

MINUTES: HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Meeting of March 20, 2019 at 7:00PM
City Administrative Services Building,
304 N. Church St., Bowling Green, Ohio 43402

MEMBERS PRESENT: Les ~~Barbour~~, Reina Calderon, Greg Halamay, Gail Nader,
John Sampen. *Barber*

MEMBERS ABSENT: No members were absent.

AGENDA FOR THE MEETING:

The meeting's Agenda, distributed to the members and publicly posted on the City's website in advance of the meeting, is attached for convenience of reference and made a part of these Minutes. Of the items on the Agenda, all items were discussed by the members and no item was not discussed by the members. A summary of the discussion of Agenda items is set forth below, under the same heading for the item as is used in the Agenda.

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS:

No motion was made as to any Agenda item at this meeting, other than for Appointment of Officers and adjournment. The meeting of March 20, 2019 7PM is the initial meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission. Lobby visitation is recorded under the "Item E. LOBBY VISITATION" portion of these Minutes.

ITEM A: INTRODUCTIONS:

Each member introduced himself or herself. Mr. Halamay and Mr. Barbour identified that each had had previous experience with the City's Historic Preservation Study Committee, convened by Mayor Edwards in August, 2013. Mr. Halamay related that he had an interest as a downtown business owner in seeing buildings in the historic downtown area preserved. Ms. Nader related that her husband's family had been in the Bowling Green area for over one hundred years; historic preservation was of interest to her and valuable for the community; her husband, Larry Nader, had also served on the Historic Preservation Study Committee. Mr. Sampen identified that he owned a home on Maple Street and had an interest in the role which historic preservation can bring in maintaining and enhancing the value of neighborhoods. Ms. Calderon related that her prior service

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION,
MEETING OF MARCH 20, 2019 - 7PM
Page 2 of 13**

on the City's Zoning Board of Appeals had made her aware of the importance of historic preservation. All members expressed that it was an honor to serve on the Commission.

Mayor Edwards provided an introduction to events leading up to the formation of the Historic Preservation Commission, and to historic preservation in the State of Ohio and Ohio communities:

* There are currently 70 communities in the State of Ohio which have historic preservation commissions that have been qualified as a "Certified Local Government ("CLG") for Historic Preservation" (as referenced in these Minutes, a "CLG"), through the State of Ohio's Historic Preservation Office. There is variety and diversity in the types of CLG's within these 70 communities; CLG status is not a "one size fits all" proposition, although there are baseline state and federal requirements for qualifying as a CLG.

* The State of Ohio has an interest in seeing historic preservation efforts carried out in the State; the City's experience with representatives of the State's Historic Preservation Office is that it has significant staff and educational resources it can bring to bear to assist communities to form CLG units and help them engage in historic preservation, including grant funding. State grant funding through the Ohio Historic Preservation Office is dependent upon CLG status. State tax credits for commercial property owners are also available in the event that a community receives CLG status for its historic preservation commission (and the building or structure is within a qualified historic district area within the City).

* City officials have had contact and conversations with the State of Ohio Historic Preservation Office; the State is quite interested in the City of Bowling Green as an Ohio university community with a rich history and potential sites for historic preservation efforts. Mayor Edwards, as well as City Council Member Sandy Rowland, have visited or conversed with representatives of the State's Ohio Historic Preservation Office. Councilwoman Rowland, as well as past Wood County Auditor, Mr. Mike Sibbersen, served on the Historic Preservation Study Committee active in the 2013-2014 time period.

* Representatives of the Ohio Historic Preservation Office in Columbus have related to City officials that, from the State of Ohio's perspective, the City of Bowling Green is a community with significant historical assets, and the State is

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION,
MEETING OF MARCH 20, 2019 - 7PM
Page 3 of 13**

interested in City efforts to engage in historic preservation. One of these assets is the Wood County Court House, currently on the National Register of Historic Places. State Historic Preservation Office personnel have encouraged the pursuit of National Historic Landmark status for the Wood County Court House.

