

## **MINUTES: HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

Meeting of Friday, September 27<sup>th</sup>, 2019 – 3:30 PM  
City of Bowling Green Administration Services Building  
304 N. Church Street, Bowling Green, Ohio 43402

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

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None.

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:** None.

### **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 (Attachment A). The September 27, 2019 meeting was the Commission's seventh. Also attached and incorporated within these Minutes is Attachment B, entitled "LEGISLATION PROPOSED BY THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION August 2019", and hand-notated on the first page at the top "Revised selected pages of L. Barber – Proposed Changes to the 2014 CLG Legislation – Illustrating several types of change[d] For HPC review September 27, 2019 or later", this document provided for discussion by Mr. Barber and taken up for consideration by the Commission under "Agenda Item 3. C. Certified Local Government Program Interest." [bracketed material in the original].

### **SUMMARY OF MOTIONS:**

The motions considered and voted upon at the September 27<sup>th</sup> Meeting were the following:

- (a) Motion to approve the delegation to Ms. Nader of the preparation of a draft plan for Public Engagement, inclusive of a draft public relations and communications plan consistent with City requirements; Mr. Barber made the motion, Mr. Sampen seconded the motion, and the Commission members voted unanimously in favor of the motion.
- (b) Motion for adjournment, unanimously approved.

### **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.

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 27, 2019  
PAGE 2 OF 5**

**AGENDA ITEM 2: APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The Minutes for the August 30, 2017 meeting having been distributed at the September 27, 2019 meeting by the Secretary, the Commission determined to table the approval of the Minutes of the August 30, 2019 meeting until the October 25, 2019 meeting.

**AGENDA ITEM 3: DISCUSSION:**

**ITEM 3.A PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT**

Mr. Sampen suggested that Ms. Nader be the Commission member in charge of coordinating a Public Engagement Plan. Ms. Nader confirmed that she had been working on a draft public relations plan for the Commission, but needed to have feedback from City Administrative staff and Ms. Sayler concerning such issues as the City's chain of command in relation to the Commission's public communications and public engagement efforts, proper levels of approval, and issues concerning communications and other policies which the City might have. Also, consideration as to appropriations and budgetary issues (e.g. how the Commission would obtain funds to pay for public relations events and other engagement initiatives, whether the Commission would need to adopt and submit for approval a budget and appropriations request to the City Administration, etc.) A basic press release would also be included within the draft Public Engagement Plan, to be prepared by Ms. Nader. Mr. Halamay indicated that in public engagement efforts, that he believed that the Commission should be reaching out to those involved in the City's Special Improvements District, since a number of major property owners within the City were already involved in, or would be affected by, the efforts centering in the Special Improvements District. Mr. Halamay requested Ms. Nader to indicate to the Commission her experience as a marketing professional; Ms. Nader indicated that she was experienced in business management and graphic design, has served as an operations manager, and worked as a grants coordinator with Professor Bob Vincent, within the Geography Department at Bowling Green State University. Mr. Barber made the motion that Ms. Nader be tasked with preparing a draft Public Engagement Plan for the Commission's consideration; Mr. Sampen seconded the motion; the Commission members voted unanimously to approve the motion.

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 27, 2019  
PAGE 3 OF 5**

**ITEM 3.B. PRINCIPLES AND STANDARDS:**

Although the Minutes for the August 30, 2019 Meeting had been tabled until the October 25, 2019 meeting, the Members consulted them to refresh their recollection of positions taken concerning the “Notes to the full HPC on early steps in seeking CLG status 8/30/2019” (attached to and incorporated by reference to the August 30, 2019 Minutes, as its Attachment B). The Commission members confirmed that they had determined by consensus that an Architectural Design Review Board would not be utilized. Other positions reflected in the Minutes of August 30, 2019 in relationship to the Commission’s positions on Items [A] through [F] on the “Notes to the full HPC on early steps in seeking CLG status 8/30/2019” looked to be accurate, subject to the formal consideration and approval of the Minutes at the October 25, 2019 meeting.

**ITEM 3.C. CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROGRAM INTEREST:**

Within the timing of the meeting, some of the discussion of Item 3.B. overlapped Item 3.C; these Minutes attempt to provide a consolidation of the discussion under this heading. Mr. Barber, Ms. Nader, and Ms. Calderon all were committed to looking at the 2014 CLG ordinance to see what it needed. Mr. Barber provided the “LEGISLATION PROPERED BY THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION August 2019”, (see Attachment B to these Minutes), which is a color-coded document. Mr. Barber walked the Commission members through the color coding of the document, identifying which colors corresponded to deletions, additions, and movements of text from one portion of the ordinance to another. Ms. Nader offered to provide to the Commission a red-lined (i.e. track changes) version of the proposed revised CLG ordinance proposed by Mr. Barber (Attachment B is a sample, not the whole proposed ordinance).

