
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, December 10, 2015

in the

Training Room, City Hall

101 First Street SE, Cedar Rapids, Iowa

AGENDA

Call Meeting to Order

1. Public Comment

Each member of the public is welcome to speak and we ask that you keep your comments to five (5) minutes or less. If the proceedings become lengthy, the Chair may ask that comments be focused on any new facts or evidence not already presented.

2. Approve Meeting Minutes

3. Action Items

- a) Certificates of Appropriateness (60 minutes)
 - i. 348 16th Street SE – replacement of roof on the house
 - ii. 1602 Park Avenue SE – replacement of roof on garage and house
 - iii. 1837 and 1841 Grande Avenue SE – window replacement

- b) Demolition Applications (5 minutes)
 - i. 1215 2nd Street NW – *City owned property*

4. New Business (25 minutes)

- a) Overview of the Vacant and Neglected Building Ordinance and Building Services Enforcement Activities

5. Knutson Building Update (15 minutes)

6. MOA/LOA Project Updates – (if necessary) (5 minutes)

7. Announcements

8. Adjournment

MINUTES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING,
Thursday, November 12, 2015 @ 4:30 p.m.
Training Room, City Hall, 101 First Street SE

Members Present: Amanda McKnight-Grafton Chair
Todd McNall
Bob Grafton
Ron Mussman
Pat Cargin
Tim Oberbroeckling
Mark Stoffer Hunter
Barb Westercamp
Sam Bergus
Caitlin Hartman

Members Absent: BJ Hobart

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

Call Meeting to Order

- Amanda McKnight Grafton called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m.
- Ten (10) Commissioners were present with one (1) absent.

1. Public Comment

- No public comment

2. Approve Meeting Minutes

- Barb Westercamp made a motion to approve the minutes from October 22, 2015. Todd McNall seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Action Items

a) Certificates of Appropriateness

i. 1730 2nd Avenue SE – Rear Addition

- Jeff Hintz stated that this project involves the removal of the existing mudroom due to rotting and deterioration. The existing footprint would be rebuilt with five feet additional width and the additional width would not be visible from the street. Mr. Hintz shared pictures of the house showing where the proposed expansion will be as well as the district guidelines for additions. The Commission has the following options: 1) approve the application as submitted, 2) approve with modifications (only if all changes are agreeable to applicant), or 3) disapprove application (to be used if changes are not agreeable). Staff

recommends option 1 because the proposal is what is recommended within the guidelines. The basis for the recommendation are that the project is on the least important side of the structure, the applicant is using matching materials, the matching roof shows congruence and harmony with the structure, there is no intrusion on design of original structure, and the project is a positive change for the property as it is keeping the structure in use and in livable condition.

- Bob Grafton stated that the expansion will be to the east. The electrical service mast and meter box will be shifted slightly to the east also to accommodate the clearances for the structure. This house was built in 1910 and it is on floating footings which has been compromised by a leaking roof. Because of that, the applicant will not extend beyond the visual plane of the house on the west side. The roof will match the pitch of the bay window.
- Pat Cargin made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the rear addition at 1730 2nd Avenue SE as presented. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

b) Demolition Applications

i. 820 Wilson Avenue SW – Private Property

- Jeff Hintz stated that the property was built in 1920 and has been surveyed in the 2014 Citywide Survey and the 2008 Young’s Hill Kingston Survey and deemed not eligible. Staff recommends immediate release. The adjacent owner has acquired this property and has plans to expand their yard. The house has been empty since at least 2004 and has no utilities hooked up to it. Photo documentation is allowed.
- Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that he plans to do photo documentation within the next five days. There is no evidence that this house is especially historic and there are a lot of tiny houses in this neighborhood.
- Barb Westercamp made a motion to approve the demolition application for 820 Wilson Avenue SW after Mark Stoffer Hunter has completed photo documentation. Sam Bergus seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

c) Knutson Building

- Jennifer Pratt stated that, in October 2012, the City entered into a purchase agreement for the sale of the Knutson Building and took possession in February 2013. The City paid \$1.5 million for the land, building, and business relocation. The purpose of the sale was to remove the metal scrap operation which was not compatible with the new amphitheater. Ms. Pratt stated that clarification was made in the November 2015 Condition Assessment Report that “the extent of the damages now observed within and throughout the building are characteristic of long-term deterioration, occurring over several years. The roof, window and door openings were likely in poor repair prior to the city taking possession of the building, based on the results observed”. In January of 2002, the City Assessor’s record indicated that the Knutson building is in poor condition.
- Ms. Pratt discussed the following recent activities:
 - March 24, 2015 - Second Request for Proposal Round initiated to determine financially feasible of renovation.
 - April 13, 2015 - Three responses received; evaluation team recommended KHB.
 - May 28, 2015 – Recommendation from HPC to prepare Conditions Assessment and cost estimate for both stabilization and full renovation.
 - June 9, 2015 – City Council authorized the Conditions Assessment and Cost Estimates.

