

**MINUTES**  
**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING,**  
**Thursday, July 14, 2016 @ 4:30 p.m.**  
**Training Room, City Hall, 101 First Street SE**

Members Present: Amanda McKnight-Grafton Chair  
Bob Grafton  
Ron Mussman  
Tim Oberbroeckling  
Todd McNall  
Barb Westercamp  
Caitlin Hartman

Members Absent: BJ Hobart  
Sam Bergus  
Mark Stoffer Hunter

City Staff: Jeff Hintz, Planner  
Jennifer Pratt, Community Development Director  
Kevin Ciabatti, Building Services Director  
Anne Kroll, Administrative Assistant

**Call Meeting to Order**

- Amanda McKnight Grafton called the meeting to order at 4:31 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 June 23, 2016. Barb Westercamp seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**3. Action Items**

**a) Demolition Applications**

**i. 392 26<sup>th</sup> Street SE – Private Property**

- Jeff Hintz stated that this property was built in 1922. The Citywide Reconnaissance Survey recommends intensive survey of the area and the property is on the edge of this area. The owner plans to build new on site. The owner expressed to staff that renovation or rehabilitation is not economical or practical. This property is in very poor condition per the City Assessor.
- Amanda McKnight Grafton asked if photo documentation is permissible. Jeff Hintz stated that exterior documentation is allowed, but not interior; this option is only available if the Commission deems the property to be historically significant however.

- Barb Westercamp made a motion to approve the demolition of 392 26<sup>th</sup> Street SE. Bob Grafton seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**b) Demolition Applications under Review**

**i. 360 15<sup>th</sup> Street SE – Private Property**

- Amanda McKnight Grafton and Bob Grafton abstained from this item.
- Bob Grafton stated that he has a letter from a financial institution that his loan is approved.
- Jeff Hintz stated that this is the Commission’s last chance to remove the hold before it expires.
- The Commission would like the property to remain on hold until it expires on July 26, 2016.

Jennifer Pratt arrived to the meeting at 4:41 p.m.

**c) Certificates of Appropriateness**

**i. 337 17<sup>th</sup> Street SE – Replacement of 10 windows on the dwelling unit**

- Jeff Hintz stated that this application is for the replacement of six (6) upstairs and four (4) main level windows and shared pictures of the property. All the windows are visible from the right-of-way and the applicant is proposing to use vinyl windows. Mr. Hintz shared the District Guidelines for historic windows and stated that staff recommends denial of the project because the windows are readily visible from right-of-way, the proposal is inconsistent with guidelines, and the proposal is inconsistent with past approvals from the Commission.
- Bob Grafton asked if the existing windows are wood. Jeff Hintz stated that he could not tell from the right-of-way and the applicant is not in attendance to ask.
- Tim Oberbroeckling made a motion to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness for 337 17<sup>th</sup> Street SE for the replacement of ten (10) windows on the dwelling unit. Todd McNall seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
- Amanda McKnight Grafton asked if the Commission could provide some suggestions for the applicant for when they come back to focus on the guidelines and make sure that they have a representative when they apply again. Jeff Hintz will pass that along to the applicant.
- Barb Westercamp asked if they knew about the guidelines before they applied. Jeff Hintz stated that he worked with them and let them know what the guidelines are, but they still submitted the project with vinyl windows.
- Todd McNall noted that the applicant needs to know that the windows need to be replaced with the same size since he could see that some of the windows are big enough to be replaced with two windows.

**d) Historic Rehabilitation Program**

- Jeff Hintz stated that based on the Historic Preservation Plan, City staff requested an additional \$25,000 for historic preservation activities. This was approved by City Council as part of the FY17 budget (July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017). The program will have \$25,000 as a new budget item and also the \$25,000 from the existing Paint Rebate Program (within Urban Renewal Area boundaries) to equal a total of \$50,000. Mr. Hintz discussed the program proposal, the process to apply and receive grant/loan, eligible

projects, eligible activities, and the grant/loan structure. Mr. Hintz discussed the funding options for grants/loans:

- 1) 100% grant – *highest risk of continued funding.*
  - 2) All Projects 50% grant and 50% zero interest loan – *moderate risk, some funds replenished.*
  - 3) Income based approach – *moderate risk, some funds replenished*
    - At or above 80% low-moderate income (LMI) - 0% loan
    - Below 80% LMI –grant
  - 4) 100% Loan – *maximizes future funding*
- Jeff Hintz stated that staff recommends approval of the Historic Rehabilitation Program and using the income based funding approach (option 3) because this option addresses the financial hardship issue directly and allows for some replenishment of the funding.
  - Bob Grafton asked if there would be a requirement for the homeowner to reside in the property once they receive funding. Jennifer Pratt stated that typically, how other programs are run, it would be a five (5) year period and if you sold it before then you would repay the balance.
  - Tim Oberbroeckling stated that he would like to go with grants since there will be a lot more work to do with the other options. Jennifer Pratt stated that the risk is that there is no guarantee that this money would be budgeted every year. The income based approach is also consistent with what the Historic Preservation Plan recommends with a revolving loan fund.
  - Bob Grafton stated that the income based approach is how Habitat for Humanity runs their program and without the loan portion the program would not exist. Mr. Grafton is in favor of the income based approach.
  - The Commission discussed whether or not to allow the National Districts or those eligible for further study to apply for the funding along with the Local Historic Districts. Bob Grafton stated that only funding the Local Historic Districts could be an incentive for the National Districts to get on board with becoming a Local Historic District.
  - The Commission discussed giving grants versus giving loans. Tim Oberbroeckling asked what happens if the loan is not paid. Jennifer Pratt stated that there will be a lien placed on the property and once the property is sold the money will be recouped.
  - Caitlin Hartman asked what would happen if there was money left over. Jennifer Pratt stated that if we did a funding round you would see the pool and see how many applications you have. If there is clearly money left over you can open it back up. There is potentially a mechanism to have the money roll over, but we would really work hard to spend all of the money.
  - Todd McNall stated that there are three (3) Commission members who would be eligible for these funds and asked if that would be a conflict of interest. Amanda McKnight Grafton stated that those Commissioners would recuse themselves if and when their application was being discussed; they would step out of the room and not vote on their project. Jennifer Pratt stated that there is a difference between being eligible and actually applying.
  - The Commission discussed only letting an owner occupied resident apply for the funding and not rental properties. Tim Oberbroeckling stated that landlords should still be able to apply since they are trying to keep up their property too. Jeff Hintz stated that preference will be given to owner occupied, but landlords can still apply and the Commission would decide who is allocated funding and what projects would be funded.

- Bob Grafton suggested adding un-enclosing enclosed porches and removing noncompliant fencing to the approved project list. Jeff Hintz stated he did not put fences in the program because they are not geared towards the structure. It can detract from the structure, but whether there is a fence or not is not a key element to the structure on the property. Bob Grafton stated that it should be in there for the front of the property because it detracts from the neighborhood.
- Amanda McKnight Grafton stated that she likes funding option three (3) because the income situation has been addressed, it has the ability to receive some funding back, and the Commission's comments and frustrations have also been addressed.
- Todd McNall made a motion to approve option three (3) and to include the National Districts along with the Local Historic District. Barb Westercamp seconded the motion. The motion did not pass with Bob Grafton, Tim Oberbroeckling, Caitlin Hartman, and Amanda McKnight Grafton opposing.
- Tim Oberbroeckling made a motion to approve option three (3) for only the Local Historic residential residents for the first year of the program. If the program grows or the money is not spent the National Districts can be included at a later date. Bob Grafton seconded the motion. The motion passed with Todd McNall opposing.

#### **4. Discussion Items**

##### **a) MOA/LOA Project Updates**

- Jeff Hintz stated that the final Structure Reports were sent into the State so all of the LOA requirements have been officially met. There is still excess money to be spent which will be discussed at the next meeting. Mr. Hintz spoke with the IEDA about the concept decided on last week to fund the posts and markers for the kiosk project and IEDA was in support of that.
- Amanda McKnight Grafton asked when the list of historic properties for the markers needs to be decided on. Jeff Hintz stated that it will be a discussion item at the next meeting, so it would be a good idea for the Commission to review it before then. Jennifer Pratt asked if the properties are shown on a map. Mr. Hintz will check into that. Todd McNall stated that the list has no explanation as to why these properties are historic. Mr. Hintz stated that Mark Stoffer Hunter will know that information.
- Amanda McKnight Grafton what is left open for MOA/LOA. Jeff Hintz stated that all of the obligations for the LOA are finished. The only one still open for MOA is historic sewers. Todd McNall asked if any have been found. Mr. Hintz stated that there have not to date. Bob Grafton asked about exposed brick when looking for historic sewers. Mr. Hintz stated that it is not tied to streets and only to the sewers.
- Bob Grafton asked to have exposed brick and trolley tracks on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE and what happens to that on an upcoming agenda. Ron Mussman stated that he has been doing research on brick streets and some of them have fresh concrete poured into them. Brick has been torn out and the Street Department has a stock pile to put back in, but they do not seem to be doing that. Amanda McKnight Grafton asked for an update on that.