Ms. Calderon indicated that she was most interested in structural issues concerning the design of the ordinance, not only language changes; she raised the question of “why the need” for essentially two different definitions of historic properties, “historic properties” and “landmarks”, with only degrees of “specialness” creating a difference, and no objective standards for determining what was a local landmark (or why it would be more special or deserving of protected status than any other historic property). She expressed the view that the ordinance should be reviewed from the standpoint not only of how it might be beneficial but also how it could be misused or abused. Ms. Calderon linked this point

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 27, 2019  
PAGE 4 OF 5**

to the power of eminent domain and possible abuse of the ordinance to reallocate properties to those already within a concentrated real estate business who might be better able financially to fix them up. Ms. Nader indicated that if a property owner could not take care of a historic property, the City should have the ability to utilize the historic preservation ordinance as a means of protecting the property. Mr. Barber indicated that he did not think that the draft ordinance conferred powers of eminent domain.

Ms. Holly Kirkendall, Curator of the Wood County Historical Museum, in the audience, suggested that the Commission consider linking the ordinance definition of “landmark” to the state classification system of landmarked properties—i.e. landmarks would have some greater significance to the local community as well as the State of Ohio. Ms. Calderon indicated that she would have more comfort with the concept of local landmarks if they were tied to the State of Ohio’s process of defining what is a “landmark”. Mr. Barber expressed the view that it was important to be able to protect, as a local landmark under the ordinance, a structure such as Needles Hall—that this was a felt concern that properties which were “local landmarks” to the community should have protection beyond being only designated as “historic properties.” Ms. Calderon expressed the need to review the CLG ordinance in light of a property owner’s requirements under the State Building Code, in the event of a change of usage of the property; i.e. the CLG ordinance and its requirements would necessarily not operate in a vacuum relative to other requirements which a building or property owner may have, particularly in a change of use triggering other requirements under the State building code (e.g residential to commercial). She expressed that not all residential properties in the City may continue as such; at some point, redevelopment might mean converting residential properties to other uses, with other State Building Code requirements. Ms. Nader thought this concern was going too far for the scope of work to which the Commission should commit itself; essentially, it would be up to the property owner’s project contractor to ensure that all levels of state and local regulation were properly followed in connection with the project; however, she concurred that the ordinance should be constructed with awareness of other applicable requirements; the City’s legal counsel (i.e. Mike Marsh) would be involved for that type of concern. Mr. Sampen expressed the concern that flexibility was important in the CLG ordinance, and asked whether, after adoption, it could be amended.

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 27, 2019  
PAGE 5 OF 5**

Mr. Barber expressed that, as he had looked at the Design Guidelines/Standards concept, that these were essentially voluntary and that the ordinance itself would control a property owner's options. The primary focus should therefore be on the ordinance, not design guidelines/standards. Mr. Halamay and Ms. Calderon thought that other realities (i.e. realities in addition to, but having connection with, the requirements of a historic preservation ordinance) facing a property owner might need to be taken into consideration, as for example, the insurance aspects of a building once designated a historic property, the devaluation or loss of a historic building (and what requirements would apply in these situations), building code changes, and what were replacement, restoration, and repair situations vis a vis historic properties and how these would be practically and equitably identified. The Commission members concurred that in the case of a loss of a building (e.g. by fire), a property owner should not be required to rebuild it in a replacement of the historic original, but that the replacement building (or whatever was built or rebuilt on the site) should be historically sympathetic to the area.

**AGENDA ITEM 4: LOBBY VISITATION:**

There was no formal lobby visitation.

**AGENDA ITEM 5: ADJOURNMENT:**

The Members confirmed the next regular meeting of the Commission would be on Friday, October 25, 2019 at 3:30PM. The Commission Members voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Greg Halamay, Chairman      Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Reina Calderon, Secretary      Date



PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
CITY OF BOWLING GREEN

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

Administrative Services Building, 304 North Church Street  
Bowling Green, Ohio 43402  
Friday, September 27, 2019 – 3:30 P.M.

**1. ROLL CALL**

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A. For the August 30, 2019 meetings.

**3. DISCUSSION**

A. Public engagement

B. Principles and strategic decisions

C. Certified Local Government Program interest

**4. LOBBY VISITATION**

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

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