- September 22, 2015 – City Council adopts the Historic Preservation Plan, the guiding policy document for preservation.
 - Goal 1: A Sustainable community supported by preservation efforts
 - Preservation of historic resources promotes economic, environmental, cultural, and social sustainability.
 - Goal 9: Public appreciation of Cedar Rapids’ diverse history and its historic resources
 - Knutson Building represents an opportunity to expand awareness of Cedar Rapids’ history and historic properties.
 - Initiative 7.4a – Develop an endangered property WATCH list
 - Implementation of this initiative will allow for the prioritization of the community’s historic resources.
- Ms. Pratt discussed the assessment results:
 - No structural concerns were observed on the exterior masonry walls.
 - Stabilization and mothballing of the building until renovation occurs is possible.
 - Cost Opinions:
 - Stabilization \$167,448 initial expense
 \$16,200 annual expense
 - Renovation Ranges from \$2,175,000 to \$4,800,000
 comparisons of \$145 to \$320 per sq. ft.
- Ms. Pratt shared the two options for the Commission:
 - Option 1 – Stabilization
 - \$167,448 project cost estimate
 - \$16,200 annual upkeep
 - \$100,000 increased cost of Flood Control System levee alignment
 - Risks:
 - Completion of stabilization before winter weather is challenging.
 - If funding is not obtained for the full restoration, the stabilization expense may be considered wasted.
 - Community Benefits:
 - Preservation of historic building, one of the oldest commercial buildings on the west side of the Cedar River.
 - Time to identify funding sources, such as fundraising, to off-set cost of renovation.
 - Option 2 – Demolition
 - \$400,000 project cost estimate
 - eligible for Flood Control System grant funding
 - Risks:
 - Permanent loss of historic building
 - Community Benefits:
 - Avoids on-going liability and maintenance costs.
 - Opportunity for cost-effective future development
- Ms. Pratt stated that the next steps are the recommendation from the HPC during this meeting and City Council consideration on November 17, 2015.
- Bob Grafton asked how long it would take for the RFP process to gather bids for the mothballing and stabilization. Ms. Pratt stated that staff is concerned about the pending weather so there may be options to do emergency repairs. Staff will be looking into that since there is a lot of time that goes into the standard procurement process.

- Ron Mussman asked if staff has spoken to KHB about the structure report. Ms. Pratt stated that staff has not. Mr. Mussman asked if KHB's bid is still valid or are there time limits. Ms. Pratt stated that are not time limits, but staff's recommendation to council is going to be not to go with the private proposal. If Council does want to go with a private developer then staff would initiate those discussions. Mr. Mussman asked if staff's only recommendation is what HPC is recommending. Ms. Pratt stated that staff will give Council both options as presented here and share HPC's recommendation as well. In this case, staff is not making a recommendation.
- Mark Stoffer Hunter stated that he appreciates the follow through to have this report done as the HPC requested and having consideration made for this historic building. Mr. Stoffer Hunter stated that this building is important to Cedar Rapids history and is a top priority in the adopted Historic Preservation Plan. Mr. Stoffer Hunter thinks that with stabilization, there is a real opportunity to gage the support of the community. How much is the community willing to invest and help save this building?
- Ron Mussman asked if staff has been in contact with SHIPO about Section 106. Anne Russett stated that it is not subject to Section 106. Mr. Mussman disagrees and thinks SHIPO might disagree as well because there is a permit from the Army Corps on the rivers of Iowa that would apply to historic context. Ms. Russett stated that staff has had conversations with the State, FEMA, and the Army Corps regarding this. The Army Corps is at the opinion that when they moved forward with Flood Control they looked at all possible impact. If the City Council decides to move forward with demolition based on the input from the Army Corps, it would not be subject to Section 106. Mr. Mussman would like staff to reach out again because he has talked to SHIPO and has gotten a different response.
- Barb Westercamp asked if the time period for the mothballing is indefinite. Ms. Pratt stated that right now it is indefinite.
- Bob Grafton asked if staff has considered state and federal tax credits. Ms. Pratt stated that stabilization will give staff time to look into all resources.
- Todd McNall stated that KHB had a valid plan with valid costs estimates. Mr. McNall wanted it noted that KHB did use a structural engineer as part of their proposal. Mr. McNall stated that the Knutson Building was designed by a local architect and the materials of the building are from local masons. The City Council recently adopted the Historic Preservation Plan and, as far as Mr. McNall is concerned, saving this building is the right first step taken after adoption.
- The Commission stressed the importance of City Council adopting the Historic Preservation Plan, which received an award, and moving forward with saving this building.
- Amanda McNall Grafton stated that there is a small fraction of buildings and properties left in this time period and the HPC does not want to lose one more.
- Todd McNall made a motion that the HPC recommend option 1 of stabilization to the City Council and that City staff pass along the comments made by the HPC at the November 17, 2015 City Council meeting. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
- Ms. Pratt stated that staff will follow up with SHIPO on the Section 106 questions as well as reach out to KHB.
- Amanda McKnight Grafton asked that when the opportunity for additional funding comes up with City Council that there be examples given as to what those might be, such as fundraising or tax credits.

Jennifer Pratt left the meeting at 5:17 p.m.

~~4. New Business~~

~~a) Overview of the Vacant and Neglected Building Ordinance and Building Services Enforcement Activities~~

5. MOA/LOA Project Updates

- Anne Russett stated that all three nominees for the National Register have been reviewed and approved by SHIPO and submitted to the National Park Service.
- Anne Russett stated that staff is doing training on the City's Preservation Plan and the new GIS Web Application for Historic Resources on December 1, 2015. Two trainings will be open to the public at the Cedar Rapids Public Library in the Whipple Auditorium at noon and 5:30 p.m.
- Bob Grafton asked if the MOA/LOA for signage has been closed out because there is a missing sign in the median of 3rd Avenue, Grande Avenue, and 16th Street SE. Jeff Hintz stated that staff will look into that.