* All cities within the State of Ohio that are the home of a major state-supported and state chartered public university (e.g Miami University, Ohio State University, Kent State University) have a Historic Preservation Commission that has been qualified as a CLG unit, with the exception of the City of Bowling Green.

* City Council took a major step forward when it enacted Ordinance 8714 (passed October 15, 2018), authorizing formation of the Historic Preservation Commission.

* The importance of historic preservation, and the need for a historic preservation component to City government, have been identified in a number of contexts over a period of years, including within the City's visioning process, the upgrade of the City's land use plan, within the neighborhood revitalization context, and in connection with the planning surrounding Wooster Green. These planning contexts, as well as suggestions over the years by consultants engaged by the City in connection with planning, have brought out that historic preservation is needed to enable the City to grow and develop, while being healthy.

* One area of importance for historic preservation is education: it is important to educate the general public about what historic preservation is, and what it is not. Members of the public as well as property owners may understand "historic preservation" to mean "what kind of door knocker am I allowed to use on my building", rather than appreciate that historic preservation is more about the structural characteristics of buildings and neighborhoods.

* The area around the Court House is an example of how historic preservation could assist in conserving value in an area of the City, and the neighborhood around an important historical building – the Wood County Court House. As more of the older, once-stately homes have been turned into student rentals, the area around the Court House has degraded. Historic preservation efforts could retain and enhance value of neighborhoods while also preserving the value of an important historical community asset—the Wood County Court House.

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION,
MEETING OF MARCH 20, 2019 - 7PM
Page 4 of 13**

* A critical part of the Historic Preservation Commission (as identified also by the Historic Preservation Study Committee) is the educational aspect: educating the public on what we are setting out to do. To protect historical integrity; to refrain from telling property owners specifically what they can and cannot do; to help and assist to develop appropriate guidelines; to help form community partnerships that assist in preserving historical structures and places; to help with education of what it is to do historic preservation well within the community; to assist individual building owners with educational materials about historic preservation of structures.

ITEM B: APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS:

Motions were made, seconded, and unanimously approved for the appointment of the following officers:

Chairperson: Greg Halamay, with the motion to approve the appointment of Mr. Halamay as Chairperson made by Ms. Nader, seconded by Mr. Sampen, and unanimously approved by all members.

Vice Chairperson: Gail Nader, with the motion to approve the appointment of Ms. Nader as Vice Chairperson made by Mr. Sampen, seconded by Mr. Barbour, and unanimously approved by all members.

Secretary: Reina Calderon, with the motion to approve the appointment of Ms. Calderon as Secretary made by Mr. Halamay, seconded by Mr. Sampen, and unanimously approved by all members.

ITEM C: PURPOSE, POWERS, AND DUTIES:

- 1. Review of Ordinance 8714 (passed October 15, 2018) and**
- 2. Review history and Planning Documents**

There was some overlap in the presentation and discussion of Agenda Items C.1 and C.2, given that enactment of Ordinance 8714 (October 15, 2018) occurred some almost four years after proposed Ordinance 8382 had been postponed indefinitely by City Council, in 2014. Proposed Ordinance 8382 had been the culmination of the year-plus efforts of the Historic Preservation Study Committee

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION,
MEETING OF MARCH 20, 2019 - 7PM**

Page 5 of 13

appointed by Mayor Edwards in August, 2013. This proposed Ordinance 8382 would have created a Historical Preservation Commission with enforcement powers for the proposed Historic Preservation ordinance's requirements, which included an approval process for modifications, changes to, or replacements of listed historic properties or specific types of properties lying within historic areas or districts. A detailed set of design guidelines had accompanied the proposed Ordinance 8382.

As these Minutes will reflect, Members of the Historic Preservation Commission, in their initial meeting discussion of the Commission's work, and its powers and duties under enacted Ordinance 8714 (October 15, 2018), reflected on the experience surrounding the indefinitely postponed Ordinance 8382, and whether CLG status should be sought. Ordinance 8714, enacted in October, 2018, almost four years after indefinite postponement of Ordinance 8382, does not contain an enforcement mechanism or accompanying design guidelines, and it emphasizes partnerships and voluntary activities, including educational efforts.

