242 30th Street SE – 19x22 Accessory Structure, *Private Property*
   b) Certificates of Appropriateness (15 minutes)  
      i. 1316-1320 3rd Avenue SE – Installation of a rear yard fence
   c) Prioritization of Areas Recommended for Intensive Survey (30 minutes)

4. Discussion Items (30 minutes)  
   a) Update to historic district guidelines  
   b) Historic Preservation Commission Bylaws  
   c) Recognition of Outgoing Commissioner

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](mailto: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, August 10, 2017 @ 4:30 p.m.
Five Seasons Conference Room, City Services Center, 500 15th Avenue SW

Members Present:    Mark Stoffer Hunter      Chair
                    Amanda McKnight-Grafton
                    Tim Oberbroeckling
                    Ron Mussman
                    Barb Westercamp
                    Caitlin Hartman

Members Absent:    BJ Hobart
                    Todd McNall
                    Heather Sundermann

City Staff:                Jeff Hintz, Planner
                            Iván Gonzalez, Planner
                            Anne Kroll, Administrative Assistant

Call Meeting to Order
•    Mark Stoffer Hunter called the meeting to order at 4:31 p.m.
•    Six (6) Commissioners were present with three (3) absent.

1. Public Comment
•    There was no public comment.

2. Approve Meeting Minutes
•    Amanda McKnight Grafton made a motion to approve the minutes from July 27, 2017. Tim
    Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Action Items
a) Certificates of Appropriateness
i. 336 18th Street SE – installation of two (2) vinyl windows
   •    Jeff Hintz stated that this project is for the installation of one vinyl window on the south and east
        elevation for a total of two (2) windows installed on the property. Mr. Hintz shared photos of
        where the windows are located (on the back and side of the property) as well as the Historic
        District Guidelines for windows and the Historic District Guidelines Prioritization. Staff
        recommends approval of the application because none of the windows would be installed on a
        priority location per Page 6-7 of the Guidelines, the distance from the right-of-way is significant,
        there is no grille pattern to match to other windows, the proximity to adjacent structures limits
        visibility of windows, and installation would occur on non-priority locations. These factors in
        combination together, mitigate any adverse impacts on the building and historic district in
        general.
- Tim Oberbroeckling asked the applicant if she asked for an estimate for wood windows. The applicant stated that wood windows would cost $1400 more.
- Tim Oberbroeckling asked staff if the applicant could apply for funding from the Historic Rehabilitation Program should she decide to replace windows in the front of the property as they would have to be wood windows. Jeff Hintz stated that she could apply now, but applications will not be reviewed until February 2018.
- Amanda McKnight Grafton made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of two (2) vinyl windows at 336 18th Street SE because of their location at the back and side of the property. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion and commented that other windows closer to the street would be less likely to be approved if they were vinyl. The motion passed unanimously.

b) Demolition Applications under Review
   i. 1414 B Avenue NE - Primary Structure, Private Property
- Amanda McKnight Grafton recused herself from discussion and voting.
- Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that the house will not be moved, but salvage is in the works as there are still historic elements that need to be removed. Keeping the property on hold until it is released on August 22, 2017 will not impact Coe College’s demolition schedule.
- The Commission agreed to keep the hold on the property.

c) Prioritization of Area Recommended for Intensive Survey
- Jeff Hintz stated that prioritizing a list of areas which were identified for intensive survey in the Citywide Survey is Initiative 5.1.a of the Historic Preservation Plan and is also a task in the HPC 2017 Workplan. This is a discussion that took place at the last meeting and the Commission decided that all members should rank the fourteen (14) areas on their own and bring that to this meeting. Since there is not a full Commission in attendance, a decision can be made at the next meeting if the Commission would prefer.
- Ron Mussman asked about the boundaries of the recommended areas and if they could be changed or made larger. Jeff Hintz stated that if the Commission feels there are properties that should be included then they can be added, but it could cost more to survey additional properties.
- Ron Mussman asked about the funding for the surveys. Jeff Hintz stated that the City would apply for a CLG Grant. This is a State funded grant where ninety-nine (99) Iowa counties compete for about $90,000. In most cases, they only award $10,000 for each project chosen with a few exceptions.
- Caitlin Hartman asked if the City is relying one hundred (100) percent on the grant money. Jeff Hintz stated that the City will have to have funding for it as well, including staff time, but he is not sure the exact amount. Iván Gonzalez added that the CLG grant requires sixty (60)/forty (40) participation from the City, but the City typically funds more than that.
- Amanda McKnight Grafton suggested that staff send out the spreadsheet of areas so that Commission members can send it back to staff filled out with their rankings before the meeting. Staff can then set a new ranking based on those results.
- Barb Westercamp made a motion to table this item until the August 24, 2017 meeting so that Commission members have more time to rank the areas and so that more Commission members are involved to get the most accurate ranking of areas to survey. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
d) Letter of Support for Cedar Rapids Historic Sites and Districts Identification System
   • Jeff Hintz stated that the Iowa Chapter of the American Planning Association (APA) gives out awards for best practices at their annual conference. Staff is applying for the award for the Cedar Rapids Historic Sites and Districts Identification System and is asking for a letter of support from the Commission. Staff can write up a draft letter for the Chair to edit and sign.
   • The Commission asked questions about the map viewer and gave some ideas for improvement. Jeff Hintz will follow-up with IT.
   • Tim Oberbroeckling made a motion to approve staff writing the letter with input and approval from the Chair and submitting that letter to the Iowa Chapter of the APA. Amanda McKnight Grafton seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Caitlin Hartman left the meeting at 5:23 p.m.