6. Announcements

- Barb Westercamp stated that she talked to Dawn Stevens, who lives in the Luther Brewer House that was moved in April 2014, and that they are living in the house and have had a lot of work done to it. Ms. Stevens is trying to put together a Luther Brewer collection that would be open to the public. If anyone has anything for the collection Ms. Westercamp will pass along Ms. Stevens' contact information. Ms. Stevens would also be glad to speak about the process of moving a house. Amanda McKnight Grafton stated that Ms. Stevens would be a great speaker for the showcase.
- Todd McNall asked to have a discussion concerning HPC's interest in doing a Local Historic Landmark District in the 3rd Street/16th Street area added to a future agenda.
- Bob Grafton stated that the Frankie House is sitting on its foundation, but the porch will need to be repaired as it has loosened from the house after the move.

7. Adjournment

- Barb Westercamp made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 5:27 p.m. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anne Kroll, Administrative Assistant II
Community Development



Community Development and Planning Department
City Hall
101 First Street SE
Cedar Rapids, IA 52401
Telephone: (319) 286-5041

To: Historic Preservation Commission Members
From: Jeff Hintz, Planner II
Subject: COA Request for 348 16th Street SE
Date: December 10, 2015

Applicant Name(s): Len Staab
Owner Name: Len and Kay Staab
Address: 348 16th Street SE
Local Historic District: Redmond Park- Grande Avenue Historic District
Legal Description: BEVER PARK 2ND N 50' LOT 7 & W 13.9' N 50' STR/LB 8 14
Year Built: 1905

Description of Project: Reroofing the house with texture grey metal, the same color which is there presently.

Information from Historic Surveys on property: 1995 Site Inventory Form from the District Nomination survey lists the property as "good." The defining features are listed as side-gable roof with single gable wall dormer on right side of front (has pent roof effect); flat roofed sleeping porch projecting over hipped front porch on right side of front; medium width siding-lower and square-cut shingles-upper with beltcourse between; front porch extends across front with heavy battered columns (upper half fluted) extending to ground; balustrade has 2"x2" balusters narrowly spaced with vertical board design in porch skirting; windows are double-hung with entrance off-center beneath sleeping porch; large circular, Neo-Classical window in wall dormer; 1/1 double-hung flanked by quarter-round windows in peaks of side-gable ends. The property contributes to the historic district and is individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

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.

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

Roof and Roof Elements:

Recommended:

- Asphalt shingles or composition shingles
- Replacing oval gutters with a modern equivalent

Not Recommended:

- Roll roofing, metal roofing, or clay shingles
- Covering cornices, eaves, soffits or fascia with vinyl or metal elements
- Removal of dormers
- Removal of non-functioning chimneys

Analysis: The proposal does not seek to change any design elements on the roof, so the pitch and character of the overall roof structure would remain the same. The submitted proposal does seek to change the roofing material from a recommended material (asphalt, albeit in the form of diamond cut asphalt shingles) to a material that is not recommended, metal texture roofing. The color would stay the same as what is currently on the structure; color is not something that is subject to review but the texture, style and material of the roof certainly is and this analysis will focus on that.

The site inventory form does make mention of the “square-cut shingles upper with beltcourse between.” This is one of the most unique roofing patterns in the historic district and is not all that common in Cedar Rapids or the local historic districts. It is not the only one of its kind by any means, but preservation and restoration of it should be done if at all possible given how unique it is. Restoration and repair is what is generally recommended for defining features, if that is all possible in this instance it would be recommended. If repair of damaged elements is not possible, it may prove difficult and costly to replicate this exact look and pattern using modern materials.

For that reason, repairing small sections with modern materials (or some of the leftover materials) that match that of the existing would be the ideal solution for the look of the structure and impact on the district; more importantly, repairing small sections that are in need of replacement could prove to be more cost effective to the owner. The letter from the owner does indicate there are a few of the shingles from the roof now in the garage on the property and that any assistance in locating a craftsman to repair the roof would be appreciated.

Staff Recommendation: **Continue the item** and assign a Commission liaison to work with the applicant and city staff to work towards a more agreeable solution. If a craftsman is located and can do a repair using the same materials and match the look of the roof now, the project would be eligible for administrative approval.

Alternative Staff Recommendation: Given that metal roofing is listed as not recommended within the Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts, if there is no scenario in which the Commission would be agreeable to a metal roof, the application could be **Disapproved** (denied).

Attachments: Application and letter from applicant.

House

B# 46381-2015

CEDAR RAPIDS HISTORIC DISTRICT APPLICATION

Department of Development, 3851 River Ridge Dr NE, Cedar Rapids, IA 52402, Phone 319-286-5041, Fax 319-286-5130

