

MINUTES: HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Meeting of Friday, May 24, 2019 – 3:30 PM
City of Bowling Green Administrative Services Building,
304 N. Church Street, Bowling Green, Ohio 43402

MEMBERS PRESENT: Les Barber, Reina Calderon, Gail Nader, John Sampen.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Greg Halamay

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Heather Saylor, Director of Planning Department,
City of Bowling Green

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:

The Minutes of the April 26th meeting were unanimously approved, as corrected (see AGENDA ITEM 2). A motion was made and approved unanimously to adopt a document entitled "PROJECTED GOALS & PLANS FOR THE HPC, 2019-2020", attached and incorporated by reference to these Minutes. Informal action items identified by the Commission, and action items which individual members of the Commission agreed to undertake and report back to the Commission, are detailed in these Minutes under the applicable agenda item. The May 24, 2019 meeting is the Commission's third.

AGENDA ITEM 1: ROLL CALL:

Gail Nader, Vice Chairman, called the roll. Each member present acknowledged his or her presence, such that the Roll Call established both the constituency of the Commission members present, at four, and the presence of a quorum. All Commission members were present throughout the Meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 2: APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Prior to the Commission's engaging in a vote to approve the Minutes of the April 26th meeting, Mr. Barber, Ms. Nader, and Ms. Calderon offered corrections to the Minutes. Mr. Barber offered four corrections to the Minutes:

- (1) Under "AGENDA FOR THE MEETING", second full sentence, that Items 4 (C)

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING OF MAY 24, 2019
PAGE 2 OF 6**

and 4 (D) of the Agenda for the April 26th meeting were in fact not discussed, and the Minutes of the April 26th meeting at “AGENDA FOR THE MEETING, page 1, second full sentence, should be corrected to read: “Of the items on the Agenda, all items were discussed by the members and no item was not discussed by the members, *except for Items 4.C and 4.D.*” (Correction in italics).

(2) Under “Agenda Item 3: Staff Research,” and the minutes at paragraph (a), the sentence reading, “Landmark designation protects a building from being demolished or modified in a historically inappropriate manner, whereas the Registry program is voluntary and does not protect the property from demolition or inappropriate changes.” is incorrect on the substance, as the situation is exactly the opposite.

(3) At the paragraph (e) on page 3 of 5, the “and” in the sequence “afforded by the designation, and” should be revised to a “but”, so that the sentence is corrected to read: “e. Mr. Barber asked what the significance would be to the community of having the Wood County Courthouse designated as a National Historic Landmark—what protections were actually afforded by the designation, *but* maybe this designation would be a way of getting the community on board as to historic preservation in the City.” (correction in italics)

(4) In paragraph (h), the words “including the Court House” should be added after the word “city” in the first sentence of the paragraph.

Ms. Nader observed inconsistency in the spelling of the word “Courthouse” and the Commission members decided to regularize use of “Courthouse” (not Court House). Ms. Calderon offered that “Atlantic Insurance Company” (bottom of page 2 of 5, under paragraph (b), should be corrected to “Atlanta Life Insurance Company.”

Ms. Nader asked for a motion to approve the Minutes, as corrected. Mr. Sampen made the motion, and Mr. Barber seconded. The motion was approved.

AGENDA ITEM 3: UPDATES

- A. Presentation by Ohio Historic Preservation Office**
- B. National Historic Landmarks Program (County Courthouse)**

AGENDA ITEM 3.A. Presentation by Ohio Historic Preservation Office

Ms. Sayler reported that she had made contact with Mr. Nathan Bevil of the Ohio Historic Preservation Office and that he was prepared to make a presentation and answer questions at a meeting of the Commission. Various dates were discussed among the members and Ms. Sayler; a “Doodle” calendar would be posted for members to confirm

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING OF MAY 24, 2019
PAGE 3 OF 6**

their availability across various meeting dates. Ms. Sayler asked Members what issues they would like Mr. Bevil to focus upon; among the topics mentioned by Members were: (a) clarification on CLG status; (b) resources available for historic preservation efforts by cities, outside of the CLG framework (e.g. private sector resources); (c) a landmark designation case study (i.e. how another community obtained a National Historic Landmark designation status successfully); (d) the place of meeting suggested by the Members was the Wood County Courthouse.