4. Discussion Items
   a) Update to Historic District Guidelines
      • Jeff Hintz stated that the subcommittee had their last meeting and updated some of the language in the draft document. Once staff receives a template from the City’s graphic designer they will copy and paste the draft into that template. The draft will then be sent to the full Commission for review and then to stakeholders for their review.

   b) Historic Preservation Commission Bylaws
      • Tim Oberbroeckling suggested that all officers have the same term amount that can be served instead of just the Chair. The Commission agreed that a maximum of six (6) years should be listed for all Officers.
      • Amanda McKnight Grafton and Ron Mussman shared various items where language from the original document should be added back into the draft as well as areas where the language needed clarification for better understanding.
      • The Commission discussed Commissioner attendance and ways to improve it.
      • Staff will revise the draft and highlight the changes requested by the Commission for the August 24, 2017 meeting.

5. Announcements
   • Jeff Hintz stated that he, Mark Stoffer Hunter, and a Public Works employee will be doing the utility locates for the historic markers. All of the posts and plaques have been ordered and are ready for installation. There will be an unveiling media event on September 13, 2017 in front of the Bethel AME Church. Staff will send out the information to the Commission.

6. Adjournment
   • Barb Westercamp made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:17 p.m. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anne Kroll, Administrative Assistant II
Community Development
Background and Previous HPC Action: The City Assessor information indicates the housing unit to be assessed at just over 34,000 dollars. The home was recently purchased by the current owner after the previous owner sold the property due to difficulty finding tenants to occupy the building. At this time, no future plans have been formally submitted, but the owner has indicated the desire to establish a daycare at the neighboring property to the west. Anything that is salvageable will be saved prior to demolition.


Historic Eligibility Status: Eligible

Explanation (if necessary): This property was originally identified in the 1994 *Historical and Architectural Reconnaissance Survey Report for CDBG Neighborhoods in Cedar Rapids*. The 1994 survey did recommend this area for intensive study, which occurred. The property was intensively surveyed and determined eligible under Criteria C.

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

Explanation (if necessary):

Recommendation: Immediate release.

Rationale: A single-family residence is not in the future plans of the owner.
Historic Preservation Commission Agenda Item Cover Sheet

Meeting Date: August 24, 2017

Property Location: 1869 Ellis Blvd NW
Property Owner/Representative: City of Cedar Rapids
Owner Number(s): Demolition Contact: John Riggs 286-5981
Year Built: 1956
Description of Agenda Item: ☒ Demolition Application ☐ COA ☐ Other

Background and Previous HPC Action: This property was recently acquired by the City and removal of the structure is necessary to allow for the construction of the Flood Control System. Until the construction begins in this area, the lot will be seeded and maintained as grass.

City Assessor Information on the parcel:

Historic Eligibility Status: Eligible ☐ Not Eligible ☒ Unknown ☐ N/A ☐
Explanation (if necessary):
The 2009 Beverly Hill Additions Architectural Reconnaissance Survey identified this property as Not Eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

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): Demolition of the structure once a bid had been awarded.

Recommendation: Immediate release.

Rationale: Determined not historic for state or national significance in an intensive level survey. The structure generally lacks character defining features that would be significant at the local level.
Historic Preservation Commission Agenda Item Cover Sheet

Meeting Date: August 24, 2017

Property Location: 2120 E Ave NE
Property Owner/Representative: Peter Wilcox
Owner Number(s): 319-560-9705 Demolition Contact: Self
Year Built: 1935
Description of Agenda Item: ☒ Demolition Application ☐ COA ☐ Other

Background and Previous HPC Action: The structure subject to demolition is the 12x24 garage built in 1935 per the City Assessor. The future plan is to rebuild after the demolition; 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.
Historic Preservation Commission Agenda Item Cover Sheet

Meeting Date: August 24, 2017

Property Location: 1919 Park Avenue SE
Property Owner/Representative: David Meaney 847-736-9285
Owner Number(s): Demolition Contact: Action Garage Builders 319-364-4800
Year Built: 1922
Description of Agenda Item: ☒ Demolition Application ☐ COA ☐ Other

Background and Previous HPC Action: The structure subject to demolition is the 16x20 garage built in 1922 per the City Assessor. The future plan is to rebuild after the demolition; any development would go through the land development process.