Owner Information Name <u>Len Staab</u> Address <u>348 16th St SE</u> City <u>CR</u> State <u>IA</u> Zip <u>52403</u> Phone <u>319-362-6373</u> <u>KANDTSTAAB@HOTMAIL</u>		Applicant Information Name <u>Len Staab</u> Company _____ Address <u>1609 Park Ave SE</u> City <u>CR</u> State <u>IA</u> Zip <u>52403</u> Home Ph <u>319-362-6373</u> Work Ph. _____	
Address of property where work is to be done: <u>348-16th St SE</u> ^{com}			
Project type: House <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> , Garage <input type="checkbox"/> , Shed <input type="checkbox"/> , Fence <input type="checkbox"/> , Addition <input type="checkbox"/> , other _____			
Project description <u>Repair or Replace Roof</u>			
Location: Describe where (what part of building, or where on property) work will be done <u>Street side from west</u> <u>Alley side from N & South side</u>			
Materials: Type and design to be used <u>Texture Grey metal</u> <u>Same Grey as Present</u>			
Estimates required: If you will not be using the same type of materials as already used on the building, then you must obtain two estimates using the existing material(s) and two estimates using the new material(s).			
Plans/illustrations: If major elements such as windows and doors are proposed for replacement, then drawings, photographs, or product literature for the proposed new elements must be submitted with the application. Large projects, such as building additions and new garages, require plans and elevations.			
Samples: Applicant must bring a sample of the material(s) to HPC meeting if a COA is required.			
Applicant's signature <u>Len Staab "Tony"</u>			

For Development Department use only:

Date Received:	Received by:	File No. _____
Redmond Park-Grande Avenue <input type="checkbox"/> Second and Third <input type="checkbox"/>	Contributing structure? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Key structure? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	CNME Issued? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No COA required? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Nov. 19, '15

Historic Committee,

Jeff Heintz RE: 348 16th St SE, 1602, 1601, 1609 Park Ave. SE

Hi Jeff, and Committee Members

We spoke briefly last Wednesday when we were applying for a Roof Repair or Replace on 4 Homes we own in the District.

Kay and I have lived in Wellington Heights for more years than I can remember and are proud of the fact we have Saved 4 Grand Properties from the Tax Collectors wrecking ball and have done so with our money. No grants, No Tax Credits, No Smarts, I guess.

Now we need some affordable direction from you and the Committee.

We received quite an education already. 4 Bids for 1602's new roof were 1. \$6075, 2. \$8500, 3. \$12000 with maybes. 4.\$26,764.. Same Roof.

No.1 Had a questionable reputation

No. 2 Has done great work for us before at 1524 5th Ave. SE

No. 3 was iffy without straight answers.

No.4 was a very good sales person, he better be.

We like No.2 and his Life Time Product to protect these Old Treasures, well, for a life time. A legacy for our kids.

We're looking for help from you in finding a craftsman to Repair the roof at 348, it has some kind of Grey Diamond Shape hard composition roofing? We found a few unused in the garage.... Or cover the roof with Grey Texture roofing metal No. 2 recommends, We'd like to hear any other suggestions, and or about Historic \$\$\$ to help pay for hefty expense of the above.

We like our Neighbor HOOD, have invested our life savings in the Neighborhood, Raised our kids in this Neighborhood, are believers in Saving not Bull Dozing the History of our Neighborhood and plan on staying in this Neighborhood through Thick and Sin.

Sincerely,

Kay

Tony

Kay and Len "Tony" Staab

1609 Park Ave. SE Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52403

Ph. 319- 362- 6373

tandkstaab@hotmail.com

PS Jeff, We'll do our best to get you a sample or Brochure explaining the Metal Product. It looks like the way to go to us.



Community Development and Planning Department
City Hall
101 First Street SE
Cedar Rapids, IA 52401
Telephone: (319) 286-5041

To: Historic Preservation Commission Members
From: Jeff Hintz, Planner II
Subject: COA Request for 1602 Park Avenue SE
Date: December 10, 2015

Applicant Name(s): Len Staab
Owner Name: Len and Kay Staab
Address: 1602 Park Avenue SE
Local Historic District: Redmond Park- Grande Avenue Historic District
Legal Description: BEVER PARK 2ND S 90' STR/LB 7 14
Year Built: Dwelling Unit – 1915 Garage - 1983

Description of Project: Reroofing of the garage and house with texture blue metal, the same color which is there presently.

Information from Historic Surveys on property: 1995 Site Inventory Form from the District Nomination survey lists the property as “fair.” The defining features are listed as *complex roof pattern with front-gable with deep, pent roof cornice returns facing Park Ave and 2-story low shed roof sleeping porch facing 16th St.*; narrow clapboard siding-lower and square-cut shingles-upper with brick foundation and decorative brick section on lower level; shallow, *low-pitched hipped roof veranda across front*; porch has piers resting on brick pedestals; balustrade is removed; windows are 1/1 double-hungs of various sizes with multi light uppers; also, fixed and casement style divided light sash; round arched window in brick section on right side facing front The property contributes to the historic district and is individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

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.

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

Roof and Roof Elements:

Recommended:

- Asphalt shingles or composition shingles
- Replacing oval gutters with a modern equivalent

Not Recommended:

- Roll roofing, metal roofing, or clay shingles
- Covering cornices, eaves, soffits or fascia with vinyl or metal elements
- Removal of dormers
- Removal of non-functioning chimneys

Analysis: The proposal does not seek to change any design elements on the roof, so the pitch and design would remain the same. The submitted proposal does seek to change the roofing material from a recommended material (asphalt) to a material that is not recommended, metal texture roofing. The color would stay the same as what is currently on the structure; color is not something that is subject to review but the texture and material of the roof certainly is and this analysis will focus on that.

