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Executive Summary

The City of Raleigh Parks, Recreation and Cultural Resources Department (PRCR) is currently working on the development of a Master Plan for the Latta House & University Site at 1001 Parker St. located in the historic Oberlin Village.

The first part of this Master Plan process is conducting a Situation Assessment that includes site analysis, historical research, community data collection, a public meeting with the area’s Citizens Advisory Council (CAC), a public meeting with the Friends of Oberlin Village, online community survey, establishment of a public website, and identifying & interviewing stakeholders.

The key community concerns and recommendations identified from the stakeholder interviews and the community survey include:

• Trepidation surrounding the development & gentrification of the area
• Suggestion on historic interpretation of the Latta House & University Site
• Opportunities for a community gathering space
• Preservation of the site’s large trees & open space

This initial phase also includes the gathering of a list of recommended Citizen Planning Committee (CPC) members comprised of stakeholders that work together with the project team in the master planning process. The CPC membership recommendations and Situation Assessment is presented to the City of Raleigh Historic Resources & Museums Advisory Board (HRMAB) with final approval by the Raleigh City Council.

Following the Council’s approval, the Project Team and the CPC begin the next phase of master planning by generating a park design addressing the issues and recommendations identified. This involves gathering the community’s feedback during subsequent public meetings so that the end result will be a Master Plan the community and City can embrace.
Introduction

Project Overview

The project area is located at 1001 Parker Street and occupies just under two acres of land. The property is surrounded by single-family homes, with a mixed-use commercial corridor along Oberlin Rd approximately 600 feet east. There are several close-by parks including Jaycee, Isabella Cannon, & Chamberlain Park.

The Latta House & University Site has a rich history that is integral in understanding African-American life in Raleigh in the late 1800s & early 1900s. The site is a Raleigh Historic Landmark, listed in the National Register of Historic Places and is part of the Oberlin Village Historic Overlay District.

Latta House & University Site - Context Map

Means & Methods

To begin the public master plan process, a Situation Assessment is conducted to collect information about the surrounding communities, identify stakeholders and issues important to them, and assess the communities’ needs. The Situation Assessment’s purpose is to provide means for an effective public participation process by understanding the needs, issues, and conditions of the stakeholder community.

Research, public participation, review of the study area context and demographics, field review, and site analysis and observation are some of the methodology that is used in developing the Situation Assessment report. Additionally, methods for community engagement were established early in the process to include social media outreach, stakeholder interviews, community survey, public meetings, and the selection and participation of a Citizen Planning Committee.

The master plan process will follow the Consensus Seeking pathway outlined in the City of Raleigh Parks, Recreation and Cultural Resources Department Comprehensive Public Participation Program for Park Planning. A Consensus Seeking process is designed to provide a high level of public acceptance for park planning, design, and development. Even though final decision-making authority rests with elected officials, the public can influence decision-making and assist the Department in making informed choices by helping to define the problem, generate a range of alternatives, develop evaluation criteria and make recommendations.

Public involvement in a Consensus Seeking process typically involves a planning committee, and participants are usually representatives of organized interest groups or individuals who can articulate shared interests of a broader public such as homeowners and business owners. Decision making often takes the form of consensus that requires opposing interests to work together to develop a common and mutually acceptable solution.

Proposed Public Participation Timeline

2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Survey Opens</td>
<td>Community Survey Closes</td>
<td>City Council Presentation</td>
<td>Public Input Meeting</td>
<td>Public Input Meeting</td>
<td>Raleigh Historic Development Commission Presentation</td>
<td>Raleigh Historic Development Commission Presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celebrate Oberlin Village Event Outreach</td>
<td>Citizen Planning Committee Meeting</td>
<td>Citizen Planning Committee Meeting</td>
<td>TBD Event Outreach</td>
<td>TBD Event Outreach</td>
<td>Oberlin Festival Event Outreach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Context

Site History
Reverend Morgan London Latta founded Latta University in 1892. Reverend Latta was born into slavery at Fishdam, a Cameron family plantation near the Neuse River approximately 25 miles north of Raleigh, yet persevered to support his twelve brothers and sisters and become one of Shaw University’s first graduates. Latta University at its height was home to 26 buildings and 1400 students, including orphaned children of formerly enslaved people. The university operated for thirty years. The Latta House was the residence of Reverend Morgan London Latta and his family. It was the last remaining historical landmark of the original 26 structures that comprised Latta University.

The Latta House was designated a Raleigh Historic Landmark in 1993 and listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 2002. Unfortunately, the Latta House was destroyed by fire in 2007.

In January 2009 an archaeological survey began at the site of the former Reverend M.L. Latta House and University. The Raleigh Historic Development Commission (RHDC) worked with City Parks and Recreation staff and Environmental Services, Inc. to complete the archaeological survey. On August 4, 2009, the Raleigh City Council accepted the archaeological report as presented by the RHDC and the consultant.

The Raleigh Historic Development Commission administered the archaeological survey for the City of Raleigh. The investigation was conducted to recover artifacts and data from the Latta House and accessory buildings, additional buildings related to the University, an old well located on the property, and other site features. A comprehensive analysis of the site yielded new information regarding the history and prior land-use of the University and residence. Based on findings, the consultant, Environmental Services, Inc., recommended that the site be reinstated as a Raleigh Historic Landmark. On July 6, 2010 City Council adopted an ordinance designating the Latta House and University Site as a Raleigh Historic Landmark.

Oberlin Village
Free African-Americans established a settlement along Oberlin Road in the 1850s prior to the Civil War. Oberlin Village was officially established in the late 1860s when white landowners, including Lewis W. Peck and Timothy F. Lee, subdivided land along Oberlin Road and sold lots to newly freed African Americans. By the 1880s there were roughly 150 households within Oberlin Village. The main social node of the village was along Oberlin Road between Mayview Road and Bedford Avenue. The Latta House & University Site is an integral historical aspect of Oberlin Village.