City Assessor Information on the parcel: http://cedarrapids.iowaassessors.com/parcel.php?parcel=142218101000000

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 recommended for intensive survey. The survey does not mention accessory structures, but generally focuses on primary structures.

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: August 24, 2017

Property Location: 1242 30th Street SE
Property Owner/Representative: Greg Sundberg
Owner Number(s): 319-560-2224  Demolition Contact: Same
Year Built: 1928
Description of Agenda Item: ☒ Demolition Application  ☐ COA  ☐ Other

Background and Previous HPC Action: The structure subject to demolition is the 22x19 garage built in 1928 per the City Assessor. The future plan is to rebuild after the demolition; any development would go through the land development process.

City Assessor Information on the parcel:
http://cedarapids.iowaassessors.com/parcel.php?parcel=142617701400000

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.
To: Historic Preservation Commission
From: Jeff Hintz, Planner II
Subject: COA Request at 1316-1320 3rd Avenue SE
Date: August 24, 2017

Owner Name: St. Paul’s United Methodist Church

Address: 1316-1320 3rd Avenue SE

Local Historic District: Second and Third Avenue Historic District

Year Built: 1881 and no structure on the lot at 1320

Description of Project: Installation of 6 foot chain link fence to match the existing fence at 1320 3rd Avenue SE. A shed was moved which formed this section of fence; the request is to fill the 15 foot gap as shown below. The fence will match what currently exists (see left image below).

Installation of a CertainTeed brand vinyl fence which is 6 feet high with a gate as shown below. This fence will simulate a cedar surface and be colored a “weathered blend” to match the trim on the adjacent learning center connected to the church. Where the fence will run is depicted in the image on the right below.

1320 3rd Avenue SE gap in fencing
1316-1320 Fencing
Information from Historic Surveys on property: The 1995 Site Inventory Form from the District Nomination survey lists the property addressed as 1316 as “good.” The defining features listed include: complex roof including intersecting gambrel and gable forming an ell and a 2-story hipped roof porch in the ell; hipped bay window section on front; medium width clapboards and square-cut shingles in gambrel; Paladian window with tracery in each window and four rows of shingles over the semi-circular arch; ocular window in gambrel peak; enclosed porch with double-hung sash, closed balustrade and smooth columns-lower and shuttered openings-upper. 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:
   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

Excerpt(s) from Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts Applicable to Project: Fences

Recommended:
- Wooden picket fence
- Opaque privacy fence
- Maximum of 6 feet high in the rear and side yards
- Maximum of 3 feet high in the front yards

Not Recommended:
- Chain link fence
- Metal fence

Analysis: This project would occur is 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.

It is also noteworthy that neither of these projects for fencing would alter anything on a building. The accessory buildings in the rear of the property are not mentioned in the site inventory form, based on their construction it is highly doubtful they are contributing structures. Concealing them from view with a fence would likely be beneficial to the historic district as a whole given where the vinyl fence would go is literally the edge of the historic district boundary.

The playground fencing is to close in a gap left by the removal of an accessory structure which effectively completed the fencing. It would look out of place to require a wood style fence to close in this 15 foot gap and have the remainder of the fence as chain link. Additionally, visibility into the play area is required for supervisory purposes and safety of those who are within the play area. Concealing this area from view would not be in the best interests of the operation taking place on the parcel at 1320 3rd Avenue SE, nor would it be beneficial for the overall aesthetics of the area. Staff would not recommend a chain link style fence for the entire property if there were no fence there at all; however, this is not the case and the existing fence is not proposed to be removed. The property was fenced several years ago and the fence which would fill the existing gap will match what is presently there. If the lot had no fencing at all, staff would recommend some sort of ornamental metal fence, such as a wrought iron style. For a gap this small however, staff recommends approval of the chain link fencing to match what exists on the lot now.

The vinyl fencing at the rear of 1316 3rd Avenue SE would provide a benefit to the aesthetics of the area given the visibility of the property from Second Avenue SE. The fence would screen the accessory buildings and provide a shield of the current view. While the accessory buildings are not dilapidated, service type buildings and maintenance areas can look more presentable when screened.

The distance to the fence from Second Avenue is significant to where the vinyl fence would be located. It is also noteworthy that there is a similar style fence at 845 First Avenue SE adjacent to the Ausadie Building, currently the City’s only local historic landmark. The fence is approximately 10 feet from the front property line and readily visible from the sides of the building. This fence fits in with the style of the Ausadie and the same would be expected here. This fence is adjacent to an alleyway at the rear of the building; there is certainly much less traffic through an alleyway in this location as opposed to the Ausadie Building along First Avenue.