The Planning Department staff had prepared a binder of materials for each Commission member, made available for pick-up by the members prior to the Commission's March 20, 2019 initial meeting. Each binder contained the following selected materials, also accompanied by face sheets which helped the reader construct the recent history (since approximately August, 2013) of events and background leading up to City Council's enactment of Ordinance 8714.

* A copy of Ordinance No. 8714 (Passed: October 15, 2018), "ORDINANCE AMENDING AND ADOPTING SECTION 30.101 OF THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF BOWLING GREEN, OHIO ESTABLISHING A HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION."

*A description of a proposed historic preservation commission, accompanied by a "why have a historic preservation commission" with a brief timeline of past efforts related to historic preservation within the City of Bowling Green, "Historic Preservation within City Planning Document Recommendations", and "What could a historic preservation commission do?" (5-page document with footer ""DRAFT - 8/22/2018 - Historic Preservation Commission" City Planning Department staff had prepared this Draft 8/22/2018 document and provided it to Mayor Edwards

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION,
MEETING OF MARCH 20, 2019 – 7PM**

Page 6 of 13

prior to the enactment of Ordinance No. 8714, establishing the Historic Preservation Commission.

* Notes of the City of Bowling Green Historic Preservation Study Committee, of a presentation made to the Study Committee by Mr. Nathan Bevil, Certified Local Governments and Preservation Services Manager, Ohio Historic Preservation Office, on Tuesday, April 8, 2014. The Historic Preservation Study Committee for the City had been put together by the Mayor on August 23, 2013.

* The Report of the Historic Preservation Study Committee, submitted as a memorandum to the Mayor of the City of Bowling Green, with copy to Members of City Council and the Municipal Administrator, and dated May 20, 2014. This was the final report of the Historic Preservation Study Committee.

* Ordinance No. 8382, which received a 1st reading by City Council on November 11, 2014, "ORDINANCE CREATING AND ADOPTING NEW CHAPTER 158, AND AMENDING SECTIONS 30.86 AND 30.95 AND 30.104 AND 32.01 AND 38.01 AND 93.01 AND 150.132 AND 151.27 OF THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF BOWLING GREEN, OHIO, IN ORDER TO ESTABLISH A HISTORIC AND ARCHITECTURAL PRESERVATION CODE, AND MODIFY CERTAIN EXISTING CODE SECTIONS SO AS TO BE IN ALIGNMENT WITH SAID CHAPTER." This Ordinance No. 8382 was proposed in 2014 by the Historic Preservation Study Committee, but it was postponed indefinitely (i.e. tabled indefinitely by City Council).

* A presentation by the Historic Preservation Study Committee on its Final Report, dated May 2014, including Presentation Sections entitled "a Brief History", "BG's Built Environment", "Legal and Policy Framework", "Benefits of Historic Preservation", "Who Would NOT be Affected by an Ordinance," "Draft Ordinance and Design Guidelines" and "Conclusion and Recommendations." This presentation used to dispel myths concerning historic preservation.

* A Flyer concerning the proposed (draft) Historic Preservation Ordinance #8382, also used to dispel myths concerning historic preservation and for public education.

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION ,
MEETING OF MARCH 20, 2019 - 7PM**

Page 7 of 13

Using the documents listed above, Director Saylor provided an introduction to Ordinance 8714 (October 15, 2018) (Agenda Item C.1) and then a walk-through and synopsis of the history and planning documents which led to the City Council's enactment of Ordinance 8714 and its establishment of the Historic Preservation Commission (Agenda Item C.2). The design guidelines developed by the earlier Historic Preservation Study Committee were not included within the materials provided to the Historic Preservation Commission. Planning Director Saylor advised the Commission that she wished the Commission to know they existed, but did not include them in the binders provided to Commission members.

