MINUTES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING,
Thursday, May 11, 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
Todd McNall
Ron Mussman
Caitlin Hartman
Mark Stoffer Hunter

Members Absent: BJ Hobart
Sam Bergus
Barb Westercamp

City Staff: Jeff Hintz, Planner
Anne Russett, Planner
Jennifer Pratt, Community Development Director
Anne Kroll, Administrative Assistant

Call Meeting to Order
- Amanda McKnight Grafton called the meeting to order at 4:36 p.m.
- Seven (7) Commissioners were present with three (3) absent.

1. Public Comment
- There was no public comment

2. Approve Meeting Minutes
- Tim Oberbroeckling made a motion to approve the minutes from April 27, 2017. Ron Mussman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Action Items
   a) Certificate of Appropriateness
      i. 355 19th Street SE – installation of a wrought iron fence
         - Jeff Hintz stated that this project is for the installation of a wrought iron fence in the front yard of the property along the sidewalk. Mr. Hintz shared a photo of where the fence will be placed, proposed materials, Historic District Guidelines for fences, and criteria for the decision. Staff recommends approval of the application because the proposal is consistent with past approvals, not all metal fencing is the same as this is ornamental metal fencing, the style of this fencing compliments the style and architecture of the building, and the proposed fence is more complementary to the building than the fencing recommended in the Guidelines.
Bob Grafton made a motion to approve the COA for the installation of a wrought iron fence at 355 19th Street SE. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

ii. 1610 2nd Avenue SE – installation of ten (10) vinyl windows

- Jeff Hintz stated that this project is for the installation of vinyl windows on the rear elevation of the house and on the back half of the side elevations for a total of ten (10) windows. Mr. Hintz shared photos of the property and where the windows are located, the proposed materials, the Historic District Guidelines for windows, and the criteria for the decision. Staff recommends approval of the application because the proposal is consistent with past approvals, 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, applicant researched the Guidelines and past approvals when submitting application with this proposal, there is no grille pattern to match to other windows, and the proximity to adjacent structures limits visibility of windows. These factors in combination together mitigate any to adjacent structures limits visibility of windows.
- Bob Grafton made a motion to approve the COA for the installation of ten (10) vinyl windows at 1610 2nd Avenue SE because they are at the back and back half of the sides of the house, there are no defining architectural features or grill patterns on the windows, the size of the windows will not change, the applicant did his research on past approvals, and the current windows are in bad shape. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Item 4.b was considered next.

4. Discussion Items
b) Historic Preservation Plan Goals and Policies related to Archeology

- Ron Mussman stated that since the 2008 Flood there have been multiple archeological studies done on both sides of the river. Mr. Mussman would like to have visualization of all of the sites and suggested adding a password protected layer to the GIS database that would mark those sites to help City staff when new developments arise in these areas. Mr. Mussman shared concerns of other departments not having this information.

Todd McNall arrived at the meeting at 4:59 p.m.

- Anne Russett stated that is a good idea and that staff can compile documents and start a development process for the GIS database, though it will take some time. The database has been shared with and is used by other City departments.

3. Action Items
b) Demolition Applications
i. 1307 10th Street NW – 26X22 Accessory Structure, Private Property

- Jeff Hintz stated that this property was built in 1940. It was surveyed in 2009 and deemed not eligible. This property is not believed to be historically significant and staff recommends immediate release. The intent of Chapter 18 is not to target garages lacking ornate features. This building style and character is not consistent with other carriage house in the City. Mr. Hintz reviewed historic significance and the demolition review process.
- Tim Oberbroeckling made a motion to approve the demolition application for a 26X22 accessory structure at 1307 10th Street NW. Mark Stoffer Hunter seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
c) Demolition Applications under Review
   i. 530 Cobban Court SE – hold expires June 27, 2017
      • Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that he and Bob Grafton were able to view the interior of the
        property. There was not much architectural detail inside and it does not meet the criteria to keep
        this property on hold.
      • Mark Stoffer Hunter made a motion to lift the sixty (60) day hold on the property at 530 Cobban
        Court SE. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Discussion Items
   a) Prioritization of Historic Resources
      • Jeff Hintz shared a list of one hundred and thirty-eight (138) properties compiled by staff with
        properties sent by Commission members as well as a map of their locations. The list of
        properties has eligibility and assessor condition information.
      • The Commission discussed how to get all of the properties on the list without the list being too
        large.
      • Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that instead of listing each property within the Historic Districts the
        actual District should be labeled as one item. Any individual property outside of those Districts
        can be listed separately. Amanda McKnight Grafton added that if there are specific properties
        within the district that have been threatened by demolition then they could be listed separately.
      • Bob Grafton stated that the list could be separated by quadrant to make four (4) smaller lists.
      • Mark Stoffer Hunter asked staff to include the districts in the map and have it labeled and color-
        coded.

c) Update to Historic District Guidelines
   • Amanda McKnight Grafton stated that Commission members were asked to bring product
     samples for discussion at the last meeting. There are no samples to share at this time.