The applicant has taken care to pick a material which is simulating the appearance of wood and having the color tie in with the trim of the main building. This rear location will now focus as the main entrance to St. Paul’s, and concealing the accessory buildings is a positive enhancement for the area in general. While the guidelines do not explicitly say a vinyl fence is recommended, the guidelines also do not discourage a vinyl fence either. At the time the guidelines were
originally authored, this type of material was not as prevalent as it is today. The overall style and attention to detail by the applicant when making this proposal is important; the intent of the guidelines and historic preservation in general, is to have the buildings and other historical elements remain for future generations to enjoy. This proposal effectively has no impact on anything which is of historical significance in the historic district. Even if the fence is not constructed, the view of historic elements would remain the same due to the presence of the accessory buildings.

The view below is taken from the sidewalk on Second Avenue, the sheds are readily visible, but the chain link fencing is fairly well hidden given the color choice of the material and the color of the surrounding building. While not invisible, this fence does blend in well with the surroundings. The vinyl fence would be noticeable, but would also hide the maintenance type functions which are currently in this area. The applicant is aware a wood fence would be allowed and could be permitted immediately, but has some concerns with the long term maintenance and durability. The question for the Commission related to the vinyl fence is essentially, which is more of an aesthetically appealing entrance to the historic district: several unscreened accessory buildings or a vinyl fence simulating the appearance of cedar wood material.

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

**Attachments:** Application from applicant and fencing information.
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: St. Paul's United Methodist Church</td>
<td>Name/Company: Dale Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 1340 Third Avenue SE</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:mooredale@imomnail.com">mooredale@imomnail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Cedar Rapids</td>
<td>Address: 3508 River Ridge Ct NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State: Iowa</td>
<td>City: Cedar Rapids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip: 52403</td>
<td>State: Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 319-363-2058</td>
<td>Zip: 52402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Address of Property where work will occur: Same as Owner

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

Project Description and Location on the property/structure (please be as detailed as possible):
Part 1 - Install approximately 15 lineal feet of 6 ft high brown chain link fence to finish enclosure of existing playground. A storage shed formed this section of fencing, but was recently removed.
Part 2 - Install approximately 68 lineal feet plus a 10 foot double gate of vinyl fencing to improve visual appearance of property adjacent to the alley. The second avenue entrance is now the main entrance and visual appearance is important.

Description of existing materials (e.g. wood, metal, asphalt shingles):
Part 1 - New material will match existing.

Description of proposed materials (e.g. wood, metal, asphalt shingles):
Part 2 - The proposed fencing is CertainTeed brand Bufftech Imperial style with textured cedar surface. Color is Weathered Blend to match existing building trim.

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:
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:
Vinyl fencing will be less maintenance than wood. Potential graffiti can be cleaned off of the vinyl will wood would need to be painted.

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
PART 1 – Area requiring 15 LF of chain link fence to match existing playground fencing.

Part 2 – Screening fence to improve visual appearance will begin at corner of furthest shed and extend eastward for 58’ and turn diagonally to intersect playground fencing. Fencing will hide appearance of storage sheds and provide more security.
Semi-Private
A versatile option that complements any setting

Imperial Select Cedar Texture

Thru-picket “good neighbor” design is equally attractive on both sides. Top rails in ColorLast® colors feature reinforcement for added strength and durability.

Heights: 4’, 5’ & 6’ (5’ & 6’ include midrail)
Picket Style: 7/8” x 3”
Picket Spacing: 7/16”

Imperial Smooth Finish

Heights: 3’, 4’, 5’ & 6’
(5’ & 6’ include midrail)
Picket Style: 7/8” x 3”
Picket Spacing: 7/16”
The Bufftech® Advantage

Long-lasting beauty, superior performance and the best protection you can get — that’s the Bufftech Advantage.

The difference starts with details.

**Precision Routing**
Assures a clean, realistic look without visible glue or screws.

**Heavyweight Pickets**
Provide impact resistance and reduces movement.

**Internal Reinforcement**
Limits sagging and maintains a strong and sturdy performance.

Shown here:
Chesterfield CertaGrain Texture in contrasting colors: Brazilian Blend posts and rails with Frontier Blend pickets.

Color & Texture

CertainTeed sets the standard for the latest innovations in sophisticated styling. From our proprietary texturing process to our unique shades and stain blends, CertainTeed is the undisputed leader in color and texture. Whether you want the look and feel of natural wood or an easy-to-maintain, economical alternative to stucco walls, Bufftech has a vinyl fence to complement any setting. Plus, Bufftech is virtually maintenance-free, and never needs staining or painting. For complete style and color specifications, see page 32.
Performance

Bufftech’s premium features, including high-quality raw materials, reinforced rails, heavyweight pickets, routed rails and fence posts, and concealed fasteners, ensure it will outlast and outperform other vinyl fences.