Director Saylor identified that the East Wooster corridor and older residential areas in the City had already been identified as clear areas for historic preservation. Currently, the Boomtown area near the central City core and Main Street are the only two areas of the City which are on the National Register of Historic Places. Within the City are some buildings which have been individually placed on the National Register. National Register status does not confer any enforcement ability in the event that the building is proposed for change or demolished; Ms Saylor directed the attention of the Commission to the "Notes of the Historic Preservation Study Committee of the presentation made to it by Mr. Nathan Bevil, of the Ohio Historic Preservation Office, April 8, 2014. The CLG qualification process is carried out with application submission to the State of Ohio (Ohio Historic Preservation Office) and federal review and approval by the National Park Service.

The Ohio Historic Preservation Office offers a Building Doctor program for working with individual buildings or structures, trainings for CLG's (and historic preservation commissions), and designated landmark status for properties, structures, and places. Director Saylor also related that Ohio Historic Preservation Office personnel had suggested that a National Historic Landmark status designation might be sought for the Wood County Court House. The Ohio Historic Preservation Office also could serve as a resource for physical practices in maintaining historical properties—e.g. lead paint and historic buildings.

Discussion ensued among members of the Commission concerning the prior process which led to Ordinance No. 8382 and its indefinite postponement by City Council, as well as where the Commission should go in its work from this time forward, and how it would prioritize its work.

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION ,
MEETING OF MARCH 20, 2019 - 7PM
Page 8 of 13**

Mr. Halamay asked the other Commission members whether the goal of the Commission should be formation of a Certified Local Government (CLG) unit for historic preservation purposes in the City. Mr. Barbour offered that it was difficult to see how the Historic Preservation Commission could have a real impact unless there were design guidelines and an enforcement power. However, he believed that the CLG process itself served as a distraction from the basic activity of enlisting public support for historic preservation, in that the CLG application and review process was a complicated one that could get wrapped up in detailed regulatory and administrative requirements. It was not strictly necessary to pursue CLG status in order to pursue historic preservation within the City. In Mr. Barbour's view, local buy-in and solicitation of input of the community were critical steps to the success of historic preservation within the City. Other members concurred in the need for public buy-in and support for historic preservation activity in the City, as well as partnership-building with local organizations (e.g. Downtown BG, East Side Residential), county government and agencies (e.g. Wood County Historical Museum, Wood County Public Library) and Bowling Green State University (e.g. University Library archival resources). The point was raised by more than one member regarding linkages between CLG status and grant funding; and if "no CLG status" would significantly hamper Historic Preservation Commission efforts from a practical perspective.

Mr. Sampen asked why the previous ordinance had failed to be adopted. Mr. Barbour offered that he thought that the design guidelines developed and provided by the Historic Preservation Study Committee approached issues at too detailed of a level, reinforcing the public view and that of property owners in the City that historic preservation would be about "what type of door knocker will I be allowed to use?" and the Ordinance as a whole received push-back as a result. Mayor Edwards confirmed to Mr. Sampen and the Members that in his view Mr. Barbour had "hit the nail upon its head" as to why Ordinance 8382 had failed to be enacted.

Ms. Calderon offered that an inventory of historic buildings could be a place to start and a potential way of enlisting community involvement in and public support for historic preservation. She mentioned that perhaps the public schools could be enlisted and neighborhood organizations (e.g. East Side). Ms. Nader offered that significant work had already been accomplished in inventorying by (or under the direction of) the university's archivist, Dr. Eric Honoffer; the University's archival services resources and its architecture program were both

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION ,
MEETING OF MARCH 20, 2019 - 7PM**

Page 9 of 13

mentioned in connection with community resources that might be available for assisting with identifying and inventorying historic areas or historic properties. The inventory work already compiled may also need to be reviewed for updating and utility as to purpose, and this might be a start. Ms. Calderon offered that the economic history of the City and how it developed might be a focus, as well as individual historic properties. Mr. Barbour mentioned the Heinz Plant site as a possible example of industrially significant history in Bowling Green; Ms. Nader related as an example the effect of geography (bedrock) lying under the numbered streets, and how the lack of an ability to build houses with basements in that area classified it as not as desirable a location in the City as other areas. The numbered streets consequently developed as worker's housing. These examples were cited by Commission members as "historical" but not in the more conventional connotation of "the site of a famous event" or "the home of a famous person"--i.e. "historical preservation" could also encompass the industrial, socioeconomic, geographical, or topographical reasons the City developed as it did—social, industrial, and economic history also mattered, as well as architecture and design or "important or significant events and people."