5. Announcements
   • Jeff Hintz stated that the first round of plaques for the historic marker project is being reviewed.
     The posts have arrived and are being stored in one of the garages at the City Services Center. The
     Commission would like to have a ribbon cutting and dedication when the first marker is put
     in.

6. Adjournment
   • Tim Oberbroeckling made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 5:53 p.m. Bob Grafton seconded
     the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anne Kroll, Administrative Assistant II
Community Development
Historic Preservation Commission

May 11, 2017

Certificate of Appropriateness

355 19th Street SE

Project Description

Installation of a four foot wrought-iron fence in the front yard of the property along the sidewalk.

View From Street

Materials

Historic District Guidelines

Fences

Recommended:
- Wooden picket fence
- Opaque privacy fence
- Maximum of 6 feet high in the rear and side yards
- Maximum of 5 feet high in the front yards

Not Recommended:
- Chain link fence
- Metal fence
Criteria for Decision

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.

Analysis

Staff recommends approval of the application.

– Proposal is consistent with past approvals.
– Not all metal fencing is the same
  • This is ornamental metal fencing
– Style of this fencing compliments the style and architecture of the building (Tudor Revival Style)
– Proposed fence is more complementary to the building than the fencing recommended in the Guidelines

Actions

1. Approve as submitted; or
2. Approve with modifications agreeable to the applicant; or
3. Deny the application; or
4. Request additional information.

If denial is chosen by HPC, specific reason(s) why need to be included

Certificate of Appropriateness
1610 Second Avenue SE

Project Description

Installation of vinyl windows on the rear elevation of the house and on the back half of the side elevations; this would be 10 total windows.

South Elevation
From Sidewalk
Prioritization

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.

Criteria for Decision

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.
Analysis
Staff recommends approval of the application.
– Proposal is consistent with past approvals.
– None of the windows would be installed on a priority location per Page 6-7 of the Guidelines.
– Distance from the right-of-way is significant
  • 45 feet from sidewalk on side elevations
  • 70 feet from a parked vehicle
  • 250 feet to First Avenue

Analysis
– Applicant researched Guidelines and past approvals when submitting application with this proposal.
– No grille pattern to match to other windows
  • Depth and shadowing is minimized with no grilles
– Proximity to adjacent structures limits visibility of windows.

These factors in combination together, mitigate any adverse impacts on the building and historic district in general.

Actions
1. Approve as submitted; or
2. Approve with modifications agreeable to the applicant; or
3. Deny the application; or
4. Request additional information.

If denial is chosen by HPC, specific reason(s) why need to be included

Demolition Review
1307 10th Street NW
26x22 Garage Structure

1307 10th Street NW
• Built 1940
• Property Surveyed in 2009
  – Not Eligible
• Not believed to be historically significant
• Immediate release

1307 10th Street NW
• Intent of Chapter 18 not to target garages lacking ornate features
• Building style and character not consistent with other carriage houses in City
Historic Significance

18.02(T) Cedar Rapids Municipal Code – Historic Significance:
1. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
2. Associated with the lives of significant persons in our past; or
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
4. Yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.

Demolition Review Process

1. Determination of Historic Significance
   - 2a. Not Historically Significant
   - 2b. Historically Significant
     - Release Property
     - 60-day hold if HPC wishes to explore options (e.g. photo doc) with property owner
     - Release property if HPC does not wish to explore options

Background

February 9 – HPC elected to send properties to Staff

The list included as an attachment has historic eligibility and assessor condition information

Prioritization List

Results

Table 1: Historic Eligibility Status of Submitted List of Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Criteria</th>
<th>Total Number of Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NRHP Listed in a district or individually</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible as determined by Intensive Survey or SHPO</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended for Intensive Survey</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Surveyed</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Eligible for Listing</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

Table 2: Assessor’s Condition of Submitted List of Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition Criteria</th>
<th>Total Number of Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Normal</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Normal</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed/No Data</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

Table 3: Assessor’s Condition of Historically Eligible or Listed Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition Criteria</th>
<th>Total Number of Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Normal</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Normal</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed/No Data</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Researching Sites

Use the list in your packet to become familiar with the list.

Demonstration of two City Websites to help
1. Assessor Parcel Viewer
2. Assessor Parcel Search

Next Steps

June or July – Discussion item with HPC after members have had a chance to review