Backed by CertainTeed’s exclusive WindZone™ performance, Bufftech fence is engineered for use in high wind and hurricane conditions, as approved by Miami-Dade County NOA #12-1106.11*. Recognized as the most stringent standards in the country, Miami-Dade test protocols include dynamic wind load testing up to 115 mph.

The Bufftech line also meets requirements of the ASTM and includes styles that comply with local codes for swimming pool applications. Check with your local building code official as local codes may vary.

*Miami-Dade County-approved NOA #12-1106.11, for exceptional performance in high wind conditions. To comply with WindZone Performance, additional items are needed for installation. Please reference our product catalog. Expires 3/13/2018.

Peace of Mind

CertainTeed stands behind the Bufftech line with an exceptional lifetime limited transferable warranty. SureStart™ protection, an exclusive CertainTeed benefit, covers warranted repair and replacement costs—including labor, for five years after installation.

CertainTeed also guarantees the performance of Bufftech’s darker colors and stain blends with our proprietary ColorLast® fade protection, a state-of-the-art acrylic formulation that provides superior protection from the harsh rays of the sun.

CertainTeed is actively pursuing strategies to reduce our environmental impact, while increasing the sustainability of our operations and products. (see back cover for complete third-party testing information).

A company you can trust.

For more than 100 years, homeowners and building professionals alike have relied on CertainTeed as a trusted source of innovative, high-quality building products. Bufftech continues this long-standing tradition with its superior vinyl fencing line, proudly made in the U.S.A.
Date: August 24, 2017
To: Cedar Rapids Historic Preservation Commission
From: Jeff Hintz, Planner II Community Development Department
Subject: Prioritization of Areas Recommended for Intensive Survey

Background: The HPC work plan for 2017 as well as the Historic Preservation Plan (HPP) identify prioritizing a list of areas which have been identified for intensive surveys in the Citywide Historic and Architectural Reconnaissance Survey. This initiative is identified in the HPP as initiative 5.1.a on PDF page 25 of the plan. This was slated to be completed within 23 years of plan adoption as indicated on PDF page 44 of the HPP. An initial ranking was included in the plan, by quadrant on PDF pages 142-143.

The table below identifies the 20 areas from the Citywide Survey which a written narrative was provided. Those areas highlighted in yellow were not recommended for an intensive survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HPP Priority</th>
<th>Number on Map</th>
<th>Draft Overall Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 Belmont Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 East Highlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 North Highlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Rapids Township</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Greene and College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 Clarendon Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Noelridge Plat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Bever Park &amp; Woods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 Northview 1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Coon McNeal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Ridgewood Addn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 Eastland Manor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Coe College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Mosher’s Addn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 Mound Farm Addn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Mount Mercy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Country Club Addn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Kenwood Plat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Vernon Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Midway Park Addn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ranking of the areas recommended for intensive survey in the HPP was not intended to be final, but used as starting point for discussion. The ranking by quadrant in the HPP is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NW Quadrant Area Name</th>
<th>HPP Priority</th>
<th>Number on Map</th>
<th>Draft Overall Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Highlands - First Avenue - C Avenue NW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapids Township - E Avenue NW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Highlands - B Avenue NW - E Avenue NW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NE Quadrant Area Name</th>
<th>HPP Priority</th>
<th>Number on Map</th>
<th>Draft Overall Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coon-McNeal Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northview First Addition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene &amp; College First Addition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coe College Campus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Mercy*</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mount Mercy was unintentionally omitted in the original plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SE Quadrant Area Name</th>
<th>HPPPriority</th>
<th>Number on Map</th>
<th>Draft Overall Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country Club Heights Additions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bever Park Additions and Bever Woods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgewood Addition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Heights*</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Vernon Heights was unintentionally omitted in the original plan*

**Analysis:** A draft overall priority for all of the areas would be the recommended approach, regardless of quadrant. As money becomes available to conduct surveys, it will not be looked at on a quadrant basis, but an overall basis. The purpose of this initiative is to rank these areas for intensive survey, staff would recommend taking this overall approach and that is how the recommendation below has been formulated.

The HPP on PDF page 68 does offer some guidance, the last bullet point on the Identification Issues Summary reads:

“Priority should be given to surveying, with emphasis placed upon areas that are targeted for redevelopment, or where pressure for demolition is anticipated.”

The areas south of Brucemore and north of Mount Vernon road have been a topic of discussion for potential survey by the HPC for the past several years. While not targeted for redevelopment or under any pressure for demolition, they are areas likely to yield a historic district per the Citywide Survey. The remaining areas staff has taken a shot at ordering based off HPC conversations and where demolitions have occurred or been discussed over the past several years.