There are various types of metal roofing on the market ranging from traditional corrugated metal to newer metal roofing materials which simulate the texture and look of traditional asphalt shingles. This product which simulates the appearance and texture of an asphalt roof is more recent; neither the local guidelines nor the National Park Service Preservation Briefs have considered the inclusion of newer style metal roofing on a visible roof on a historic structure which contributes to a historic district. If this were a flat roof not visible from the street, it would be much less of a concern. However, this roof is easily visible and as such, any material and texture changes need to be evaluated with caution.

The garage is not mentioned on the site inventory form, but it is visible from the street. City assessor records indicate *this garage was built in 1983*; the garage *should be treated differently* than the house because it is not historic. The way the garage is constructed, the roof actually faces away from the street and while visible, is not the first thing one sees when facing the garage.

The primary concern should be shown to the primary structure given that it is individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and is a contributing structure to the historic district. Until there is a materials sample or product catalog produced though, staff would be hesitant to make any recommendation on the matter. The letter to staff and the Commission which accompanies the application, does ask for some assistance and recommendations in getting this work done.

Staff Recommendation: At the time this report was compiled, a materials sample or product catalog depicting the project was not yet submitted. Until this is submitted, neither staff nor the Commission can be fully aware of what the applicant is proposing. Staff recommends **continuing the item** until such time this information has been provided. At this future meeting, the proposal could be fully understood and evaluated by the Commission.

Alternative Staff Recommendation: Given that metal roofing is listed as not recommended within the Guidelines for Cedar Rapids Historic Districts, if there is no scenario in which the Commission would be agreeable to a metal roof, the application could be **Disapproved** (denied).

A Commission liaison could be assigned to work with the applicant and city staff to work towards a more agreeable solution as well and the item should be **continued** to a future, specified meeting.

Attachments: Application and letter from applicant.

House

B# 46383-2015

CEDAR RAPIDS HISTORIC DISTRICT APPLICATION

Department of Development, 3851 River Ridge Dr NE, Cedar Rapids, IA 52402, Phone 319-286-5041, Fax 319-286-5130

Owner Information		Applicant Information	
Name	Len STAAB	Name	
Address	1609 Park Ave SE	Company	
City	C.R.	Address	
State	IA	City	
Zip	52403	State	
Phone	319-362-6373	Zip	
		Home Ph	
		Work Ph.	

Address of property where work is to be done: 1602 Park Ave SE

Project type: House , Garage , Shed , Fence , Addition , other _____

Project description: Repair & or Replace Roof

Location: Describe where (what part of building, or where on property) work will be done

North & South Facing Roof

Materials: Type and design to be used Textured Blue Metal
Same colour as house and
as presently

Estimates required: If you will not be using the same type of materials as already used on the building, then you must obtain two estimates using the existing material(s) and two estimates using the new material(s).

Plans/Illustrations: If major elements such as windows and doors are proposed for replacement, then drawings, photographs, or product literature for the proposed new elements must be submitted with the application. Large projects, such as building additions and new garages, require plans and elevations.

Samples: Applicant must bring a sample of the material(s) to HPC meeting if a COA is required.

Applicant's signature: Len STAAB "TOBY"

For Development Department use only:

Date Received:	Received by:	File No. _____
Redmond Park-Grande Avenue <input type="checkbox"/>	Contributing structure? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	CNME Issued? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Second and Third <input type="checkbox"/>	Key structure? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	COA required? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Det Garage

B # 46384-2015

CEDAR RAPIDS

HISTORIC DISTRICT APPLICATION

Department of Development, 3851 River Ridge Dr NE, Cedar Rapids, IA 52402, Phone 319-286-5041, Fax 319-286-5130

Owner Information	Applicant Information
Name <u>Len STAAB</u>	Name _____
Address <u>1602 Park Ave SE</u>	Company _____
City <u>CR</u>	Address <u>[Signature]</u>
State <u>IA</u> Zip <u>52403</u>	City _____
Phone <u>319-362-6393</u>	State _____ Zip _____
<u>7</u>	Home Ph _____
	Work Ph. _____

Address of property where work is to be done: 1602 Park Ave SE

Project type: House , Garage , Shed , Fence , Addition , other _____

Project description Repair / Replace roof as nec.

Location: Describe where (what part of building, or where on property) work will be done Roof from West and South view

Materials: Type and design to be used Texture Blue Metal
Same color presently. P

Estimates required: If you will not be using the same type of materials as already used on the building, then you must obtain two estimates using the existing material(s) and two estimates using the new material(s).

Plans/Illustrations: If major elements such as windows and doors are proposed for replacement, then drawings, photographs, or product literature for the proposed new elements must be submitted with the application. Large projects, such as building additions and new garages, require plans and elevations.

Samples: Applicant must bring a sample of the material(s) to HPC meeting if a COA is required.

Applicant's signature [Signature] "TONY"

For Development Department use only:

Date Received:	Received by:	File No. _____
Redmond Park-Grande Avenue <input type="checkbox"/>	Contributing structure? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	CNME Issued? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Second and Third <input type="checkbox"/>	Key structure? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	COA required? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Nov. 19, '15

Historic Committee,

Jeff Heintz RE: 348 16th St SE, 1602, 1601, 1609 Park Ave. SE

Hi Jeff, and Committee Members

We spoke briefly last Wednesday when we were applying for a Roof Repair or Replace on 4 Homes we own in the District.

Kay and I have lived in Wellington Heights for more years than I can remember and are proud of the fact we have Saved 4 Grand Properties from the Tax Collectors wrecking ball and have done so with our money. No grants, No Tax Credits, No Smarts, I guess.