The Wilson Temple United Methodist was originally built in 1873 as a wooden sanctuary, and the still-intact Gothic Revival-style church was built in 1911. Three dwellings clustered on Oberlin Road are particularly notable for their two-story height; the 1890 Willis Graves House, the 1900 James S. Morgan House, and the 1910 front addition to the John and Mary Turner House. Two-story houses were rarities for the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century black homeowners in and around Raleigh and the larger houses reflect the relative wealth and stature of the owners. Oberlin Cemetery dates to at least 1873. However, a number of unmarked headstones, as well as local tradition, suggest that the cemetery was once a slave burial ground.
Oberlin Village Historic District Special Character Essay Excerpt

Oberlin Village Historic Overlay District possesses architectural significance for its unusually wide variety of late nineteenth and early-twentieth-century house types for a small district. The styles and types include Queen Anne, vernacular tri-gable, shotgun, Craftsman bungalow, Tudor Revival, Minimal Traditional, Ranch, and Split-level. Unlike the standard versions of these popular styles and types in white neighborhoods, those in Oberlin tend to be vernacular versions not present in plans distributed in popular publications, whether catalogues, magazines, newspapers, or mail order outlets. African American historic districts in North Carolina often present more vernacular versions of popular house types than are found in white historic districts.

The street design and landscape of Oberlin Village has a special character quite distinct from the surrounding more affluent white neighborhoods of West Raleigh. Because it was planned piecemeal over decades rather than designed as a planned community, its streets evolved over time and have differing characters. The wide main street of Oberlin Road, a long-time country road along the highest ridge in west Raleigh before being developed as an African American rural village, constitutes the district’s spine. Its sidewalks serve many pedestrians and bicyclists; its bus stops are heavily used. The narrow side streets include through-streets, cul-de-sacs, and unpaved lanes, none with sidewalks. A canopy of oaks, pecans, magnolias and cedar trees create a lush atmosphere. Lots are quite small, with 50 x 150 foot lots of one-fifth-acre being the norm. Driveways are generally unpaved and often shared between neighbors. Many rear yards have high board fences for privacy.

Oberlin’s porches constitute one of its most characteristic and picturesque architectural elements. The wraparound porches of the Willis Graves House and John and Mary Turner House have painted blue ceilings, a folk tradition said to keep away flies. Many of the district’s porches contain alterations that are particularly characteristic of African American neighborhoods, such as replacement concrete floors, often paved with terra cotta tiles, replacement decorative metal porch posts, even for the upper sections of bungalow porch posts, installed in the mid-twentieth century, and vintage metal awnings that add to the shade of the porch roofs.


Existing Site Conditions

The site is scattered with mature hardwood trees and young planted trees and shrubs with a maintained grass understory. There is also a grass field where the Latta House used to reside. The frontage along Parker Street includes a landscaped bed with a low slate border. A portion of the plants on site are considered invasive species.
**Existing Conditions: Structures**

There is a historic well that is capped by concrete, as well as a historical marker constructed out of bricks salvaged from the Latta House. The site also includes an outdoor grill that is in poor shape and not original to the Latta site.

**Site Analysis Overview**

The project area lies within the Neuse River drainage basin. The project area drains north and west into an ephemeral tributary drainage of Southeast Prong Beaverdam Creek, which is a tributary of Crabtree Creek. Crabtree Creek flows into the Neuse River. The project area occurs within the Cecil soil association. The soils within this association are gently sloping to steep, deep, well-drained soils that have a subsoil of firm red clay and are derived mostly from gneiss and schist. A detailed survey of the site can be found in Appendix E: Site Survey.

The current zoning of the property is Residential-10. The future land use is planned to be low-density residential. The site is within the Oberlin Historic Overly District, and the Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District. The site is near the Oberlin Rd. Streetscape Plan.
Archaeological Study Findings (2009)

The project area does contain intact archaeological deposits that appear to date to the use of the property as the residence of the Latta family and as Latta University. The deposits date to the historically significant occupation of the property by the Reverend M.L. Latta and Latta University. The significant archaeological deposits are not spread across the entire property, rather they are concentrated in particular areas, most specifically in the western half of the property. It is recommended that no activities that have the potential to impact the subsurface archaeological deposits in the western half of the property occur without prior archaeological investigation to ensure that the activities do not adversely affect the archaeological deposits.

Architectural/Construction artifacts such as nails and window glass and General Foodways artifacts such as curved glass were the most common artifacts. Specific foodways items included white ware and porcelain from serving dishes, a spoon, bottle and jar glass, and faunal materials including animal bone, oyster shell, and clam shell. Clothing-related artifacts consisted of a glass button and a metal snap. Personal artifacts included fragments from medicine bottles, shoe shine bottles, fragments from old, single-sided shellac records, and a piece of decorative glass, possibly from costume jewelry. Labor related artifacts included barbed wire, a wrench, and an iron padlock with a brass mechanism.

Deed Restrictions

The project site property was deeded to the City of Raleigh October, 26th 2007 by Adryon H. Clay.

There are five important restrictions listed in the deed that should be kept in mind when preparing for the Latta House & University Site Master Plan.

"The Property shall be owned, held, operated, used and enjoyed subject to the following restrictions and covenants:

(a) A mature tree canopy shall be maintained over seventy-five percent (75%) (approximately, 64,360 square feet) of the Property. Notwithstanding the foregoing, diseased or dead trees may be cut or removed as necessary to control or prevent imminent hazard, disease or fire in accordance with good forestry management practices; provided, any cut or removed tree(s) shall be supplemented by or replaced with appropriate tree-sapling(s) to restore and maintain a 75% mature tree canopy over the Property.

(b) No portion of the Property shall be used for the parking or storage of motor vehicles.

(c) The total roof area of structures on the Property shall not exceed five percent (5%) (approximately, 4,291 square feet) of the Property.

(d) The Property shall not be subdivided.

(e) The Property shall be owned, held, operated, used and enjoyed only for public park purposes."
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Community Framework

The Latta House & University Site is surrounded by single-family homes, schools, parks, and a corridor of mixed-use & commercial along Oberlin Rd. As a park’s context has a significant impact on the way it is used and accessed, demographic information and a review of these nearby amenities, parks, and schools was compiled for this report.

Demographics

In the census block group immediately surrounding the Latta House & University Site, the population is mostly white with an average income of $108,320. There are about 1,375 people living in 690 households, and roughly 20% of the population is under 19.