Mr. Barbour thought that a survey could be developed and used with property owners and the public, as a step in inventorying the City's historic properties (or areas) and in enlisting public input into the historic preservation process as it evolves specific to Bowling Green as a community. Ms. Calderon said she thought that the language of Ordinance 8714 (at (D) Powers and Duties (1)-(9) could be used as the structural basis of a survey to enlist public input or inventory of properties.

Ms. Sayler suggested that a separate Commission meeting could be held just concentrating on CLG's. Federal tax credits for historic preservation were not dependent on CLG status. The CLG status determined accessibility to state tax credits for commercial buildings and the possibility of grant funding to the CLG. The model ordinance establishing a CLG is simply a model. The federal tax credits available for historic preservation were for mixed use, commercial buildings. There was not much available in the way of government-conferred incentives for

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION ,
MEETING OF MARCH 20, 2019 - 7PM
Page 10 of 13**

individual residential property owners to do historic preservation activities on their own homes.

Ms. Calderon offered that historic preservation efforts and planning may also need to be pursued keeping in mind the requirements of the State Building Code, and working with Wood County, in particular where buildings were historic but not able to be economically maintained as residences, and mixed use or change of use became a necessary consideration to keep the building viable. In that case, a change of use from a Building Code perspective could also trigger significant expenditures to comply with State Building Code requirements. This was an example of the need of the work of the Commission to be carried out in coordination or partnership with other agencies and entities to be successful. Partnerships would be key in advancing historic preservation in the City.

Mr. Barbour asked the other members what areas the Commission should focus on, first –and how should we involve the community?

Various members of the Commission discussed pursuing and obtaining National Historic Landmark status for the Wood County Court House, as a priority of the Historic Preservation Commission. Mayor Edwards identified, as a positive consideration, that Wood County would be celebrating its 200th anniversary in 2020; thus, pursuing designation of the Wood County Court House as a National Historic Landmark would be timely. Mr. Barbour thought that pursuing National Historic Landmark designation for the Wood County Court House a tactically valuable focus in getting the public involved and Ms. Nader thought it a good first public relations step. Mr. Sampen offered that an article could be run each week in the local newspaper on a point of historical background, and something about the Wood County Court House published periodically as a part of informing the public about the National Landmark status being sought for the building. Mr. Sampen suggested that it would be important to have the newspaper on board. Ms. Nader expressed some concern regarding the length of the application process and whether a National Historic Landmark status designation during 2020 would be feasible. Ms. Calderon offered that she thought that the National Historic Landmark status might be pursued for the Wood County Court House irrespective of whether that designation could happen by or within 2020.

Chairman Halamay asked the Commission members to return to the subject of an inventory of historic properties. Discussion ensued concerning whether it

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION,
MEETING OF MARCH 20, 2019 - 7PM
Page 11 of 13**

would be appropriate to leave it to individual property owners to respond to a survey or inventory; or whether public records would be sufficient to identify historical structures and places, and owners not necessarily relied upon in the inventory process. Ms. Sayler said that she could provide a form of building inventory and the information it collected. Mr. Barbour saw that the inventorying process might be a two-step process—a building inventory/historical sites survey process, and then a step in which the public is also invited to provide input as to historic districts and historic properties, including ideas about what should be preserved (or included within the definition of a “historic district”).