Now we need some affordable direction from you and the Committee.

We received quite an education already. 4 Bids for 1602's new roof were 1. \$6075, 2. \$8500, 3. \$12000 with maybes. 4.\$26,764.. Same Roof.

No.1 Had a questionable reputation

No. 2 Has done great work for us before at 1524 5th Ave. SE

No. 3 was iffy without straight answers.

No.4 was a very good sales person, he better be.

We like No.2 and his Life Time Product to protect these Old Treasures, well, for a life time. A legacy for our kids.

We're looking for help from you in finding a craftsman to Repair the roof at 348, it has some kind of Grey Diamond Shape hard composition roofing? We found a few unused in the garage.... Or cover the roof with Grey Texture roofing metal No. 2 recommends, We'd like to hear any other suggestions, and or about Historic \$\$\$ to help pay for hefty expense of the above.

We like our Neighbor HOOD, have invested our life savings in the Neighborhood, Raised our kids in this Neighborhood, are believers in Saving not Bull Dozing the History of our Neighborhood and plan on staying in this Neighborhood through Thick and Sin.

Sincerely,

Kay

Tony

Kay and Len "Tony" Staab

1609 Park Ave. SE Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52403

Ph. 319- 362- 6373

tandkstaab@hotmail.com

PS Jeff, We'll do our best to get you a sample or Brochure explaining the Metal Product. It looks like the way to go to us.



Community Development and Planning Department
City Hall
101 First Street SE
Cedar Rapids, IA 52401
Telephone: (319) 286-5041

To: Historic Preservation Commission Members
From: Jeff Hintz, Planner II
Subject: COA Request for 1837 and 1841 Grande Avenue SE
Date: December 10, 2015

Applicant Name(s): John Jakobsen
Owner Name: LKJ Enterprises
Address: 1837 and 1841 Grande Avenue SE
Local Historic District: Redmond Park- Grande Avenue Historic District
Legal Description: BEVER PARK 3RD N 100' LOT 1 & E 10' STR/LB 2 20
Year Built: 1914 for 1837 Grande and 1915 for 1841 Grande

Description of Project: Replacement of all windows on both structures with vinyl single hung windows. Note, this work has already occurred on the structure addressed as 1837 Grande Avenue SE on this ownership parcel.

Information from Historic Surveys on property:

1995 Site Inventory Form for 1837 Grande Avenue SE from the District Nomination survey lists the property as “good.” The defining features are listed as flared front-gable roof with no dormers; clapboard siding with belt courses between lower and upper levels; broad gable roof porch across front with large, battered piers extending to deck and ashlar concrete block pedestals below; balustrade has alternating narrow, square balusters and wider boards narrowly spaced with vertical board design in porch skirting; windows are double-hung with entrance slightly off-center. The property contributes to the historic district and is individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

1995 Site Inventory Form for 1841 Grande Avenue SE from the District Nomination survey lists the property as “good.” The defining features are listed as front-gable roof with shed dormer facing 19th St.; narrow clapboard siding; broad gable roof porch across front with battered piers resting on brick pedestals; balustrade has 2"x2" balusters narrowly spaced with matching vertical board design in porch skirting; windows are double-hung (3/1 & 6/1 vertical light uppers) with entrance slightly off-center; attached car port at rear has combination hipped/flat roof with low balustrade on the roof. The property contributes to the historic district and is individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

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.

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

Historic Windows:

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 are allowed only at the rear of a 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 for 1837 Grande: The current windows are replacement windows and not original to the structure. It should be noted that during the time of the 1995 survey, no grille (muntin) patterns were observed in the windows so there is not the need for a grille pattern to be matched on the replacement windows. The windows were replaced without obtaining a building permit which would have triggered the required historic review. The north side of the house (street side) is certainly the most prominent and is the most key side of the structure. The west side of the house is easily visible from the sidewalk and the east and rear elevations are obscured from convenient view from the public right-of-way by adjacent houses.

Given the windows at the rear (south elevation) and east elevation are generally hidden from convenient public viewing, allowing the installed vinyl windows to remain is something the Commission should give consideration when making a determination of appropriateness. The obscured view and fact these sides of the structure are not key are in harmony with the local guidelines and consistent with recent approvals from the Commission for this type of project.

The windows on the front elevation (north side of house) and the west side of the house (right side when facing house from Grande Avenue SE) are readily visible and as such need to be treated differently. The guidelines and decisions by the Commission have consistently required wood windows on front elevations; on side elevations visible from the street, windows on the top floor and towards the back of those elevations would be best replaced with wood. This is in accordance with the guidelines and would be the ideal solution. Given the openness of this area

and presence of driveways, it is unlikely any structure could be built or natural plantings introduced that would mask this west elevation from public view.

The Commission can deliberate on any of the elevations if the proposed changes are agreeable to the applicant. In the instance a further deviation from the guidelines is sought, staff would be alright with leaving the upper floor windows as vinyl as they are 20 feet above the grade of the lot which is already elevated higher than that of the street and sidewalk. The lower floor windows are closer to the ground but still setback a distance of over 50 feet from the sidewalk.

Staff Recommendation for 1837 Grande: *If* applicant is agreeable, the front (north) and west side elevations would be changed to be wood windows which fit the existing openings and; approval of installed windows as is, on the rear (south) and east side elevations.

Alternative Staff Recommendation for 1837 Grande: *If* the changes are not agreeable to the applicant, **disapprove** (deny) the application as the installed windows are not consistent with the guidelines or in harmony with past approvals by the Commission.