In the census block groups adjacent to and including the Latta House & University Site, the population is significantly more white with most common household income bracket being between $35,000 and $49,000. There are about 8,968 people living in 4,470 households, and roughly 15% of the population is under 19.

Nearby Neighborhoods & Schools

Fred Olds Elementary School (PK-5th grade) and Broughton High School (9th-12th grade) are both within a 1-mile radius from the Latta House & University Site. Both schools are in the Wake County Public School system. Olds Elementary School is located on 2.97 acres at 204 Dixie Trail. It was opened in 1927 and has 342 enrolled students. Broughton High School is located on 26.24 acres at 723 St Marys Street. It was opened in 1929 and has 2,129 enrolled students.

The Latta House & University Site is within the University Park Homeowners Association. The University Park HOA was founded to preserve the quality of the neighborhood while promoting reasonable and desirable growth. A few of their accomplishments include: promoted safer crossing for Fred Olds School, supported Isabella Cannon Park Children’s Mural, and influenced zoning & variance regulations.

Mayview affordable housing community is also located with a few blocks of the Latta House & University Site. It has 61 units which are rent subsidized, which means rent is income based.
Nearby Parks & Greenways

Within a 10-minute walk of the Latta House & University Site are 4 parks with a combined 37 acres and a total of 19 park experiences provided. There is also 2/3 of a mile of greenway within a 10-minute walk of the project site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Distance to Latta</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jaycee</td>
<td>0.1 mile</td>
<td>24.85</td>
<td>11 = Ballfields, Greenway Access, Gym, Picnic Shelter, Playground, Community Center, Sand Volleyball, Tennis Court, Walking Trails, Daylily Garden, Dog Run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlain</td>
<td>0.3 mile</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2 = Outdoor Basketball, Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Garden &amp; Raleigh Little Theatre</td>
<td>0.5 mile</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>2 = Picnic Shelter, Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabella Cannon</td>
<td>0.5 mile</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>4 = Ballfields, Outdoor Basketball, Picnic Shelter, Playground</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within a 10-minute Drive there are 55 parks with a combined 822 acres and 152 experiences. There is 24.5 miles of greenway within a 10-minute drive of the Latta House & University Site.

Community Engagement

Community participation is an important component of the master plan process allowing multiple opportunities to engage the community and solicit input throughout the process. This participation helps foster a sense of ownership for the community and encourages future stewardship for the park. The following summarizes the community outreach that has been completed or is currently being used to engage the public during the park planning process.

City of Raleigh Project Website

The City of Raleigh initiated a project website in October 2018 to inform the community, provide updates of the process, and promote involvement in the Park’s master plan process. The website contains a location map of the site, the current activity, a brief project summary and history, contact information, and a project schedule with dates and description of tasks.

Highlighted at the top of the page is current activity to direct visitors to public input opportunities. The website will continue to be used to keep visitors informed of project progress and upcoming public feedback meetings. The project website also provides links to download report documents as they become available.

Public Input Project Website

The City of Raleigh also has a project website through https://publicinput.com/Latta. This website hosted the community input survey, the citizen planning committee interest card, and provided opportunity for visitors to leave comments & engage with one another.

This website will be kept up to date throughout the master plan process to further encourage discussion among interested citizens.

Social Media Outreach

Multiple outlets of social media have been used during the park planning process to encourage community participation, provide information and to promote the Latta House and University Site Master Plan. One example includes MyRaleigh Subscriptions (which is a free subscription based service provided by the City of Raleigh) allow the City to provide the community access to relevant information about the park planning process by pro-actively delivering new information through email and wireless alerts.

Mailers, Fliers, & Postcards

Further outreach was undertaken by mailing a postcard to the 1,000 residents who live closest to the Latta House & University Site to inform them of the Master Plan and the community input survey. Flyers and postcards with this same information were stationed at several locations including: Wilson Temple United Methodist, Oberlin Baptist Church, Friends Meeting of Raleigh, Community Deli (901 Oberlin Rd), Jaycee Park, Fred Fletcher Park, 5 Points Center for Active Adults, Pullen Park, Method Community Park, Halifax, City of Raleigh Museum, Mordecai Historic Park, Pope House Museum, Cameron Village Library, YMCA (1012 Oberlin Rd), Raleigh Little Theatre, John Chavis Memorial Park, Shaw University, and St. Augustine University.
Hillsborough-Wade CAC

The Latta House & University Site falls within the newly combined Hillsborough-Wade Citizen Advisory Council. A presentation was given at their monthly meeting on Tuesday, October 23, 2018. The attendees were given a project fact sheet and hard copies of the community input survey & citizen planning committee interest card.

Some of the questions they asked were about deed restrictions and potential scope of construction. Many also expressed interest in the history of the site and their desire to see that interpreted successfully. There was also some comments about connecting to the surrounding historic attractions within Oberlin Village.

Friends of Oberlin Village

The Friends of Oberlin Village is a grass-roots non-profit organization that formed in 2011 to preserve, protect, and honor the establishment of Oberlin Village through community awareness, outreach and education. A presentation about the Latta House & University Site Master Plan was given at their Monday, November 26, 2018 meeting. The attendees were given a project fact sheet and hard copies of the community input survey & citizen planning committee interest card.

There were few questions asked and they were mostly about the deed restrictions for the site. There was also a question about the end date for the community input survey which was scheduled to close on December 3rd.

Community Input Survey

An online community survey was developed to further understand the community’s needs and interests in the planning process for the Latta House & University Site. The community survey was available online from October 19, 2018 through December 3, 2018. A link to the survey was provided on the City of Raleigh’s project website, the Public Input project home page, and promoted through the City of Raleigh’s emails and other social media outlets. The survey was conducted through a third-party survey software enabling anonymous input and consistent response compilation.

A total of 42 surveys were completed online. Hard copies were made available at various public meetings, and three were handed in to be collected. Please refer to Appendix C and D for a copy of the community survey questions and additional survey results. The survey’s key findings are summarized below.

