

## **MINUTES: HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

Meeting of Friday, August 30<sup>th</sup> 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, Gail Nader, and John Sampen.

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None.

**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 (Attachment A). The August 30, 2019 meeting was the Commission's sixth. Also incorporated within these Minutes is Attachment B, entitled "Notes to the full HPC on early steps in seeking CLG status 8/30/2019" (see AGENDA ITEM 3, DISCUSSION, at point A).

### **SUMMARY OF MOTIONS:**

The motions considered and voted upon at the July 26<sup>th</sup> Meeting were the following:

(a) Motion for approval of the Minutes for the July 26th 2019 Meeting. Mr. Sampen moved to approve; Mr. Barber seconded; and the Commission voted unanimously to approve.

(b) Motion for adjournment.

(c) Although not formally approved by motion, the Members discussed and on certain points concurred by consensus regarding certain philosophical principles for moving forward, addressed under "AGENDA ITEM 3. DISCUSSION – A. Principles moving forward (overall goal, design guidelines, flexibility, historic districts, contributing and non-contributing properties)" (see below).

### **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. Mr. Sampen joined the meeting at 3:35PM. All the Commission Members remained at the meeting until it was adjourned by their vote.

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MEETING OF AUGUST 30, 2019  
PAGE 2 OF 2**

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

The Minutes for the July 26<sup>th</sup> 2019 meeting were approved by unanimous vote of the members. Ms. Sayler advised that she had received an email confirmation from Mr. Bevil of the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office that the "Summary of Questions and Answers" section of the June 28<sup>th</sup> 2019 meeting minutes looked fine (this email from Mr. Bevil she had also forwarded to the Members prior to the August 30 meeting), the Members having determined at the July 26<sup>th</sup> meeting to ask Mr. Bevil to review for technical accuracy the "Summary of Questions and Answers" portion of the June 28<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes.

**AGENDA ITEM 3: DISCUSSION**

**A. Principles moving forward (overall goal, design guidelines, flexibility, historic districts, contributing and non-contributing properties)**

Distributed to the Members in advance of the August 30, 2019 meeting via email, by administrative staff of the Planning Department, was the document attached to these Minutes denominated "Notes to the full HPC on early steps in seeking CLG status 8/30/2019 From Les Barber" (Attachment B). The members discussed the items listed on Attachment A, [A] – [F], in order to determine concurrence or disagreement among the Commission members regarding these items, which the document identified as strategic decisions which the Board as a whole must make. Discussion concerning these items is captured below:

[A] Historical purity is not the goal; stabilization and preservation, coupled with the hope preservation efforts would encourage even more landowners in BG to support historic preservation for their properties is the goal.

[B] Flexibility is desired as to treatment of properties; public health and safety are important considerations, including in situations involving state building code requirements and permits newly applicable to the property due to a change in use; flexibility is also desired in the ability to amend a CLG ordinance or to adopt interim standards which become permanent after testing with some experience; backs and fronts of buildings may or may not be treated differently, depending also on the type of area (commercial, with multiple "public view corridors or publicly facing building sides (e.g. downtown buildings around the center of town) or residential areas (where backyards are typically not "publicly viewable"). Ms. Nader suggested that the term "historically sympathetic" be used as the operating concept, rather than "historically accurate"--that the goals should be both "aesthetically beautiful" and "historically sympathetic." The Commission discussed the efficacy and desirability, or not, of having a formal Design Review Board of architectural professionals set up to advise

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MEETING OF AUGUST 30, 2019  
PAGE 3 OF 4**

the Commission Members in decisions on applications from property owners who wished to make changes or demolish buildings in historic districts. Alternately, that no formal Design Review Board would be used, but that the Commission may employ architects as consultants in their decision-making process, as independent experts. President of City Council, Mr, Mike Aspacher, present at the meeting, informed the Commission that the City was undertaking a review of its zoning ordinances and in the East Wooster Street Corridor, certain design standards were being developed extending to choice of building materials, with natural materials (wood, masonry, stone) being preferred or required whenever buildings were modified; thus, there would be a need for cross-over discussion in the Commission's standard-setting for historic districts and that of the Planning department in its development of community-wide design standards. The anticipated development path for the zoning ordinance revisions for community-wide design standards is anticipated to take place over the next year. In addition, public nuisance enforcement officers will begin to be used starting in January, 2020, for nuisance violations by property owners.

[C] The Commission members discussed having one set of standards for the City or for specific historic districts; preference in discussion was for the latter as public buildings in the downtown and residential buildings in residential areas may need different treatment. Mr. Aspacher observed that the Commission's decision making would be simplified by clear standards that could be readily applied (i.e. either building project fits or doesn't fit the standards). Awnings as a form of signage and its regulation was raised by Mr. Halamay, as a proper object of regulation. The Commission members concurred that buildings in residential versus commercial areas presented different contexts and needed different sets of standards. Within the discussion of flexibility in standards for different districts or areas of the City, the Commission members also discussed the need for public engagement, and possibly a method of surveying public opinion among property owners. The need for an appeal process (e.g. to the zoning board of appeals) was also identified, as well as a mechanism for public participation in the adoption of the CLG ordinance and any historic districts regulated under it (e.g. vote of 60% of property owners within the proposed historic district, as a requirement for its establishment as an overlay district within the City's zoning code).

[D] The Commission members concurred that reasonable flexibility in meeting standards concerning design features was desirable (e.g. window replacements where wooden replacement windows would not be available, or would not be as long-lasting, as windows that were historically compatible in design with the building, but made of newer, more longer-lasting synthetic materials).

[E] The consensus was that the 2014 CLG legislation would be used as a basis for a revised, proposed CLG ordinance. Mr. Sampen expressed the need for the CLG ordinance

**MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MEETING OF AUGUST 30, 2019  
PAGE 4 OF 4**

to address non-contributing properties, a view in which other members concurred. Mr. Barber and Ms. Calderon offered to provide suggestions for proceeding from the 2014 ordinance, as it might be revised by the Commission as proposed legislation. A public event for promoting historic preservation was again raised, and the need for public engagement efforts generally. The Commission members affirmed that the downtown area was remarkable in looking as nice as it did, without the City having a CLG ordinance, and even though historic preservation efforts to date were entirely voluntary.

[F] Consensus was that the concept of historic preservation should be widely utilized in the City, with possibly the addition over time of other historic districts to the Boomtown and Main Street historic districts. Ideally, there would be many property owners working on historic preservation efforts, in diverse areas throughout the City.

**B. Public engagement.** This item was not separately discussed outside of Item 3.A.

**C. Certified Local Government Program Interest.** This item was not separately discussed outside of Item 3.A.

**AGENDA ITEM 4: LOBBY VISITATION**

There was no formal lobby visitation.

**AGENDA ITEM 5: ADJOURNMENT**

The Members confirmed that the next regular meeting of the Commission would be on Friday, September 27, 2019 at 3:30PM. Mr. Sampen moved to adjourn the meeting; Mr. Barber seconded the motion; the Members unanimously approved the motion. The August 30<sup>th</sup> meeting adjourned at 5:35 PM.

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date