Ms. Sayler indicated that definitions exist within federal and state regulations concerning “what is a historic property or historic district”. She offered to send to the Commission members by email the following materials:

- * Definitions of what constitutes “historic” to include a building or district on the National Register of Historic Places.
- * Information on how to obtain Designated Landmark status for a property or district.
- * Information on becoming a CLG.
- * A list of CLG’s in the State of Ohio.
- * Additional documentation regarding the work of the original Historic Preservation Study Committee
- * A sample building inventory

Ms. Sayler offered that the City’s Community Action Plan prioritized concentrating on single family reinvestment areas and East Wooster Street; the single family reinvestment areas are in the First Ward and Second Ward. Mr. Sampen asked other Commission members, “What might our assignments be?” Ms. Calderon said that she could not think of assignments as yet, in advance of reading the materials forthcoming—that there was much to digest.

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION,
MEETING OF MARCH 20, 2019 7PM
Page 12 of 13**

Mayor Edwards suggested that at the top of the list could be pursuit of the National Landmark Designation status for the Wood County Court House, consistent with the 200th Anniversary of Wood County in 2020. The Commissioners and County Administrator Andrew Kalmar ought to be contacted; also past County Auditor Mike Sibbersen, who had indicated to Mayor Edwards that he would be interested in assisting the Commission.

Mr. Barbour said that at the next meeting, he would like to present a motion for the Commission's consideration that covered pursuing National Historic Landmark status for the Wood County Court House, a building inventory, and outreach to the public for their input on historic preservation (e.g. a survey for public input). Consistent with the idea of a two-step process for defining historic places, districts, or buildings, the inventory process would encompass identification of potential historic places, districts, and buildings, and a second step the solicitation of input and ideas from the public regarding historic preservation efforts. Mr. Halamay and other members expressed support for the concept of involving other groups in supporting historic preservation efforts in the City. Although the City did not have a town historian on its staff, a number of individuals in the community had energy, experience, and resourcefulness surrounding City history; community, neighborhood, and business organizations, as well as the University and University community, could be tapped. Mr. Halamay gave the example of "dog leg alley" between Main Street and the Municipal Parking Lot accessed from Court Street, which had been originated as a student project.

ITEM D – MEETING DATE AND TIME

The members decided by unanimous consensus without a vote that the Historic Preservation Commission would meet on a monthly basis in Council chambers. Two possible times for the next meeting, in April, were generated, as potential dates: April 24th at 7PM and April 26th at 3:30PM. Director Saylor would confirm with Members via email which of these two dates and times would be the Commission's April, 2019 meeting time., given the Commission's preference to have its meetings in Council chambers.

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION,
MEETING OF MARCH 20, 2019 - 7PM**

Page 13 of 13

ITEM E. LOBBY VISITATION

City Council President Mike Aspacher and City Council Member Sandy Rowland each spoke during Lobby Visitation, concerning the importance, to the City, of the Historic Preservation Commission's work. City Council might well have an openness towards a new legislative proposal coming from the Historic Preservation Commission. City Council had become much more aware, since the 2014 time frame, of the strategic importance of historic preservation for a City such as Bowling Green, and historic preservation's linkages to a healthy local economy, tourism and trade, and urban development and reinvestment.

ITEM F. ADJOURNMENT

A motion for adjournment was made by Ms. Nader and seconded by Mr. Sampen. The members voted unanimously to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 8:20PM.



Greg Halamay, Chairperson

4-26-2019
Date



Reina Calderon, Secretary

4-26-2019
Date



Historic Preservation Commission
March 20, 2019

The following items will be discussed at the first meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission. The Board will meet in the City Administrative Services Building at 304 North Church Street, Bowling Green, Ohio at 7:00 p.m. on the above date.

A. INTRODUCTIONS

B. APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS

1. Chairperson
2. Secretary
3. Other officer positions

C. PURPOSE, POWERS, and DUTIES

1. Review Ordinance 8714 (passed October 15, 2018)
2. Review history and planning documents

D. MEETING SCHEDULE

E. LOBBY VISITATION

Stay Informed. Sign-up for the City's eNewsletter on the City's website (www.bgohio.org) and follow the City on Facebook and Twitter (@cityofbg)