##### **b) Knutson Update**

- Jennifer Pratt stated that City Council has directed staff to move forward with the Hobart Restoration project. There were two (2) HPC representatives on the review panel. The process worked well because of the comments that were made based on the historic view of the building that was passed on to the other developer as well. Stabilization will be done first and there are many other things that will need to be done as well.

- Todd McNall stated that in the previous Hobart proposals they needed a lot of money so is that going to be a problem this time? Jennifer Pratt stated that they have requested less money this time.
- Ron Mussman stated that, in the past, when the City passes on a property that has historic eligibility that there is a preservation covenant placed on that property. Mr. Mussman wanted to make sure that is done with the Knutson Building. Jennifer Pratt stated that staff will have to take a look at that because typically the City is only involved during the Development Agreement process, which can be around ten (10) years.
- Caitlin Hartman asked if the Knutson Building will be used for accommodating the amphitheater. Jennifer Pratt stated that is part of a bigger issue. There are some immediate needs for the amphitheater where staff is looking for more permanent restrooms and especially until the levee gets built is not really conducive to having immediate needs. There has been some confusion on what could be accommodated in the Knutson Building. It is a fairly long distance for people to be using restrooms that are attending the concerts. There are multiple issues here which also include storage. The City will do a study to find out the highest and best long term use. If it makes sense for the City to use the first floor of the Knutson Building then staff will look at those opportunities.
- Barb Westercamp asked if the City is doing the stabilization. Jennifer Pratt stated that the City will agree to an upfront cost that the City will be putting in. The request is for \$367,000.
- Bob Grafton wanted to make the Commission aware that the project has two (2) phases. Jennifer Pratt stated that stabilization is the immediate issue then phase one (1) is the full restoration of the building and then the next phase is a new building between the Knutson Building and the Mott Building.

## **5. Announcements**

- There were no announcements.

## **6. Adjournment**

- Barb Westercamp made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:05 p.m. Tim Oberbroeckling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anne Kroll, Administrative Assistant II  
Community Development

www.Cedar-Rapids.org



## Historic Preservation Commission

### July 14, 2016

www.Cedar-Rapids.org



## Demolition Review

### 392 26<sup>th</sup> Street SE

www.Cedar-Rapids.org



## 392 26<sup>th</sup> Street SE

- Built 1922
- Citywide Reconnaissance Survey recommends intensive survey of area.
- Property is the edge of this area



www.Cedar-Rapids.org



## 392 26<sup>th</sup> Street SE

- Owner plans to build new on site
- Renovation or rehabilitation is not economical
- Very poor condition per City Assessor



www.Cedar-Rapids.org



## Historic Significance

Defined by 18.02 (1) – **Historically significant building:** A principal building determined to be fifty (50) years old or older, and;

1. The building is associated with any significant historic events;
2. The building is associated with any significant lives of persons;
3. The building signifies distinctive architectural character/era;
4. The building is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
5. The building is archeologically significant.”

www.Cedar-Rapids.org



## Demolition Review Process

```

    graph TD
      A[1. Determination of Historic Significance] --> B[2a. Not Historically Significant]
      A --> C[2b. Historically Significant]
      B --> D[Release Property]
      C --> E[60-day hold if HPC wishes to explore options (e.g. photo doc) with property owner]
      C --> F[Release property if HPC does not wish to explore options]
    
```

 [www.Cedar-Rapids.org](http://www.Cedar-Rapids.org)

COA: 337 17<sup>th</sup> Street SE

 [www.Cedar-Rapids.org](http://www.Cedar-Rapids.org)

Front (East) Elevation



 [www.Cedar-Rapids.org](http://www.Cedar-Rapids.org)

North Side Elevation



 [www.Cedar-Rapids.org](http://www.Cedar-Rapids.org)

South Side Elevation



 [www.Cedar-Rapids.org](http://www.Cedar-Rapids.org)

District Guidelines –  
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

 [www.Cedar-Rapids.org](http://www.Cedar-Rapids.org)

Recommendation

Staff recommends denial of project

- Windows are readily visible from right-of-way;
- Proposal is inconsistent with guidelines;
- Inconsistent with past approvals from Commission.

 [www.Cedar-Rapids.org](http://www.Cedar-Rapids.org)

## Alternative Actions

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

 [www.Cedar-Rapids.org](http://www.Cedar-Rapids.org)

## Historic Rehabilitation Program

Historic Preservation Plan, Goal 8:  
 "Incentives and Benefits for Preserving Historic Properties Should Attract Investment in Historic Properties." Policy 8.2 is to "Promote new incentives in a range of categories."

Policy 8.2:  
 "Promote new incentives in a range of categories."

 [www.Cedar-Rapids.org](http://www.Cedar-Rapids.org)

## Historic Rehabilitation Program

Initiative 8.2b:  
 "Explore the establishment of grant and loan programs for owners of historic resources."

