

**WATERLOO HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING – OCTOBER 16, 2007– 5:15 P.M.
MEETING ROOM A, WATERLOO PUBLIC LIBRARY**

Chairperson Ottesen called the regular meeting of the City of Waterloo Historic Preservation Commission meeting to order at 5:23 p.m.

Those in attendance were: Berry, Morgan, Newton (arrived 5:57), Olsson, Ottesen, Potter, and Quirk.

Those absent were: Anderson, Brockway

Also present was staff member Tim Andera and 3 citizens.

Approval of Minutes

Motion made by Quirk, seconded by Olsson to approve the minutes of the September 18, 2007 Regular Meeting, subject to Olsson being listed as attending the meeting, specifically noting she was omitted from the attendance, as well making motions. Motion carried unanimously.

Approval of Agenda

Motion made by Quirk, seconded by Potter to approve the agenda as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

Reports

1. Main Street

Ottesen gave the Main Street report, noting that on October 12, 2007, the Tour De'Loe, which toured downtown projects that are underway or completed, was held, and over 150 people attended. Ottesen noted that this attendance was a little lower than the year before, but said the turnout was very good, and everything went smoothly. Ottensen noted that multiple sign reviews came in before the Main Street Review Board, noting that a contractor was proposing to put up two new signs for two new companies leasing space in the Regions Bank building. Ottesen noted that there was some lengthy discussion between the board members about how much signage should be on a building. Ottesen noted that it was finally agreed upon to approve the request for multiple signs.

2. Silos and Smokestacks

Andera noted that Candy Streed of Silos and Smokestacks e-mailed him a packet of information on "Law and the Historic Preservation Commission: What Every Member Needs to Know". Andera noted that some of the material covered in the hand out relates to economic hardships, ethics of being a commissioner, etc, and suggested that they read the booklet for their educational benefit for historic preservation.

3. Grout

No report this month.

Public Hearings

1. Request by Mike Heneghan for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish a portion of the existing garage structure on the northern part of the house at 1003 Vine Street.

Andera gave the staff report noting that the applicant is request approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove a portion of the existing garage on the north portion of the house at 1003 Vine Street. Andera noted that the house is listed as a “C” structure for architectural significance and an “A” structure for historical significance, as well contributing to a district. Andera noted that the portion of the garage proposed for demolition appears to be used for storage, abutting the single-stall garage that is currently there. Andera noted that only the “lean-to” portion of the garage is being proposed for removal, and the garage stall would remain.

Andera noted that at this time, the property owner is currently in litigation with the City over the Property Maintenance Code, and has received recent citations from the City Code Enforcement Department to either bring the property up to code, or demolish the house. Andera also noted that Code Enforcement has indicated the house to be dilapidated, structurally unsound, and a threat to the surrounding neighborhood and public welfare. Code Enforcement has also noted that there is currently no one occupying the house because it is unsafe for human occupancy. Andera noted that recently in a conversation with the applicant, that Mr. Heneghan noted to him that he has purchased over \$2,000 worth of shingles, but has not installed them yet.

Andera reviewed with the Commission members the Guidelines for Historical Buildings, and how it is written out to address certain situations, such as demolition. Andera noted as apart of the process, a Certificate of Appropriateness must be issued prior to any building located on any “A” or “B” structure, or any historic district. Andera noted that generally in the past, the Commission would issue demolition permits for buildings, which are not key or contributing structures to the house or the district in question. Andera also noted the Commission may issue demolition permits if the applicant can demonstrate that the building is structurally unsound and irretrievable. Andera noted to the Commission that the applicant has not shown up for this particular public hearing on this matter.

Potter questioned if any residents in the Highland Neighborhood would be willing to fix this house up as a neighborhood project. Quirk noted that recently, the neighborhood board has had a difficult time finding volunteers to do maintenance work around the neighborhood.

Potter noted she would like to know what the property owners plans are for the rest of the house if he is allowed to remove a portion of the garage. Morgan questioned if the City

has the power to make him fix the inside wall of the garage after it is exposed by removal of a portion of the garage. Andera noted that if the applicant removes part of this garage, it will probably create another building code issue by exposing a wall that may not be suitable for outside weathering, and the Code Enforcement Department would still be involved with the situation.

Ottesen noted that the existing garage structure and storage area do not appear to match the historical character of the house, and it appears that the garage may have been a later thought after the house was built, as well as noting the structure is on the back of the house.