It is important to remember the overall cost of surveying an area when thinking about ranking areas. The amount of areas recommended for intensive survey here will likely take several years and a significant amount of money to be completed. The downtown historic district intensive survey and National Register of Historic Places Nomination (NRHP) cost just over $61,000 dollars to complete. The Citywide survey, which was not intensive and covered a wide swatch of the City at a much more general level, but also did not include a NRHP nomination, cost just under $45,000 to complete. While it is important to prioritize these areas, it is unlikely more than 2-3 (given the differences in geographic areas) areas on the attached map could be surveyed in a year.

**Recommendation:** The draft overall priority to the right of each table is by no means finalized, but is something to help start the discussion and finalize a list for prioritization of surveying.

This ranking is fluid and as surveys are completed, funding becomes available or priorities change, the list can and should be revisited as we look at the HPP and HPC work plan annually.

**Attachment:** Map of areas with written narrative from the 2014 Citywide Survey
Background: The current Historic Preservation Commission bylaws were adopted and have been in place since 1994. Since that time, many changes have occurred to City Government in Cedar Rapids. The draft of the proposed bylaws removes duplication of items addressed in recently adopted Chapter 18 of the City Municipal Code. The bylaws are formatted similarly to those of the City Planning Commission.

A brief overview of the changes between the current bylaws and the proposed bylaws includes the following:

- Removal of the duplication under responsibilities that exists between Chapter 18 and the current bylaws. The proper spot for responsibilities of the Historic Preservation Commission is in Chapter 18.
  - This was removed due to the inclusion of them in Chapter 18.

- Removal of the secretary position. Chapter 18 allows for a Chairperson and a Vice-chairperson.
  - This position was removed to create consistency with the makeup of other City Boards/Commissions.

- The remaining changes are related to consistency with the wording amongst other boards/commissions the City has. The general operations and how the Historic Preservation Commission conducts business currently, would not be impacted.
  - These changes were also made to ensure consistency with other Boards/Commissions.

At the August 10 meeting, the Commission provided staff with guidance and some other additions to the bylaws. Those requested changes are provided in the attachment and indicated with red lettering; proposed removals are also in red, but with a strikethrough.

Next Steps: Staff will send the final version along with written notice to all the Commissioners at least 10 days prior to the September 14 meeting. At the September 14 meeting, the bylaws will be considered for adoption by the Historic Preservation Commission.

Attachment: Draft of proposed bylaws of the Historic Preservation Commission
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION BYLAWS

Adopted August, 1994
Amended MONTH xx, 2017

I. ORGANIZATION
A. Establishment

The Historic Preservation Commission (the “Commission”) was established under Section 18.03 of the Municipal Code (the “Code”) of the City of Cedar Rapids, Iowa (the “City”).

B. Responsibilities

The Commission shall have the responsibilities provided in the Section 18 of the Code.

II. RULES

The Commission establishes the following procedural rules:

A. Offices

At its first regular meeting of the calendar year, the Commission shall elect from its membership a Chairperson and a Vice-Chairperson. No individual shall be chairperson or vice-chairperson for more than sixteen consecutive years.

1. Powers and Duties of Offices.
   a. Chairperson.
      i. Preside at meetings.
      ii. Call special meetings.
      iii. Sign official documents.
      iv. Establish committees, appoint members thereto and select chairpersons thereof.
      iv-v. See that all actions of the Commission are properly taken and carried out.
b. **Vice-Chairperson.** During the absence, disability, disqualification of the Chairperson or following removal of the Chairperson, the Vice-Chairperson shall exercise the duties of the Chairperson.

2. **Removal of Officers.** The Commission may remove an officer during a hearing by a two-thirds supermajority vote. Any such removal shall be accompanied with a written statement stating reasons as to why the officer is being removed. The officer who is being removed shall be provided an opportunity to respond to the statement of reasons for removal during the hearing on the matter, prior to the vote being taken.

3. **Replacement of Officers.** If an office becomes vacant, the Commission shall elect a member at the next regular meeting to serve the unexpired term of the vacated office.

4. **Temporary Absence of Officers.**
   a. **Temporary Appointments.** In the event of the temporary absence or following removal of an officer, the Chairperson may appoint another member to serve temporarily.
   b. **Order of Succession.** In the absence of both officers and a temporary Chairperson, the Commission shall elect a member to serve as temporary Chairperson for that meeting.

B. **Ad Hoc Committees**

The Chairperson may establish committees for a stated purpose, and appoint committee members and chairpersons, subject to Commission approval. The Chairperson may appoint non-members of the Commission to any committee, but the non-members shall not vote. The Chairperson shall may be a member of all any committees and may also choose to appoint a committee chair, who is a member of the Historic Preservation Commission, for all ad hoc committees on which they are not a part. All committees shall make timely reports of their findings and recommendations to the Commission.

