

MINUTES: HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Meeting of Friday, July 26th, 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, Greg Halamay, and John Sampen.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Gail Nader.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Heather Sayler, 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. The July 26, 2019 meeting was the Commission's fifth.

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS:

The motions considered and voted upon at the July 26th Meeting were the following:

(a) Motion for approval of the Minutes for the May, 24, 2019 Meeting, which had been corrected since their June 28th distribution to add a signature line for Mr. Halamay for approval as to form (in addition to the previous signature line for Ms. Nader, who had chaired the May 24, 2019 Meeting in Mr. Halamay's absence). The motion for approval was made conditional on a notation in the present Minutes for correction of an error of substance in the April 26, 2019 and May 24, 2019 Minutes (see "Approval of Minutes, below, at first and second sentences). Mr. Sampen moved to approve; Mr. Barber seconded; and the Commission voted unanimously to approve.

(b) Motion for approval of the Minutes for the June 28, 2018 Meeting, subject to review of the "Summary of Questions and Answers" portion of those Minutes by Mr. Nathan Bevil, Ohio Historic Preservation Office, for accuracy (see "Approval of Minutes" below, at second paragraph). (Mr. Sampen moved to approve; Mr. Barber seconded; and the Commission voted unanimously to approve); and

(c) Motion for adjournment (Mr. Barber made the motion to adjourn; Mr. Sampen seconded; the Commission voted unanimously to adjourn).

AGENDA ITEM 1: ROLL CALL:

Greg Halamay, Chair, called the roll and each Member present acknowledged his or her presence, establishing the presence of a quorum. The Commission Members in attendance were present throughout the Meeting.

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING OF JULY 26th, 2019
PAGE 2 OF 5**

AGENDA ITEM 2: APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The Minutes for the May 24, 2019 were discussed, in particular as to an error in substance which appeared both in the April 26, 2019 Meeting Minutes and May 24, 2019 Meeting Minutes, as to the comparative benefits of National Registry and National Historic Landmark designations. As confirmed by Mr. Nathan Bevil of the Ohio Historic Preservation Office at his June 28th presentation, neither designation afforded protection against demolition or inappropriate modification, except for state and federal review if federal funding were involved in a project. Subject to a notation in the present Minutes documenting this substantive error, the Minutes of the May 24th 2019 Meeting were unanimously approved. The Members then discussed the Minutes for the June 28, 2019 meeting, and in particular Question 8 (in the “Summary of Questions and Answers” section of the Minutes) and its listing of types of protectable property. The Members determined to ask Ms. Saylor to submit the “Summary of Questions and Answers” portion of the Minutes to Mr. Nathan Bevil and ask him to review and confirm for technical accuracy. Subject to this confirmation, the Members unanimously approved the Minutes of the June 28, 2019 Meeting (see Summary of Motions, above).

**AGENDA ITEM 3: REVIEW OF PRESENTATION BY OHIO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION OFFICE**

The Members revisited the subject of a CLG ordinance and the Historic Preservation Office’s CLG program. Members considered whether a local historical landmarks approach within a CLG ordinance might be an alternative focus to seeking national historic preservation program designations for particular properties; “landmark” might be locally defined and regulated. Ms. Saylor advised that the availability of federal tax credits and state grant funding required compliance with regulations and program requirements. Mr. Halamay asked Ms. Saylor whether additional blocks could be included within already-designated historic districts within the City—i.e. the Boomtown and Main Street districts; could these districts be expanded by adding blocks. The Members discussed the concept of developing design guidelines for different historic districts within the City.

AGENDA ITEM 4: DISCUSSION

(A) Update on Implementation of Goals The letter of introduction to the Commission and its work (versions 1 and 2) has not yet been published within the City’s electronic newsletter. The Members discussed whether additional ways of reaching the public also needed to be worked out (e.g. via social media; a periodic newspaper article on historic buildings or places in the City; a public participation booth at the Farmer’s Market; cross-marketing with the Convention and Visitor’s Bureau, Wood County Historical Society,

MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING OF JULY 26th, 2019
PAGE 3 OF 5

~~the~~
and the Wood County Public Library; developing a flyer on historic properties in Bowling Green which could also provide a self-guided walking tour; leveraging local expertise in Bowling Green history, e.g. by working with local authors who have published on the subject). Ms. Holly Kirkendahl, Curator, Wood County Historical Center, and Ms. Chris Mowin, an architect with the Buehrer Group, Maumee, Ohio, both offered suggestions on public outreach: that creating events in which the public could have one-on-one, face-to-face conversation about historic preservation, and what concerned them (for example, about their building) was more effective in engaging the public than simply providing information in a format in which interchange with staff was not possible. Ms. Saylor suggested that the Building Doctor program sponsored by the Ohio Historic Preservation Office might be used as a way of reaching out to the public. A "Building Doctor" presentation and clinic could be advertised to the public and held possibly at the Wood County Historical Society, as a location. The Members concurred that:

- (I) working on a CLG ordinance;
- (II) reaching out to the public concerning the subject of historic preservation (i.e. public education) and the Commission's work, and
- (III) building networks for cross-marketing and partnering opportunities with other agencies within the City and Wood County

all should be pursued as parallel activities.