Analysis for 1841 Grande: The proposal is to replace all windows in the structure with vinyl windows. The key elevations on this structure are the street sides, the north and east elevations which face Grande Avenue SE and 19th Street SE respectively. These elevations are readily visible, especially the east side as there is not much of a yard at all. The importance for wood windows on this east elevation is important as it is the closest to the street, closer than the north elevation on the front. Both are just as easily visible and the guidelines would call for wood windows on both elevations if replacement is the desired option. A repair if at all possible would be best, but wood windows replacing wood windows are also listed as recommended within the guidelines.

The west elevation of this structure at 1841 Grande is masked from any convenient viewing from the public right-of-way. While vinyl windows are not ideal, this would be the optimal side for the Commission to deviate from the guidelines on as it is very challenging to view the windows with any sort of great detail on the west side of the structure from the sidewalk or street. The grille pattern in the windows needs to be maintained for congruence with the rest of the structure, but the materials are much less of a concern on this side of the home.

The actual rear elevation of this house, to the south, is somewhat unique. Given the setback of 345 19th Street SE, 1841 Grande's rear elevation is more visible than a rear elevation on most other homes in the historic district. The windows on the garage are more obscured from the front porch on the aforementioned home, but not entirely invisible. The dwelling unit window on this side of the building is without question visible from the right-of-way and should be wood. The garage windows while visible are really noticeable to pedestrians heading north only. If the window grille pattern can be maintained, these garage windows should be given some consideration by the Commission for vinyl.

Staff Recommendation for 1841 Grande: *If* applicant is agreeable, the front (north) and east side elevations would be changed to be wood windows which fit the existing openings and; approval of vinyl windows on west side elevation; for the south elevation, vinyl windows on the

garage and a wood window on the dwelling unit. This recommendation would require all window grille patterns be maintained where current windows have a grille.

Alternative Staff Recommendation for 1841 Grande: *If* the changes are not agreeable to the applicant, **disapprove** (deny) the application as the proposal is not consistent with the guidelines or in harmony with past approvals by the Commission.

Attachments: Application from applicant.

CEDAR RAPIDS HISTORIC DISTRICT APPLICATION

Community Development Department, 101 First Street SE, Cedar Rapids, IA 52401, Phone 319-286-5041

<p style="text-align: center;">Owner Information</p> <p>Name <u>LKJ ENTERPRISES</u></p> <p>Address <u>P.O. Box 11364</u></p> <p>City <u>Cedar Rapids</u></p> <p>State <u>IA</u> Zip <u>52410</u></p> <p>Phone <u>(319)538-6752</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Applicant Information</p> <p>Name <u>John Jakobson</u></p> <p>Company <u>LKJ ENTERPRISES</u></p> <p>Address <u>P.O. Box 11364</u></p> <p>City <u>Cedar Rapids</u></p> <p>State <u>IA</u> Zip <u>52410</u></p> <p>Home Ph. <u>(319)329-0690</u></p> <p>Work Ph. <u>(319)538-6752</u></p>
<p>Address of Property where work is to be done: <u>1841, 1837 GRAND AVE SE</u></p>	
<p>Project type: House <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Garage <input type="checkbox"/>, Shed <input type="checkbox"/>, Fence <input type="checkbox"/>, Addition <input type="checkbox"/>, other _____</p>	
<p>Project description: <u>WINDOWS PACKET REPLACEMENTS</u></p>	
<p>Location: Describe where (what part of building, or where on property) work will be done: _____ <u>ALL WINDOW LOCATIONS</u></p>	
<p>Materials: Type and design to be used <u>VENYL SINGLE HUNG</u></p>	
<p>Estimates required: If you will not be using the same type of materials as already used on the building, then you must obtain two estimates using the existing material(s) and two estimates using the new material(s).</p>	
<p>Samples: Applicant must bring a sample of the material(s) to HPC meeting if a COA is required.</p>	
<p>Applicant's signature: </p>	

For Community Development Department use only:

Date Received:	Received by:	File No. _____
Redmond Park-Grande Avenue <input type="checkbox"/>	Contributing structure? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	CNME Issued? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Second and Third <input type="checkbox"/>	Key structure? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	COA required? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



Historic Preservation Commission Agenda Item Cover Sheet

Meeting Date: December 10, 2015

Property Location: 1215 2nd Street NW

Property Owner/Representative: John Riggs – City of Cedar Rapids

Owner Number(s): 286-5981 **Demolition Contact:** Not yet bid

Year Built: Shop Building – 1950 Metal Building in rear – 1984 (not subject to review)

Description of Agenda Item: Demolition Application COA Other

Background and Previous HPC Action: The shop building closest to 2nd Street NW was constructed in 1950; the metal building at the rear of property was constructed in 1984 and is not subject to demolition review as it does not meet the 50 year and older threshold.

This property was recently acquired by the City and is slated for demolition to allow for the Flood Control System. Any salvage could be considered by the demolition contractor once that contract has been awarded. Given the nature of construction and the non-eligibility status of this building, documentation is not recommended, but is possible should the Commission desire.

City Assessor Information on the parcel:

<http://cedarrapids.iowaassessors.com/parcel.php?parcel=142132600300000>

Historic Eligibility Status: Eligible Not Eligible Unknown N/A

Explanation (if necessary):

The 2014 Cedar Rapids Citywide Historic and Architectural Reconnaissance Survey **does not** indicate this property to be historic, or located within a potentially historic neighborhood recommended for further study.