Committee meetings shall be scheduled and conducted in compliance with the Iowa Open Meetings Law.

C. **Meetings**

1. **Time and Place.** Commission meetings shall be noticed at least 24 hours in advance and the agenda shall include the topics of discussion and action and also include the time and place of the meeting.

2. **Notice.** Commission meetings shall be open to the public and scheduled and conducted in compliance with the Iowa Open Meetings Law. Closed sessions may be held as provided by law.

3. **Quorum.** In order for the Commission to act, a quorum of over 50% of the members must be present.

4. **Voting.** A majority vote of members present and voting is required for Commission action. Voting shall be by show of hands, and each member’s vote will be recorded. If a member is present and voting, the member's failure to vote will be counted as an
affirmative vote. When a roll call vote is taken, the Chairperson may vote and if doing so, shall vote last.

5. **Roberts Rules of Order.** A modified “Demeter’s Manual of Parliamentary Law and Procedure” is hereby incorporated into these Bylaws as Appendix A, and shall be followed by the Commission.

6. **Minutes.** Meeting minutes shall be kept and subsequently approved by Commission action, signifying that the minutes are accurate and complete. The minutes shall record the members’ attendance, recusal for conflict, and votes. Once approved, the minutes shall become part of the public records of the Commission.

D. **Reports and Records**

The Commission shall provide for the safekeeping of all plans, reports, maps, data, and other pertinent material collected. The Commission shall provide likewise for its records, including minutes, correspondence, official documents, maps, plats, applications, petitions, and similar matter referred to the Commission. Such reports and records are public records and shall be open to inspection at reasonable times and upon reasonable notice.

E. **Meeting Attendance by Members**

If a member is absent from three consecutive meetings or more than 25% of all meetings during one calendar year, the Chairperson or in the event of a conflict real or perceived, the chairperson’s designee, who shall be a member of the Commission, shall inquire with the member whether such absences may continue in the future. If it appears that such frequent absences may continue, or if the absences do continue, the Chairperson may request removal of the member through the City Manager’s office.

If a member knows in advance that he/she will be absent from a meeting, then the member shall provide the staff 24 hours’ notice.

F. **Conflict of Interest**

When a member has a Private Financial Interest, as defined in Code § 6.22(c)(9), in a matter before the Commission, the member shall state before the Commission considers the matter that a conflict exists and that the member is recusing himself or herself from participation. Following recusal, the member shall not participate in discussion and voting on that matter and must sit with the general public or leave the room while the Commission considers the matter. The minutes shall note the member’s statement of recusal and compliance with this provision.

III. **AMENDMENT**

These Bylaws may be amended by a majority vote of members present and voting at any meeting, scheduled and conducted in compliance with the Iowa Open Meetings Law, at which a quorum is present, provided that at least 10 days prior to said meeting a written notice has been sent to Commission members containing a copy of the proposed amendment or change and also identifying the location, time and place of such meeting.
Appendix A

Rules of Order

The following procedures are based primarily, but not entirely, on the “Demeter's Manual of Parliamentary Law and Procedure” and have been established to assist with the manner in which meetings are conducted and, when utilized should help to: (1) establish orderly procedure; (2) protect the opinion of the minority and (3) express the will of the majority.

A. RESPONSIBILITY OF OFFICERS

1. The chairperson shall act as the presiding officer of a committee.

2. It is the Chairperson’s responsibility to maintain order and conduct meetings with the proper decorum. This includes recognizing those people in attendance who want to address the Commission.

3. The Chairperson shall preside with impartiality, and should not debate motions while presiding. If the chairperson wishes to debate, the duty of presiding should be surrendered to another impartial party, (preferably the Vice-Chairperson), until another topic on the agenda is presented for discussion.

4. The Chairperson may vote at any time but it is wise to vote last and only when the result would be altered by creating or breaking a tie.

5. The Chairperson should use the gavel sparingly and only to:
   A. call the meeting to order;
   B. maintain or restore order;
   C. give to someone who is temporarily acting as a chairperson; and/or
   D. give to his/her successor in office.

6. Except for those items specifically referred to the Commission by the City, (either through the City Council or another City Department) the Chairperson shall also generally have the responsibility for establishing the items to be considered on the meeting agenda. Any additional items that any Commission member wants the Commission to consider should be submitted verbally or in writing, prior to the meeting, either (1) Directly to the Chairperson for possible inclusion on the agenda, or (2) to the Community Development Department, which will inform the Chairperson for possible inclusion. Agenda items may be identified as “new business” at a Commission meeting for later consideration. A show of hands should be used to determine if there is support to consider the topic so identified at a later meeting.