AGENDA ITEM 3.B. National Historic Landmarks Program (County Courthouse)

Ms. Nader then reported on her discussion with Mr. Andrew Kalmar, the County Administrator for Wood County, Ohio. She reported that the County could be counted on to be interested in a National Historic Landmark Designation for the Courthouse, but that he would be looking for more information. Two questions that Mr. Kalmar related to Ms. Nader were: (1) “what does it cost to be a National Historic Landmark?” and (2) “what does it mean to be a National Historic Landmark?”, in particular this issue as to landownership (i.e. property ownership) and the costs and obligations of the owner of a National Historic Landmark designated property or place. The issue of whether the Courthouse could in fact be “land mark” material (i.e. the “landmarkability” of the Courthouse) would be something to take under consideration. Ms. Nader did not contact Mr. Sibbersen. Ms. Sayler offered that Mr. Sibbersen was a president of the Wood County Historical Society; in setting up the visit to the Commission by Mr. Bevil from the State Historic Preservation Office, Ms. Sayler would connect with Mr. Kalmar to invite him and interested county officials and representatives of county agencies.

AGENDA ITEM 4 – DISCUSSION

- A. Define most essential and long-term goals
- B. Citizen recommendations regarding possible buildings, places and districts of historic preservation status
- C. Generation of building inventories for potential historic preservation status

AGENDA ITEM 4.A – Define most essential and long-term goals

Mr. Barber had distributed by email, prior to the May 24, 2019 meeting, a draft document entitled “PROJECTED GOALS & PLANS FOR THE HPC, 2019-2020”, dated May 2, 2019 and labeled as “from Les Barber”. Paper copies of this document were also made available by Mr. Barber at the May 24th meeting. This document is appended to and incorporated within these Minutes, following the Agenda.

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING OF MAY 24, 2019
PAGE 4 OF 6**

Mr. Barber walked the Commission members through the document. He noted that the Commission or its members had already gotten a start on some of the items listed in this document. Ms. Nader had begun the dialogue with the County on the possibility of seeking National Historic Landmark status for the Courthouse (Item 2); Ms. Nader volunteered that she was also prepared to work on Item A4 (“Begin to meet with local partners, Wood County Historical Museum”), provided she had assistance. Mr. Sampen agreed to assist Ms. Nader in this work. Possible entities which could be partners in historic preservation efforts undertaken by the Commission: county officials, the Wood County Historical Museum, Downtown BG, Board of Realtors, etc. Mr. Barber and Ms. Calderon volunteered to work on Item 6, “Begin informal discussions with the Mayor and City Council about forwarding a recommendation for CLG status, along with (possibly) a recommended/suggested-only set of design guidelines.” Mr. Barber relayed that, although her name had not shown up for some reason on the printed copy at Item A.5, “begin to research info about available tax credits and grants for HP” (historic preservation), Ms. Calderon had made a start on this.

Discussion turned to Item 7, “Begin planning for one or more “community pride” events to be held in spring/summer 2020 and later (walking tours, etc.). The Commission members discussed whether piggy-backing on an event sponsored by the Wood County Public Library might be a possibility, focusing on Boomtown, as a way to involve the public. Ms. Nader offered to organize an event, perhaps a Friday night hot dog roast to introduce the topic of “what is historic preservation”. This could be held at a historic home (which could be her own). The purpose would be to invite community officials and local leaders into a discussion about historic preservation, in a historic setting, and start soliciting input about what should be considered historic in the City of Bowling Green, what should constitute historic places and districts, etc.

The Members discussed whether the “Projected Goals & Plans for the HPC, 2019-2020 (May 2, 2019)” should be formally adopted by the Commission as its statement of essential as well as long-term goals. Ms. Nader asked for a motion adopting the “Projected Goals & Plans for the HPC, 2019-2020” (May 2, 2019) as those of the Commission. Mr. Barber made the motion, Mr. Sampen seconded it, and the motion was unanimously approved. The members concurred that a copy of the adopted “Projected Goals & Plans for the HPC, 2019-2020” should be made part of the Minutes of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 4.B -- Citizen recommendations regarding possible buildings, places, and districts of historic preservation status

Discussion then ensued concerning various ways of reaching out to the public to engage them in historic preservation efforts and the topic of historic preservation in the City of Bowling Green, and to invite citizen recommendations. Ideas generated by the Commission members, to generate citizen involvement, including in archiving and defining the historic: (a) have a regular spotlight in the media on a historic home or property, to tell its story and significance; (b) have owners or others able to nominate properties for a media