The 2009 Hull's 3rd Addition Intensive Survey identified this property as **Not Eligible** for the National Register of Historic Places.

The State Historic Preservation Office has reviewed and concurred with both of these surveys.

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 lacks defining features and is a poor candidate for local landmarking.



Community Development Department
City Hall
101 First Street SE
Cedar Rapids, IA 52401
Telephone: (319) 286-5349

To: Historic Preservation Commission
From: Jennifer Pratt, Community Development
Kevin Ciabatti, Building Services
Subject: Overview of the Vacant and Neglected Building Ordinance and Building Services
Enforcement Activities
Date: December 10, 2015

Background

At the October 8, 2015 Historic Preservation Commission meeting members of the Commission expressed concerns with the City's enforcement efforts. At the Commission's meeting on November 12, the City staff will provide an overview of the City's vacant and neglected building ordinance, department statistics, and Building Services' enforcement activities.

Development of the Vacant & Neglected Building Ordinance

The City of Cedar Rapids municipal code of ordinances, Chapter 29 Housing Code (property maintenance code) applies to all structures, including commercial and residential, rental and owner occupied. Chapter 29 adopts the International Property Maintenance Code as the minimum standard for structures in Cedar Rapids. In addition, Cedar Rapids adopts local amendments to this code to meet local needs.

The primary focus of the inclusion of provisions for vacant and neglected buildings was to develop a method to track and register vacant and neglected properties. In developing an addition to the ordinance, the City created a focus group made up of a variety of stakeholders including representatives of the Historic Preservation Commission. This focus group has been supportive in creating a framework for this ordinance.

Through these discussions, the City developed a subchapter 10 added to Chapter 29 Housing Code, titled Vacant and Neglected Properties. This addition would further engage properties owners to maintain and improve vacant structures.

Overview of Vacant & Neglected Building Ordinance Process

On July 28, 2015 the City Council adopted these changes to Chapter 29 Housing Code to include the provisions for vacant and neglected structures. The ordinance created the following process when dealing with vacant and neglected properties:

- Identify vacant and neglected properties (Residential and/or Commercial).
- Notification process.
- Registration process.
- Payment of an annual fee.
- Submit a plan to repair the property and bring it into compliance with the code.
- Allow for an annual interior inspection.

The Building Services Department works with property owners throughout this process. If the property owner fails to meet any of the applicable sections outlined in subchapter 10 of the ordinance, the next step is the municipal infraction process.

Enforcement Divisions of the Building Services Department

The Building Services Department is divided into four Sections.

- Building Trades. Primary focus is the building and permit process for construction for building permits, mechanical permits, electrical permits and plumbing permits.
- Nuisance. Primary focus is the enforcement of the Cedar Rapids Housing Code on owner occupied structures. A majority of the work pertains to exterior violations.
- Housing Code. Primary focus is the enforcement of the Cedar Rapids Housing Code through the rental and landlord registration process.
- Zoning Enforcement. Primary focus is enforcement of zoning regulations.

General Enforcement Process

- Nuisance.
 - After receiving a complaint, inspect the property to verify violation.
 - If violation exists, issue first notice of 35 days to comply.
 - Re-inspect the violation. If not resolved, issue second notice of 35 days to comply.
 - Re-inspect the property. If not resolved, issue third notice to comply of 14 days.
 - Re-inspect the property. If not resolved, issue a municipal infraction.
- Housing.
 - Inspect the property on a 5 year schedule, unless a complaint is received.
 - After receiving a complaint, inspect the property to verify violation.
 - If violation exists, issue first notice of 35 days to comply.
 - Re-inspect the violation. If not resolved, issue second notice of 35 days to comply.
 - Re-inspect the property. If not resolved, issue third notice to comply of 14 days.
 - Re-inspect the property. If not resolved, issue a municipal infraction.
- Zoning.
 - Receive complaint, issue first notice of 14 days to comply.
 - Re-inspect the violation. If not resolved, issue second notice of 14 days to comply.
 - Re-inspect the property. If not resolved, issue third notice to comply of 7 days.
 - Re-inspect the property. If not resolved, issue a municipal infraction.
- The timeframes for notices are defined by a combination of State Statute and by local ordinances. These are the minimum timeframes allowed for notifications.
- Each inspector has the latitude to extend the timeframe based on case by case circumstances. For example, if progress is being made to remedy the violations, the schedule is modified and reflective of that progress. Therefore, many cases due not meet the timeframes defined above.
- The Building Services staff would rather gain code compliance vs. filing municipal infractions. In many cases the Building Services staff meet with the owners in order to bring the building into compliance or revise the schedule of compliance.

Summary of Enforcement Statistics

The following outlines the statistics maintained by the Building Services Department as of October 2015:

- Active number of open complaints: 535
 - 144 – Housing
 - 201 – Nuisance
 - 123 – Zoning
 - 83 – Building

- Active number of court cases: 57

Preservation of Historic Resources

The Commission has expressed concerns in the past for properties that are not well maintained and neglected. More specifically, the Commission has expressed interest in developing a demolition by neglect provision to protect historic resources. The City's vacant and neglected building ordinance and general enforcement processes help to preserve historic resources and allows the City to intervene and work with the property owner to make improvements to help protect the city's historic resources.