Motion made by Potter, seconded by Quirk to table the request until the applicant can address the Commission at the November 20, 2007 regular meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

Discussion Items

1. Invitation to the Waterloo Historic Preservation Commission as apart of the Section 106 Process for input for mitigation suggestions and ideas regarding the demolition of two potentially eligible homes at 1252 and 1302 Logan Avenue as apart of the Highway 63 Redevelopment Project from Franklin Street to Donald Street.

Andera gave a brief overview, noting that as apart of the Section 106 process, and for the guidelines of the Memorandum of Agreement to be met, the Commission had to be invited to provide its comments as far as the houses being removed on Logan Avenue. Andera noted that the Commission is not a signatory on the MOA, and specifically noted that the MOA is between SHPO, Iowa Department of Transportation and the City.

Morgan questioned why only two homes are being removed. Brenda Durbahn of Earth Tech, who is working on the highway project noted that more than these two homes are being acquired for the project, however, these two homes are the only ones that would be eligible for the National Register. Durbahn also noted that if the roadway was shifted to the west side of the right-of-way, 1239 and 1319 Logan Avenue would have to be removed, and both those homes are eligible too. Durbahn also noted that the reason it was chosen to rebuild the roadway on the eastern portion of the right-of-way was because 8 to 10 less homes would have to be acquired for the project. Durbahn noted that on the other side of the roadway, there were existing commercial businesses, as well as Logan Middle School.

Durbahn noted that they most typical thing done in the past for recordation was to have a book developed on the properties with pictures, descriptions, floor plans, etc., but also mentioned that other options such as constructing a kiosk, or having a description of architects who designed many of the homes in the area. Durbahn mentioned if a book is made about the two houses, in most cases, it just ends up being a book that just sits on a shelf.

Morgan questioned if the owners are aware that the houses are going to be removed for the project. Durbahn noted that there have been many public meetings over this project,

and she is unaware if the property owners know that the houses will be removed. Ottesen noted that the owners may not be aware the houses are going to be removed, but also noted that they may be unaware the properties are eligible and there is money available to fix these homes up. Ottesen questioned if it would be possible for the homes to be relocated, and if so, would it affect their eligibility. Durbahn noted that it would not affect their eligibility if the homes are moved, as the two houses are eligible because of their architecture, not their location. Ottesen suggested that it be discussed with the owners about possibly moving the houses to an empty lot. Berry noted that he has seen many houses in Waterloo moved to different locations, and sees the same possibility with these two homes as well. Olsson noted that she like the idea of having an interpretive kiosk with a history of the neighborhood and local architects who designed nearby homes as opposed to having a book created that not many people would read. Olsson also noted that the widening of the highway is affecting the fabric of the neighborhood, and something must be done to preserve the integrity and feel of the neighborhood, instead of having just one option to just remove houses. Ottesen noted that the suggestion and advice from the Commission would be for these two homes to be relocated.

2. Rath Administration Building Meeting – Follow-up to October 2, 2007 brainstorming session.

Andera noted this meeting will be a follow-up meeting to the October 2, 2007 brainstorming session, where ideas were discussed on what to do with the former administration offices. Andera noted that at that meeting, some attendees volunteered to do some research on getting the building advertised, contacting a structural engineer, or see if the Rath logo can be used for our purposes, etc.

Roger Lantzke noted he has an interest in trying to save the building, and believes the idea he has would be a viable solution for saving the building. Lantzke noted that there needs to be more of a proactive approach to work with consumers. Lantzke noted that there needs to be an equity established by reinvesting in the building, and one way this could be done is by getting supporters who are willing to donate at least \$1 a week, and then use the money that has been donated and use the dividends from that money to invest back into the property without having to use the money that has been donated. Lantzke noted that this concept has worked before on other projects in places, such as Rochester, New York, and believes that the Rath name has a large enough legacy, that being able to find contributors is possible. Potter questioned if this type of approach would be a viable solution at this time, due to the time constraints and grant deadline looming. Potter noted she would like Lantzke to come to the next meeting for the building on October 23, 2007, and have numbers and a plan written down on paper so that others at the meeting can see what his proposal is. Lantzke noted he would try and get something together for this meeting, but was not sure if he would make it to the meeting or not. Potter noted that this idea of creating equity seems like a very good and well thought out idea, but at this time, with demolition of the building possible by next year, that finding volunteers and being able to gain enough equity off of the money provided, time is playing against the Commission now. Quirk noted that she would like to see the legalities hashed out first before a plan such as this is considered.

3. Kingbard Walking Tour

Potter noted that there have been no changes since the last time she reported, specifically noting with the Rath Building issue, she has not had time to address this item further.

Hearing no further discussion chairperson Ottesen adjourned the meeting at 6:24 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tim Andera". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "T" and "A".

Tim Andera
Associate Planner
Staff to the Commission