General Questions

- Most visited parks: Pullen, Rose Garden & Raleigh Little Theatre, & Jaycee
- 38% visit City of Raleigh Parks weekly
- Top reasons that prevent park usage: Too far from residence, Other, Not well maintained, & Don’t know what is being offered.
- Activities needed: Nature, History & Museums, Fitness & Wellness, and Arts

Site Specific Questions

- Tied top two ways to get to Latta: Vehicle & Walk
- South (Van Dyke Ave) is where most enter the park when walking or biking
- Experiences Latta should provide: Cultural Opportunities, Social Gathering, & Sitting Outside
- Amenities Latta should provide: Community Gardens, Walkway/Trails, Picnic Areas/Shelters, Neighborhood Gathering Space
- Best way to interpret the history: Interpretive Panels, Sculpture/Statue, & Building Footing Outline

Household Information

- 87% of respondents are residents of the City of Raleigh
- 47% have lived in their current address for 7+ years, 31% for 1-3 years, and 22% for 4-6 years
- 41% of respondents are over 55, 38% are 23-40 years old, and 22% are 41-55 years old.
- 6% of respondents(or members of their household) are Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Ancestry.
- 72% of respondents are White, 16% African American/Black, 6% Prefer not to disclose, 3% Asian/Pacific Islander, 3% Multi-racial

Comments

- Preserve the history of the site
- Incorporate education
- Keep the site as a green space
- Something nicer for families with small children

Stakeholder Interviews

Focused interviews were conducted with individual stakeholders to develop a more nuanced understanding of issues and opportunities surrounding the Latta House & University Site. The stakeholders initially contacted were from the project’s Stakeholder Matrix that was established early in the process by PRCR staff. Other stakeholders were also contacted as names or organizations were suggested (see Appendix D for an example of the Stakeholder Interview Questions). A total of eleven stakeholders elected to participate (see Appendix C).

The responses to these interviews are summarized in the next section - Stakeholder Concerns and Recommendations.
Stakeholder Concerns and Recommendations

Perceived Neighborhood Demographics

The stakeholders were generally in agreement of who lives in the area. Their perception is that it is currently a mix of African American descendants of Oberlin Village, young professionals, families with children, university students, and seniors. The stakeholders foresee changes to this though as development and gentrification continue to affect the area.

Community Concerns

The stakeholders continually mentioned in their interviews the community’s trepidation when it comes to development and gentrification affecting the historical character, integrity, and community feel of the area. The stakeholders also mentioned a community concern for the future nearby road development, especially of Oberlin Rd. The community also worries that the Latta House & University Site itself will become heavily developed, subdivided, lose its natural state, not be well maintained, have poor security, or the history will not be represented adequately.

Projects in the Surrounding Area

The interviews also brought to light several projects in the area surrounding the Latta House & University Site. The Friends of Oberlin Village have applied for an inclusive Public Art grant from the Z Smith Reynolds Foundation. This grant, if awarded, could fund the creation of a permanent work of public art. The site for this art has yet to be chosen. Various developments were mentioned, as well as the future need for improved stormwater management, traffic control, and sidewalk widening that the developments would entail. The Preservation NC’s headquarters are also relocating to Oberlin Rd and could potentially provide opportunities and resources to the Oberlin Village.

The Future Role of the Latta House & University Site

The stakeholders had various ideas for the future of the project site. Some insisted that the site remain a place for passive recreation and should retain its natural state with an open green space. Some suggested a more programmed area to support the project site being a place for gatherings and social events. Their suggestions included a cultural center, event space, community gardens, and even access to electricity & water.

All stakeholders who participated agreed that the history of the site is extremely important and this site should be used as a place to educate people on its significance. There were a few different suggestions for the best way to interpret the history of site including historical reproductions of the buildings, educational kiosks, public art, outlines of the former buildings, mini-museums, or a display of the recovered artifacts.

Citizen Planning Committee

One of the initial tasks of the park Master Planning process is the identification and recommendation of interested community members for the Citizen Planning Committee (CPC). Using the data collected from stakeholder interviews, community surveys, recommendations from other stakeholders, and research & demographic analysis, a list was compiled of potential members.

Some of the criteria for selection to the CPC was residency in the service area of the park, a willingness to commit the time to attend meetings, have an interest in the park and its uses, and embody diverse demographics and interests.

The following individuals are recommended for the Latta House & University Site Master Plan Citizen Planning Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Group Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brandi Neuwirth</td>
<td>Latta House Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eric Phoenix</td>
<td>Latta House Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Greg Paige</td>
<td>Latta House Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Max Neuwirth</td>
<td>Latta House Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Karen Throckmorton</td>
<td>Friends of Oberlin Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sabrina Goode</td>
<td>Friends of Oberlin Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cheryl Grooms Williams</td>
<td>Friends of Oberlin Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Joe Holt</td>
<td>Friends of Oberlin Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Anthony Cebina</td>
<td>Raleigh Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Joe Cebina</td>
<td>Raleigh Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dawn Leonard</td>
<td>Raleigh Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Jenny Camp</td>
<td>Raleigh Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kerri Burke</td>
<td>Raleigh Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lexie Beale</td>
<td>Raleigh Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Richard Haywood</td>
<td>Raleigh Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Brittany Bryan</td>
<td>Raleigh Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Catherine Maxwell</td>
<td>Raleigh Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Anita Sawhney</td>
<td>University Park HOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Dru McGill</td>
<td>North Carolina State University - Archaeology Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kaye Webb</td>
<td>Raleigh Historic Development Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Gaston Williams</td>
<td>Raleigh Historic Development Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Alicia McGill</td>
<td>Historic Resources and Museum Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sam Mordecai</td>
<td>Historic Resources and Museum Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Clodagh Lyons-Bastian</td>
<td>Parks, Recreation, and Greenway Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below is the demographic make-up of the Citizen Planning Committee. It is a diverse group that the Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources Department feels adequately represents the community. Additional demographic information is available upon request for each of the recommended members.

**Summary and Next Steps**

After the CPC membership recommendations and Situation Assessment are presented to and approved by the City of Raleigh Historic Resources and Museum Advisory Board (HRMAB) and the Raleigh City Council, the Project Team and the CPC will begin the next phase of master planning. The CPC will meet to develop a consensus park vision plan addressing the issues and recommendations identified in the Situation Assessment. Roles and responsibilities of the members, along with developing strategies are part of the initial meeting.