B. VOTING

A Commission member, may at their option, abstain from voting.

If a vote of the Commission should result in a tie, without a simple majority decided, the motion for which the vote was taken shall be tabled, thereby allowing the Chairperson to continue with business.
No vote shall be taken at a meeting until it is determined that a quorum of the Commission is present.

C. BASIC PROCEDURES FOR MOTIONS:

The following outlines the basic procedure that should be utilized for a motion to be made, seconded and voted upon:

1. A commission member raises their hand for recognition by the Chairperson.

2. The Chairperson recognizes the Commission member thereby giving them the floor to address the Commission.

3. The Commission member states his or her motion to be considered by the Commission.

4. Another Commission member seconds the motion that has been made. The purpose of this second is to determine if there is support for discussion on the subject. Any motion, therefore, which fails to receive a second, will be laid to rest by the Chairperson enabling the Commission to move onto another motion.

5. The Chairperson then calls for the discussion on the motion (it should be noted some types of motions described under section D, do not need or allow for discussion to take place).

6. Following discussion (and approval of any other motions with a higher priority including, but not limited to, motions to amend, postpone, table, or call the question), the Chairperson calls for the vote.

7. The Chairperson announces the result of the vote.

D. TYPES OF MOTIONS:

Commission motions are ranked in a hierarchy of priority from low to high (as outlined below, motion 1 has the lowest priority, while motion 10 has the highest). A motion for an amendment (number 2) for example would take precedence over a main motion (number 1) and a motion to adjourn (number 10) would take precedence over all other motions.

1. Main motion:

   Use: To introduce a specific subject for consideration. Only one main motion may be considered at a time and when no other business is pending.
   
   - Requires a second
   - May be debated
   - May be amended

2. Motion to Amend:
Use: To change or improve upon a main motion. Amendments are voted upon separately and prior to voting on the main motion. Amendments must be pertinent to the main motion.

- Requires a second
- May be debated
- May be amended (an amendment may be amended only once. There is no limit, however, to the number of amendments that may be made to a main motion).

3. Motion to postpone indefinitely:

Use: To test the strength of a main motion; to kill a main motion. A motion which is postponed indefinitely cannot be brought up for consideration again unless it is introduced as a new motion at a later.

- Requires a second
- May be debated

4. Motion to Postpone to a Definite Time:

Use: To set a time for consideration of the subject; usually the next meeting.

- Requires a second
- May be debated
- May be amended

5. Motion to Limit or Extend Debate:

Use: To set a definite length of time for debate, to set the length of speech per debater. The Chairperson may on his/her own initiative apply limitations if there are no objections.

- Requires a second
- May not be debated
- May be amended

6. Motion to Call the Question:

Use: To terminate all further debate and amendments and vote on the main motion immediately.

- Requires a second
- May not be debated
- May not be amended
7. Motion to Table:

Use: To lay the main motion, as well as any motion affecting the main motion, aside temporarily. Business that has been tabled does not automatically come before the Commission again. A motion to take from the table can prevail no later than the meeting where approved, otherwise it must be introduced as a new subject for consideration at a later meeting.

- Requires a second
- May not be debated
- May be amended

8. Motion to Recess:

Use: To suspend business temporarily; usually for a designated time period such as five, ten, or fifteen minutes. The Chairperson may use his/her own initiative to declare a recess, if there are no objections.

- Requires a second
- May not be debated
- May be amended

9. Incidental motions:

May consist of the following:

a. Point of Order. To call attention to a possible infraction of the Commission’s by-laws.

- Does not require a second
- May not be debated
- Chair determines appropriate action

b. Question of information to secure information concerning a main motion or the Commission’s by-laws.

- Does not require a second
- May not be debated
- Chair determines appropriate action

c. Appeal a decision. To secure a reversal of a decision by the Chair.

- Requires a second
• May be debated
• May be amended

10. Motion to Adjourn:

Use: To bring the meeting to a close. In the event of an emergency or when a quorum has been lost, the Chairperson shall declare the meeting adjourned.

• May be proposed at any time after the meeting is called to order
• Requires a second
• May not be debated
• May be amended
• Does not require a quorum
• Announcements may be made only after a motion to adjourn has been approved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rules for Motions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type Of Motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Main Motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Postpone Indefinitely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Postpose To A Definite Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Limit Or Extend Debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Call The Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Recess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Incidental Motions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Point Of Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Question Of Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commission motions are ranked in hierarchy of priority from low to high (as indicated in the following, motion 1 has the lowest priority ranking, while motion 10 has the highest). A motion for an amendment (“2”) for example, would take precedence over a main motion (“1”) and a motion to adjourn (“10”) would take precedence over all other motions. Any type of motion may be reconsidered, where appropriate.