(B) Citizen Recommendations Regarding Possible Buildings, Places, and Districts of Historic Preservation Status Members concurred that community involvement was not needed to define the Commission's mission, which was already established by ordinance. Mr. Barber suggested, in regards to the development of a CLG ordinance, that philosophical issues concerning historic preservation ought to be worked out among the Commission members, before attempting to structure a proposed CLG ordinance: e.g. whether "historic preservation" meant returning a building to its original condition, or whether adaptation to contemporary materials would be permitted, and how would the architectural judgment concerning appropriateness of materials and design choices be handled. Mr. Halamay observed that it was difficult in practice in the downtown for building owners to have choices dictated to them—the issue was not historical preservation purity (in the sense of fidelity to an original), but dollars and cents. Tax credits could be important for getting building owners to do a historically appropriate repair (e.g. tuck-pointing areas of external brick building walls, instead of covering over areas with synthetic stone or aluminum siding). However, in some situations, using synthetic stone or vinyl siding might be appropriate. Professor Salim Elwazani, of the Architecture Program within the College of Technology, Bowling Green State University, who was in attendance at the meeting, offered the observation that, in historic preservation, the focus should be on moving the community into the spirit or "aura" of preservation. The goal was to develop values in the City of Bowling Green and among its citizens, as to preservation. This work of

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING OF JULY 26th, 2019
PAGE 4 OF 5**

cultivating values essentially required addressing three things: #1: to develop and identify the community's awareness of its own history; #2: to foster the social side of historic preservation, and help people create spaces where they would like be more often (e.g. having meetings to which the public is invited in historic buildings in the City is a positive step); and #3: addressing the economic side of preservation; help others apply for funding, and be creative on the economic side. Professor Elwazani offered that Secretary of Interior guidance documents provided standards for: leaving a historic building as is, preserving it, rehabilitating it, restoring it, and reconstructing it.

Mr. Sampen offered that he would like to see the Commission develop as a resource to the community—that people should be able to come to the Commission for advice, and information about substitute materials, lists of contractors specializing in particular types of repairs or installations, etc.

Mr. Halamay suggested that property owners of buildings in Bowling Green would likely already know of the availability of federal tax credits. Mr. Halamay suggested that the Commission consider designating an Architectural Review Board (or Design Review Board) which would report to the Commission and serve as a Technical Assistance Committee; property owners would be able to meet with the Architectural Review Board to assess proposed changes to a building, and the Architectural Review Board would be in the position to advise the property owner of the implications of his or her proposed changes to the building; in addition, the Architectural Review Board would be able to educate property owners about available products or contractors. The Architectural Review Board would be helpful to property owners asking the question, "What are the possibilities of my building?"

Mr. Halamay offered that Downtown BG had the participation of property owners in the City and that special improvement districts may be an avenue which could assist in historic preservation. Mr. Halamay recommended that future exchanges and a future meeting of the Commission be held with Downtown BG. It was important to create community excitement for historic preservation, Downtown BG could be instrumental in creating that excitement. Mr. Halamay offered that alleys within the Downtown should be made into destination places, not just "walk-throughs"; Dog-Leg Alley provided an example, in which students of architecture were involved in design.

Mr. Barber suggested that the Commission revisit the earlier topic of philosophies of historic preservation, in connection with how historical districts would be identified. For example, what would be the Commission's overall goal in historic preservation efforts: would it be "historical purity" (i.e. bringing properties back to their original state) or would it look to incrementally preserve what already existed in the City? Should there be a single set of guidelines which applied across the City, or guidelines for individual areas of the City? Would the focus be on seeking historical purity in details (e.g. would owners in

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING OF JULY 26th, 2019
PAGE 5 OF 5**

residential areas be allowed to change out old, double hung windows to a more modern window design?) Would the historic districts be limited to the existing ones and a few obvious areas—Boomtown, Downtown, North Main Street, South Main Street, and the Courthouse district? Or in the alternative, do we encourage as many people in the City to engage in historic preservation and create mini-historic districts placed throughout the City?

The Members concurred ^{Sampen} that philosophical principles, in regards to historic preservation, should be developed by Members and discussed, at the next meeting. The Members agreed to email to each other, prior to the next meeting, proposed working philosophical principles. Mr. ~~Barber~~ suggested that the next meeting's agenda encompass: (a) philosophical principles; (b) outreach to the public; and (c) the CLG ordinance.

(C) Generation of building inventories for potential historic preservation status.
This agenda item was not specifically discussed.

AGENDA ITEM 5: LOBBY VISITATION

There was no formal lobby visitation; contributions to the meeting by visitors are noted in the Minutes under agenda discussion items.

AGENDA ITEM 6: ADJOURNMENT

The Members confirmed that the next regular meeting of the Commission would be on Friday, August 30, 2019 at 3:30PM. Mr. Barber moved to adjourn the meeting; Mr. Barber seconded the motion; the Members unanimously approved the motion. The July 28th meeting adjourned at 5:35 PM.

 CHAIRMAN 8-30-19  9/30/19
Gregy Halamay, Chairman Date Reina Calderon, Secretary Date



**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING AGENDA
CITY OF BOWLING GREEN**
Administrative Services Building, 304 North Church Street
Bowling Green, Ohio 43402
Friday, July 26, 2019 - 3:30 P.M.

- 1. ROLL CALL**
- 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - A. For the May 24, 2019 and June 28, 2019 meetings.
- 3. REVIEW** - Presentation by Ohio Historic Preservation Office
- 4. DISCUSSION**
 - A. Update on Implementation of goals
 - B. Citizen recommendations regarding possible buildings, places and districts of historic preservation status.
 - C. Generation of building inventories for potential historic preservation status.
- 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)