The first Public Meeting will be held to present the findings, recommendations, and initial conceptual vision for the park and to receive community feedback. Subsequent CPC and Public Meetings will take place leading up to a presentation of the Master Plan to the HRMAB and City Council. The public will continue to be informed throughout the process by project website updates, online notifications, and targeted emails.

The Project Team and the CPC will utilize the data collected for the Situation Assessment continuously throughout the planning process to help with informed decisions regarding their community’s vision for the park. The understanding of the community concerns, projected needs, and recommendations provided in this document will help guide creation of a Master Plan the community will support and value.
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Harris, Isabella, Holly Springs, N. C.
Jones, Patsy, Cary, N. C.
Merritt, Mary, Oberlin, N. C.

C. Murphree, Harry E., Stephenson, N. C.
Smith, Edward, Greenvile, N. C.
Watkins, Minnie, Oberlin, N. C.

MODEL SCHOOL.

Allen, Samuel, Durham, N. C.
Allen, Austin, Durham, N. C.
Allen, John, Durham, N. C.
Anderson, Gracia, Durham, N. C.
Burden, Hiram, Oberlin, N. C.
Bryan, Sadie, New York City, N. Y.
Burton, John, Burlington, N. C.
Deans, Mytle, Raleigh, N. C.
Jackson, William, Raleigh, N. C.
Latta, Margaret, Oberlin, N. C.
Latta, Mary, Oberlin, N. C.

Latte, Agnes, Durham, N. C.
Latte, Minnie, Durham, N. C.
Latte, Annie, Durham, N. C.
Latte, Jane, Durham, N. C.
McElroy, Laura, Burlington, N. C.
Pitts, Minnie, Raleigh, N. C.
Poole, Eugene, Raleigh, N. C.
Poole, Mark, Raleigh, N. C.
Robiduck, Josephine, Oberlin, N. C.
Smith, Miriam, Oberlin, N. C.
Watson, Susie, Raleigh, N. C.

B Division.

Carrin, Katie, Oberlin, N. C.
Carrin, Eliza, Oberlin, N. C.
Parrish, Ralston, Oberlin, N. C.
Parmer, William, Oberlin, N. C.
Floyd, Katie, Oberlin, N. C.
Parker, Frances, Oberlin, N. C.

Rand, Milton, Oberlin, N. C.
Smith, U. W., Oberlin, N. C.
Smith, R. C., Smithfield, N. C.
Towser, Virginia, Oberlin, N. C.
Towser, Eliza, Oberlin, N. C.
Williams, Edward, Oberlin, N. C.

SUMMARY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Preparatory Department (Seniors)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle, Normal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior, Normal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal, Preparatory Department, A Division</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole number enrolled</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarders</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry pupils</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SENIOR YEAR.

First Term.— Algebra, Thompson; Chemistry, Steele; English Literature, Shaw; Psychology and Moral Philosophy, Young; Latin, Caesar, Harkness; School Management, Durb. Second Term.— Geometry; Ilbert, Hart; History of Education, Painter; Caesar continued; Method of Teaching, Williams; Reviews, Arithmetic and Grammar, History and Geography. Third Term.— Astronomy, Steele's; Cicero, Chase; Christianity and Science, Peabody; Reviews continued.

A diploma will be given to those who complete the studies of this course and pass satisfactory examinations; provided all bills due by them to school have been paid.

COLLEGE PREPARATORY COURSE.

FIRST YEAR.

FIRST TERM.
Latin, Collar & Daniels; Mathematics, Algebra, Wentworth; History, Outline of the World, Swinton; English, Composition, Hart.

SECOND TERM.
Latin, Collar & Daniels (continued); Mathematics, Wentworth's Algebra; History, Outlines of the World; English, Composition (continued).

THIRD TERM.
Latin, Caesar's Gallic Wars, Book I; Mathematics, Algebra; History, Outlines of the World; English, Composition (continued).

SECOND YEAR.

FIRST TERM.
Latin, Caesar's Gallic Wars, Books II, IV; Greek, Goodin's Grammar; Mathematics, Algebra—completed; English, Seven British Classics; Physics, Avery.

SECOND TERM.
Latin, Cicero, Chase; Greek, Grammar and Lessons; Mathematics, Geometry, Wentworth; English, Longfellow's Evangelist; Physics, Avery (continued).

THIRD TERM.
Latin, Virgil's Aeneid, A and G; Greek, Xenophon's Anabasis; Mathematics, History of Education, Painter; Physics, Mechanics, with laboratory work; English, Literature, Gilman.
in ignorance, in crime, and finally end in some prison house, we have provided for an Orphan Department. We have purchased a band; the members are to be chosen from among the orphan boys and will be instructed by an experienced band leader. Our books are open for enrolling names. All applicants must furnish recommendations from known person.

Admittance, tuition, board, etc., free in Orphan Department. We need clothes for the children of this department.

EXPENSES

PER MONTH IN ALL OTHER DEPARTMENTS.

(Orphan Department excepted.)

Board, room rent, fuel and light for young men and women, per month, four weeks, $7.50.

The expense for instruction upon the piano or organ is $2.00 extra per month for two lessons per week, or $1.00 per month for one lesson per week.

Twenty-five cents extra will be charged for practice on piano or organ.

Young men and women who wish to pay a part of their expense by working will be taken at the following reduced rates:

Young men, per month, four weeks, $6.40
Young women, " " 5 40
Day students, " " 1 50

That all who strive may be able to avail themselves of this chance, we have reduced the expenses to the lowest possible rates.

Therefore, the money must be paid at the end of each month or an extra fifty cents will be charged.

No part payment will be accepted. Payments must be made for one month at least, but if the student wishes he or she may pay for several months or for the whole session in advance.

As the students, and not the parents, will be held responsible for the payments of bills, they (students) should keep the money or see to it being sent to the President.

As all payments must be made in advance, ten days’ notice will be given before payments are due.

Students should come supplied with three or four dollars to purchase books.

GENERAL INFORMATION.

LOCATION.

Latta’s University is located in the village of Oberlin, one and a half miles west from the Capitol buildings in the city. The location is the very best for a school, being out of the busy city, but within easy reach by means of the electric street-cars which run close by the village.