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING OF MAY 24, 2019
PAGE 5 OF 6**

spotlight, such as a newspaper article, or a factoid generated about the property; (c) Ms. Sayler suggested that the Commission have a kid's coloring book developed that encourages pride in the city and its historic places; (f) conduct walking tours; (g) conduct a "raffle" at a public event promoting historic preservation efforts in the City, at which the "winner" gets as a prize a history of his or her home or another property (if his/her home is not historic); (d) invite the public into an archiving process through working with the schools and the University; (e) provide maps for a walking tour of historic homes. Mayor Edwards suggested that the City's newsletter could be an important and accessible forum for reaching out to the public on historic preservation topics and events. The bulletin is emailed weekly. Mr. Barber introduced a document entitled "Request for Community Input" (May 2, 2019) which had a Version #1 (front) (more formal) and Version #2 (back) (less formal). (This document had also been emailed to Members prior to the meeting, and hard copies made available at the meeting). By concurrence, the Members determined that Version #1 would be published within the City's newsletter in one week, with Version #2 to follow in a subsequent edition of the City's newsletter. A copy of the "Request for Community Input" is attached and incorporated by reference into these Minutes.

AGENDA ITEM 4.C – Generation of building inventories for potential historic preservation status

The Members discussed how to involve the University in assisting the Commission in its work of generating building inventories for potential historic homes. Ms. Nader offered that it would be important to start a conversation early with University professors, and those with a potential interest in involving their classes. Mr. Sampen mentioned the example of the University of Toledo in an evening program in which a professor and her students highlighted historic districts within Toledo. Ms. Sayler offered to help make connections with Bowling Green State University's Architecture Program, and its Office of Community and Civic Engagement. Ms. Calderon offered to contact the East Side Residential group.

AGENDA ITEM 5 – LOBBY VISITATION

During lobby visitation, Mr. Aspacher, President of City Council, was present and the Commission Members discussed the process of recommending legislation to City Council to establish a CLG. Mr. Barber said that he was in favor of getting going on CLG enabling legislation. Mr. Sampen asked if the City were willing to enact CLG legislation, and Mr. Aspacher indicated that he believed that the majority of City Council would be receptive to considering a proposed CLG ordinance, once the language had been worked out. Ms. Sayler offered that she had the latest version of the State's criteria and format for a CLG ordinance. Ms. Nader asked for a case study concerning CLGs that would be of good

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING OF MAY 24, 2019
PAGE 6 OF 6**

educational value for the Commission—she suggested that the Commission receive a “really good” case study example (in the sense that things turned out well for the CLG process and the community) and a “really bad” case study example (in the sense that things turned out badly for the CLG process and the community). Ms. Saylor suggested that as a part of the process she would be a reviewer of the ordinance, as well as Mr. Bevil of the State Historic Preservation Office, prior to the proposed ordinance’s submission to City Council. Mr. Barber and Ms. Calderon offered to work on a proposed CLG ordinance and to that end believed that meeting for an initial discussion with Mayor Edwards and Mr. Aspacher would be in order, as an initial step.

AGENDA ITEM 6 – ADJOURNMENT

The Members confirmed that the next regular meeting of the Commission would be on Friday, June 28 at 3:30PM. The May 24, 2019 meeting adjourned by concurrence of the Members at 5:00PM.

Gail Nader, Vice Chairman

Date

Reina Calderon, Secretary

Date

Approved as to form,

Greg Halamay, Chairman

Date



**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING AGENDA
CITY OF BOWLING GREEN**

Administrative Services Building, 304 North Church Street
Bowling Green, Ohio 43402
Friday, May 24, 2019 – 3:30 P.M.

1. ROLL CALL

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. For the April 26, 2019 meeting.

3. UPDATES

A. Presentation by Ohio Historic Preservation Office

B. National Historic Landmarks Program (County Courthouse)

4. DISCUSSION

A. Define most essential and long-term goals

B. Citizen recommendations regarding possible buildings, places
and districts of historic preservation status.

C. Generation of building inventories for potential historic
preservation status.

*as May 2, 2019 Dec.
US - approved*

5. LOBBY VISITATION

6. ADJOURNMENT

*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)*

PROJECTED GOALS & PLANS FOR THE HPC. 2019 – 2020

NOTE: Flexibility will be necessary in dealing with these goals/plans. Goals and plans may be altered from time to time, and time lines may change.

