

HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION NOTES

DATE: November 12, 2014

TIME: 4:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Wes Hamilton, Carolyn Larson, Andy Bloedorn

ABSENT: Lynn Englund, Mary Edel Beyer, Eric Floan, Merle Hanson, Kendall Larson, and Shaune Burke

STAFF PRESENT: Myron White, Development Coordinator

OTHER: Greg Gaut, Historic Preservation Consultant

Because there was not a quorum present, consider this document to be notes reflecting the discussion, there will be no official minutes from the meeting.

Wes Hamilton stated that because there was not a quorum, members present would have a general discussion with Mr. Gaut regarding the Preservation Education Plan.

Mr. Gaut explained that in the interest of keeping the Education Plan moving forward he would like to discuss a work proposal and get some feedback from Commissioners. Mr. Gaut thanked the Commissioners for awarding him the Preservation Education Plan contract and further explained that it combined two of his passions, Historic Preservation and Education. He noted that on the State level, Historic Preservation Education was highlighted in their 5 year plan but he had yet to see a significant education component surface.

Greg talked about how an education plan could take on two very different paths depending on the audience:

- An example of a more technical historic preservation education program might be used to provide property owners with expert information on windows and the pros and cons of rebuilding existing windows rather than replacement.
- A different approach to education might be educating the public on why there are policies in place to help protect historic structures and the importance of preserving our local history.

Mr. Gaut made the following suggestions for the December Historic Preservation Commission Meeting:

- Provide a brief overview/perspective on the history of the Historic Preservation Commission:
 - what seems to have worked well in the past, what has not

- look at historic documents that outline roles and responsibilities at the federal, state and local level with the understanding/expectation that much of the work is done at the local level with the local preservation commissions seemingly wield the most power with regard to enforcement.
 - use this information as a basis for orientation for incoming members
- Provide an overview of “players” in local historic preservation and discuss the opportunities to partner/collaborate:
- Downtown Main Street
 - Winona Visitors and Convention
 - Winona County Historical Society/History Center
 - Others?
- Discuss ideas on how we might better engage the public/get public “buy in”.

The result of the information and dialogue should help the Commission to articulate a mission statement along with a set of goals and objectives.

DISCUSSION

Andy mentioned that he liked a “back to basics” approach. Concentrating on what the HPC can do well.

Carolyn agreed explaining that the Commission needs focus.

Wes liked the idea of collaboration and wants the Commission to take a proactive role.

Commissioners along with Mr. Gaut went on to discuss strategies on how we can get the public engaged in Historic Preservation.

- How the Commission might help to best present historic information about Winona.
- Talks ensued about how residents were receptive of short plays with actors depicting historic figures.
- Members discussed the pros and cons of bringing in speakers.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 P.M.