HEALTHFULNESS.

It is enough to say that there has not been a single case of serious illness this season, the second of the University’s. Should a physician be needed, however, the best skill in the city will be called. The healthfulness of the locality cannot be excelled. Each dormitory is heated by stoves and hearths, and so every necessary comfort is secured.

MEMBERSHIP.

For membership in the Institution a person must have a good moral character and must promise to abstain from the use of all intoxicating drinks and tobacco in every form while a member of the school.

Applications for admission should, if possible, be made a month before the beginning of the school year, and should state fully previous education.

It is very important that all should be present at the opening of the school in September, that they may be immediately classified and thus lose no time in beginning work. If any part of the year must be lost it should be at the close rather than at the beginning of the year.

RELIGIOUS INFLUENCES.

The Institution is wholly non-sectarian in its religious instruction or influence, yet earnest attention will be given to Bible study, applying its truths to daily life and conduct, that a thoroughly Christian character may be attained. It is open to all students of either sex.

INDUSTRIAL TRAINING.

There will be an Industrial Department under the same management with no extra charges. This department will be opened this fall. The boys will be taught some of the principles of farming and gardening, and we will endeavor to have them taught the use of tools.
The girls will be taught various branches of household science, such as sewing, dress-making, and cooking, under experienced teachers, thus they will be trained domestically as well as intellectually.

GOVERNMENT.

The discipline of this Institution is administered with firmness and impartiality. It is necessary to induce a higher moral sentiment among the scholars, which shall be in itself a powerful governing force in the school. When it becomes plain that a scholar is stiff-necked, and continues to infringe on the few rules of the Institution, parents will be requested to take home such a pupil. Dismissal from school will be resorted to when all other means of correction fail.

WORK.

No money will be paid for work, but it will be used in defraying the student’s school expenses, or it will stand on the books of the Institution to his credit for schooling. Five cents per hour will be allowed for outdoor work. For the very poor, so far as it can be provided, extra work will be given to partly defray their expenses.

HABITS.

Habits of economy will be a part of the instruction taught. We cannot promise anything like luxury, the indulgence allowed at home or the gratification of peculiar tastes and notions, but good wholesome food will be provided. Ten cents extra will be charged for each meal carried away from the table. No wasting of food at the table, or habits disgusting or injurious to companions will be allowed. Breakages whose authors cannot be ascertained will be charged per rota to the students.

MISCELLANEOUS SUGGESTIONS.

Bring the text-books formerly used, you may need them. All should be provided with warm clothing. Young women should have rubbers and waterproofs. Shoveling and expensive dress is not permitted to be used. Prints, gingham, and plain worsteds, neatly made, and colored underskirts are the most approved wear. White dresses are not permissible. Parents should not send clothing unless the request for it is endorsed by the matron.
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Students are not allowed to receive large quantities of food, fruit or candy. Friends or parents will please not send such. Students who do not board at their homes are not allowed to board out of the Institution, except by special permission. Students should, in all cases, be regularly excused when they leave school, as leaving otherwise is regarded as an offense. Students are not allowed to make visits on the Sabbath, and their friends are earnestly requested not to call upon them on that day. This Institution is the result of benevolent efforts, and that it is decidedly religious in its influence without being sectarian is the reasonable expectation of its friends everywhere. One of the many means for securing such results, the Sabbath, with its religious services, is most important. It is our desire to make the school, as far as possible, a home for those who attend. Not only their intellectual, but also their physical, social, moral, and religious culture receive careful attention.

WANTS.

Our most pressing needs at present are the following:

1. Donations for the aid of needy and worthy students; donations for increased current expenses; donations for additional buildings for our Industrial Department; gifts of bedding, tableware, books, and furniture; endowment of professors’ chairs.

RULES.

1. Students are required to attend divine worship at the University chapel.
2. No student shall be allowed to absent himself from any of the exercises of the University enjoined by the Faculty without permission from the proper officer.
3. During study hours, each pupil who is not reciting shall remain in his room, strictly applying himself to his studies. Loud talking, laughing, or frivolous conversation are strictly prohibited. No littering on the grounds or lounging on the beds will be tolerated.
4. Students who deface the buildings or commit any nuisance shall be immediately expelled.
5. Water, slops, or anything offensive will not be allowed to be thrown from any building of the University.
6. If anything is lost that is in the possession of any student, or injury done to furniture, rooms, buildings, or anything of the University, the damage shall be assessed by the President and charged to the offender, which is to be paid immediately to cover the loss. Students who vacate their rooms must leave
them in good order, or a fine of one dollar ($1) or more will be charged.

7. Strict rules of deportment, habits of virtue, and the treating of the officers of the University, and his fellow-students, with respect are the conditions under which a student is kept in this Institution.

8. Whenever the Faculty becomes satisfied that a student is wilfully violating the rules of the Institution, or is not using his time beneficially in his studies, or is not a fit member of the University from any cause, his parents or guardian may be written to by the President so that he may be withdrawn, but should the welfare of the University demand immediate action, then he may be disciplined or excluded at the discretion of the Faculty.

9. No student shall be admitted under ten years of age.

10. No young lady or gentleman from anywhere will be allowed to mingle with them upon the grounds.

11. Relatives and friends will always be welcomed, and the generous white people of the State are invited to visit Latta's University.

12. No student shall be allowed to bring upon the grounds fire-arms, or carry concealed or dangerous weapons, or make any threats to any of the students. For the violation of this rule ten minutes will be given to leave the grounds.

13. Dishonesty in the settlement of bills, or failure to keep pledges made relative to the settlement of bills, when it is in the student's power to act otherwise, shall certainly result in exclusion.

14. No young man shall be allowed to call upon the young ladies without permission from the President.

15. No young man shall be allowed to communicate, or converse in any way, with any young woman at any time, with the exception of the time set apart for the social meeting.

16. No young lady will be allowed to visit any family without permission from the President.

17. Young ladies will be allowed to do their own shopping in company with a female teacher on Saturday afternoon.

18. No young lady will be allowed to receive any note or letter from any person, in any way, until it is first delivered to the President.