NOTE #2: Nearly all of the items listed in the City's guidelines page to us, "What Could a Historic Preservation Commission Do?" are included here.

A.] Plans and Goals for June 2019 through December 2019

- 1) Develop a document outlining projected plans and goals for this Commission. *[This draft could serve as a starting point for discussion about such a document.]*
- 2) Work with the County Commissioners on the possibility of seeking National Landmark Status for the Courthouse. *[Gail is beginning this work.]*
- 3) Meet with the Ohio Preservation Office. *[We have already asked that this be arranged.]*
- 4) Begin to meet with local partners (Wood County Historical Museum, etc.).
- 5) Begin to research info about available tax credits and grants for HP.
- 6) Begin informal discussions with the Mayor and City Council about forwarding a recommendation for CLG status, along with (possibly) a **recommended/suggested-only** set of design guidelines. *[A major step for us, and one we will need to consider carefully.]*
- 7) Begin planning for one or more "community pride" events to be held in spring/summer 2020 and later (walking tours, etc.) *[Will need a leader.]*
- 8) Possibly meet with other local communities with HP status for guidance. *[As we feel the need.]*
- 9) Begin discussions and consultations re specific historic district and/or landmarks we might want to recommend (beyond Downtown and Boomtown). *[Another major step for us.]*
- 10) Review and consolidate any input from the community, reply to individuals as appropriate, etc.
- 11) Invite Downtown and Boomtown to begin discussions about whether their groups want to be part of a CLG program.

B.] Plans and Goals for January 2020 through December 2020

- 1) Complete and/or continue any of the above that have not been finished.
- 2) Begin to identify and record historic properties.
- 3) Assist home/building owners in how to research their properties.
- 4) Continue to work with City Government on enacting CLG status for BG.
- 5) If CLG status is approved by Council, begin developing individual sets of design guidelines for each historic district/landmark, in consultation with each of them individually.

- 6) Present individual district/landmark design guidelines to Council.
- 7) Recommend historic district/landmark status for each of those we decide to support. *[Numbers 6 and 7 will likely occur together.]*
- 8) Consider possible partnerships with historic-related organizations, development of heritage tourism programs, consider sponsoring pertinent events, etc.

C.] Plans and Goals beyond December 2020

- 1) Complete and/or continue any of the above that have not been finished.
- 2) Work with home/building owners on ways to maintain, preserve, etc. their properties.
- 3) Administer the CLG program, if it is approved for X number of historic districts/landmarks.

Below are two draft versions of a letter requesting input from the community. The first contains more information about us and our task, but it may be too long. The second is shorter and more informal.

Version #1

Lead: The recently established Historic Preservation Commission in Bowling Green is looking for input from the community.

In October 2018, City Council and Mayor Edwards established a Historic Preservation Commission for Bowling Green, with the goal of preserving, promoting, encouraging and supporting the maintenance, use and reuse of historic buildings in the city. The general purposes of the Commission's work are to foster civic beauty, increase property values, strengthen the local economy, maintain and enhance the distinctive character of the city, safeguard the city's heritage and facilitate re-investment and revitalization through historic preservation.

Establishment of the Commission (via Ordinance 8714, amending and adopting Section 30.101 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Bowling Green) was, in part, a fulfillment of recommendations coming from three recent city-wide studies (the Housing Section Update of the Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Plan/Bowling Green Improvement Plan and the Community Action Plan or CAP) that historic preservation efforts be undertaken in order to help safeguard and advance our city's future.

Mayor Edwards appointed the five members of the Historic Preservation Commission in January 2019, and we have met two times so far, once each in March and April. One of our earliest decisions as a commission was to solicit input from the Bowling Green community, partly as an information-gathering effort and partly as an early means of acquainting the community with our existence, as well as promoting the very idea of historic preservation in Bowling Green.

With this message we are asking all members of the Bowling Green community to share opinions and suggestions with us. In particular, we seek your help in identifying buildings and/or areas that seem to you to significantly represent the city's architectural and cultural history and might be worthy of preservation.

Three buildings and two districts already have a kind of official historic status, all having been listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Those buildings are the Wood County Courthouse, the old post office building (now the Senior Center) and Needle Hall in City Park; the two districts are Downtown and Boomtown. It is certain, however, that other buildings (whether homes, businesses or other types) and areas of Bowling Green have great historic importance within the City, and we hope very much that you will assist us in identifying as many worthy candidates for possible historic status as possible.

Please send your thoughts and suggestions to us at