Based on the HPP, City staff requested an additional \$25,000 for historic preservation activities. This was approved by City Council, as part of the FY17 budget (July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017).

 [www.Cedar-Rapids.org](http://www.Cedar-Rapids.org)

## Historic Rehabilitation Program

Program Intent: Offset increased cost of historic restoration.

 [www.Cedar-Rapids.org](http://www.Cedar-Rapids.org)

## Historic Rehabilitation Program

Summary of FY17 Funding:

\$25,000	New budget item for historic preservation activities
\$25,000	Existing Paint Rebate Program (used only within Urban Renewal Area boundaries)
\$50,000 total	

 [www.Cedar-Rapids.org](http://www.Cedar-Rapids.org)

## Program Proposal

Creation of a Historic Rehabilitation Program with an expanded scope of work.

Four Sections in the Program

1. Process to Apply and Receive Grant/Loan
2. Eligible Projects
3. Eligible Activities
4. Grant/Loan Structure

 [www.Cedar-Rapids.org](http://www.Cedar-Rapids.org)

## Process to Apply and Receive Grant/Loan

1. Approval of COA by HPC for activities.
2. Submittal of completed application for grant/loan by January 1 each year. Requires quotes and diagrams/samples of materials.
3. Review of grant/loan application by HPC and possible selection. Priority given to owner occupied structures.

 [www.Cedar-Rapids.org](http://www.Cedar-Rapids.org)

## Process to Apply and Receive Grant/Loan

4. Written permission to begin.
5. Obtain building permit for approved work from Building Services Department.
6. Complete work as approved. Submit proof of payment or receipts to City CD Department.
7. Inspection of work by CD department after final inspection by Building Services Department.
8. Receive check in accordance with program.

 [www.Cedar-Rapids.org](http://www.Cedar-Rapids.org)

## Eligible Projects

- Must be within local historic district or local historic landmark, zoned residential.
- Interior work, mechanical work, electrical work, plumbing work, fences, landscaping or new construction is not eligible for grant/loan.
- Any work done prior to Historic Review by HPC, prior to issuance of a building permit, or without approval of grant/loan application is not eligible for grant/loan.
- Any work which results in removal of ornamental or architectural detailing is not eligible for grant/loan.

 [www.Cedar-Rapids.org](http://www.Cedar-Rapids.org)

## Eligible Activities

- Historic Window repair or replacement when repair is not possible.
- Historic door refinishing or repair; replacement of vinyl or metal front door with a wood door.
- Painting of wood or stucco exterior.
- Front porch repair, opening enclosed porch and removal of concrete entryway steps.
- Repair of wood, brick or stucco walls

 [www.Cedar-Rapids.org](http://www.Cedar-Rapids.org)

## Eligible Activities, Continued

- Underside roof element repair/maintenance of wood or historic elements.
- Removal of metal/synthetic soffits and fascia and restoration of historic materials
- Removal of synthetic siding and restoration and/or reconstruction with wood lap, wood shake, hardee plank, cement board or stucco.
- Exterior chimney repair – tuckpoint, reflash

 [www.Cedar-Rapids.org](http://www.Cedar-Rapids.org)

## Eligible Activities, Continued

- Installation of metal roofing (slate or copper), diamond cut asphalt shingles or cedar shingles on roof (requires historical documentation).
- Repair, maintenance or if necessary, recreation of ornamentation or architectural detailing.
- Reversal of any previous, historically inappropriate alterations.

 [www.Cedar-Rapids.org](http://www.Cedar-Rapids.org)

## Grant/Loan Structure

Maximum Amounts:

1. For work performed by a registered contractor, 50% of the total amount up to \$5,000.
2. For work performed by the home owner, 50% of the total cost of supplies up to \$3,000.

Discussion at the end of presentation about funding options\*

 [www.Cedar-Rapids.org](http://www.Cedar-Rapids.org)

## Funding Options for Grant/Loans

1. 100% grant – *highest risk of continued funding.*
2. All Projects 50% grant and 50% zero interest loan – *moderate risk, some funds replenished.*
3. Income based approach – *moderate risk, some funds replenished*
  - At or above 80% low-moderate income (LMI) - 0% loan
  - Below 80% LMI –grant
4. 100% Loan – *maximizes future funding*

 [www.Cedar-Rapids.org](http://www.Cedar-Rapids.org)

## Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the Historic Rehabilitation Program and using the income based funding approach.

- Addresses financial hardship issue directly
- Allows for some replenishment of the fund

 [www.Cedar-Rapids.org](http://www.Cedar-Rapids.org)

## Next Steps

1. July 20 - Presentation of HPC recommendation and program details to Development Committee
2. August – City Council Consideration