Young ladies who do not wish to be restricted, living under healthy restraints, but desire to do as they please, may not apply.
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

To All to Whom These Presents Shall Come—Greeting:

Know Ye, That it appears from the Certificate from the Clerk of the Superior Court of Wake County that the following named persons, M. L. Latta, H. L. Latta, and Frederick McHie hereinafter on the fifteenth day of February, 1894, signed and filed Articles of Agreement for the formation of a private corporation before said Clerk, and copy of said Articles of Agreement, duly certified by said Clerk under the seal of said Court, have been filed and recorded in this office, as prescribed in chapter 318 of the Acts of 1893.

Now, Therefore, Under the power and authority vested in me by said chapter 318 of said Acts of 1893, I do hereby declare the persons signing said Articles of Agreement duly incorporated, under the name and style of Latta's University for the period of sixty years from and after the fifteenth day of February, 1894, for the purposes set forth in said Articles of Agreement, with all the powers, rights and liabilities conferred and imposed by law on such corporations.

Witness my hand and the Great Seal of the State of North Carolina, at office in the City of Raleigh, this seventeenth day of February, in the one hundred and eighteenth year of our Independence, and in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-four.

OCTAVUS COKE,
Secretary of State.
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Exhibit A
Legal Description

Exhibit B
Permitted Uses and Use Restrictions

1. All existing property lines for the LUP and subsequent

2. All buildings, structures, and appurtenances shall remain at the same level.

3. All existing works shall maintain a current and accurate survey of the property.

4. The property shall not be covered, buried, obscured, or altered in such a way that may adversely affect the property.

10. A covered area may be constructed on the property in the form of a temporary covering, provided that:

a. The covering is for the use of the property, in the form of a temporary covering, provided that:

b. The covering is for the use of the property, in the form of a temporary covering, provided that:

20. The property shall not be used for the purpose of public or private rights of way.

40. The property shall not be used for the purpose of public or private rights of way.
Citizen Planning Committee (CPC) – Charter
May 24, 2019

Background and Project Description
The City of Raleigh Parks, Recreation and Cultural Resources (PRCR) Department is developing a Master Plan for the Latta House & University Site. The site was deeded to the City of Raleigh in 2007 and was designated a Raleigh Historic Landmark in 2010. In February 2019 the City of Raleigh City Council approved of the project’s Situation Assessment (SA) and nomination of Citizen Planning Committee (CPC) members.

Reverend Morgan London Latta was born into slavery at Fishdam, a Cameron family plantation near the Neuse River approximately 25 miles north of Raleigh, yet persevered to support his twelve brothers and sisters and become one of Shaw University’s first graduates. Reverend M.L. Latta founded Latta University in 1892. Latta University at its height was home to 26 buildings and 1400 students, including orphaned children of formerly enslaved people. The university operated for thirty years. The Latta House was the residence of Reverend Morgan London Latta and his family. It was the last remaining historical landmark of the original 26 structures that comprised Latta University.

Purpose of the Committee
The purpose of the Latta House & University Site Master Plan CPCis to learn about the issues and needs of children of formerly enslaved people. The university operated for thirty years. The Latta House was the residence of Reverend Morgan London Latta and his family. It was the last remaining historical landmark of the original 26 structures that comprised Latta University.

Final Products
The CPC will provide guidance for the development of four key elements:
- Program Statement
- Draft Master Plan
- Priorities for Phased Development
- Proposed Master Plan

The Program Statement, Draft Master Plan and Phasing Priorities will be available for public review and feedback. The CPC will review and help incorporate the public’s comments into a Proposed Master Plan. The Proposed Master Plan will include a final conceptual plan containing the corroborated plan elements from earlier draft plans, along with the program statement and recommendations for phasing. The Proposed Master Plan will be presented to the HRMAB for review and approval prior to City Council review.

Authority of the Committee
The Latta House & University Site Master Plan CPCreports its recommendations on the Master Plan to the HRMAB, which may be accepted in whole or in part at the discretion of the HRMAB. The approved Proposed Master Plan from the CPC will be presented to City Council along the HRMAB recommendations.

Committee Representation
The CPC is comprised of community members representing varying stakeholder groups or individuals with interest in the proposed park development. Committee members reflect the current demographics of the parks surrounding area including age, race, gender, education background, professional and/or personal experience and other relevant qualifications that may be related to the characteristic of the proposed park.

Committee Responsibilities
The key responsibilities of the Committee members are:
- Deliberate in good faith
- Balance interests and collaborate in the development of a consensus proposed plan
- Represent the interests of whole community
- Attend and participate in meetings

Committee Member Appointment, Withdrawal and Replacement
If a Committee member is no longer able to participate in the planning process, he/she may withdraw from the CPC. The Committee will determine whether the withdrawn member’s interests can be represented by the remaining members. If not, the Committee may suggest and appoint a replacement from the same interest group, organization or neighborhood.

Responsibilities of the Facilitator
- Assisting Committee members to concisely describe their interest and ideas.
- Providing for equitable participation by all Committee members.
- Reminding members of meeting objectives, planning process guidelines, and timelines.
- Facilitating meetings in a manner consistent with the City of Raleigh’s consensus building approach and with this charter.
- Managing meeting logistics.
- Ensuring the meeting is conducted so that all have an opportunity to participate in an open and respectful forum for discussion.
- Acting as contact point and spoke person for the CPC and its progress.
- Fulfilling meetings in a manner consistent with the City of Raleigh’s consensus building approach and with this charter.
- Managing meeting logistics.
- Reminding members of meeting objectives, planning process guidelines, and timelines.
- Providing for equitable participation by all Committee members.
- Assisting Committee members to concisely describe their interest and ideas.
- Ensuring the meeting is conducted so that all have an opportunity to participate in an open and respectful forum for discussion.
- Help participants share interests and concerns, find innovative and workable solutions and reach agreement.
- Maintaining a record of topics or ideas that the CPC has reached consensus or have failed to reach consensus.
- Acting as contact point and spoke person for the CPC and its progress.
- Assisting the Project Team in accurately reflecting the CPC’s progress in the Master Plan.

Meeting Agendas and Summaries
The Project Team will develop draft agendas and provide them to the Committee members prior to each CPC meeting. At the end of each meeting, the Committee members will specify a tentative agenda for the following meeting. A summary of each meeting will be provided to Committee members within two weeks following each meeting. These summaries will include an attendance record, a summary of actions taken at the meeting,
and other supporting information. Summaries from previous meeting with any additional input will be approved by the Committee at the start of each meeting. Email will be the primary form of information dispersal and correspondence within the CPC with the option of having material mailed to those who do not have email or web access.

**Decision Process**

The CPC will operate by consensus of all members. Consensus allows collaborative problem solving and does not mean unanimous agreement or that everyone will be equally pleased with the decision, but rather there is a general agreement among those involved that the best decision or recommendation has been made. In making decisions, each Committee member will be asked to indicate her/his concurrence on a specific proposal/provision based on the following five-point scale:

1. **Endorsement** – Member fully supports it.
2. **Endorsement with minor points of issue** – Basically, Member likes it.
3. **Agreement with minor reservations** – Member can live with it.
4. **Stand aside with major reservations** – Formal disagreement, but Member will not block or hold up the proposal/provision
   - a. **Abstain**
   - b. **Require more information**
5. **Block** – Member will not support the proposed plan.

The Facilitator will assess the Committee’s level of consensus as follows:

- **Consensus** – All Committee members present rate the proposal as 1, 2, or 3.
- **Consensus with Major Reservations** – The majority of Committee members present rate the proposal as a 1, 2, or 3, except at least one Committee member rates it as a 4.
- **No Consensus** – Any Committee member rates a proposal as a 5 and/or majority of Committee members rate it a 4.

The CPC may open for discussion and modify a proposal to reassess concurrence if members have major reservations with or disagree with a decision. The CPC may choose to proceed with the decision of less than consensus, if all efforts have been made to arrive at consensus, but it appears unachievable by members.

**Committee Ground Rules**

**Discussion Ground Rules During the Meetings**

- Treat one another, the associations represented by the CPC and the overall Committee members with respect at all times.
- Respect and seek to comprehend the perspectives of others, including those points of view that contrast from your own.
- Encourage each other to share their viewpoints and recognize each Committee member’s interests are important.

- **Agree that it is acceptable to disagree and disagree without being disagreeable.**
- **Focus on solving the problem.**

**Process Ground Rules Throughout the Planning Process**

- Adhere to the CPC’s charter, the public participation for park planning guidelines, policy and manual.
- Strive to understand the other points of view.
- Share information discussed during committee meetings with your community and any organizations you may represent and bring back to the CPC any opinions as appropriate.
- Encourage free thinking and offer beneficial solutions to problems.
- Work as team players and share all relevant information.
- Support and actively engage in the CPC’s decision process.

**Public Input**

The Committee members are representing the community interests for the project through the members’ own neighborhoods, organizations or affiliations and are encourage to gather feedback from others who live the project area. All committee meetings are open to observation by the public and is open to receive public comment in person at CPC meetings. Requests to present comments to the CPC must be made in advance of CPC meetings to be incorporated in the meeting agenda. Public comments will be limited to 15 minutes total for each CPC meeting. The CPC can also receive public comments in writing or via email.

**Schedule and Duration**

The planning process for the Latta House & University Site is scheduled to be completed in the Fall of 2019. A series of four CPC meetings will take place throughout the planning process. The initial public meeting will be held in April 2019 with two additional public meetings scheduled later in the year. The proposed Master Plan will be presented to the HRMAB for review and recommendations and then to the City Council for final approval and adoption.

**Amendments to this Charter**

Modifications to the charter can be made at any meeting of the CPC by consensus.

**References:**

Community Planning Committee (CPC) Meeting
3.22.19
Latta House Community Planning Committee Meeting
March 22, 2019
Jaycee Community Center Club Room
4:00pm – 5:30pm

Attendees:
Emma Liles (RPRCR - PDC) Max Neuwirth (LHF)
Shawnaeher Baker (RPRCR - PDC) Anita Sawhney (UPHOA)
Doug Porter (RPRCR - HRM) Cloagly Lyons-Bastian (PRGAB)
Tracy Burton (RPRCR - HRM) Cheryl Crooks Williams (FOV)
Lissa Utsumi (RPRCR - Recreation) Karen Throckmorton (FOV)
Joe Cebina (RC) Sabrina Goode (FOV)
Lewis Beale (RC) Joe Holt (FOV)
Eric Phoenix (LHF) Kaye Webb (RHDC)
Brandi Neuwirth (LHF) Sam Mordecai (HRMAB)

Absentees:
Shawsheen Baker (RPRCR - PDC)
TJ McCourt (RPRCR - PDC)
Emma Liles (RPRCR - PDC)

Acronyms:
RPRCR – Raleigh Parks, Recreation and Cultural Resources
PDC – Planning, Development and Communications
HRM – Historic Resources and Museums
LHF – Latta House Foundation
RHDC – Raleigh Historic Development Commission
FOV – Friends of Oberlin Village
PRGAB – Parks, Recreation and Greenway Advisory Board
HRMAB – Historic Resources and Museum Advisory Board

I. Welcome
a. Self-introductions of City of Raleigh staff and CPC Members
b. Project Background
i. Park Planning Process
1) Winter 2018 – Situation Assessment
2) Spring 2019 – Public Input Process
3) Winter 2019 – Master Plan Approval Process
ii. Project Background
1) Site Context and Historic Background – Latta University founded 1892, dedicated to educating underprivileged and orphan African-American children
2) 1993 – Raleigh Historic Landmark (house)
3) 2002 – National Register of Historic Places
4) 2007 – Latta House Destroyed, Site Resources Recovered, and Deed Conveyed
5) 2008 – Collection Processed
6) 2009 – Archaeological Survey

II. CPC Roles and Responsibilities
a. Wide diversity represented in CPC – represents both neighbors and people with expertise in different areas.
b. The CPC works together with City of Raleigh staff to develop a master plan. We make sure we have consensus. (This doesn’t mean that everyone agrees on every detail, but we generally come together to create a vision for the site that everyone feels they can support.)
c. The proposed master plan goes to the Historic Resources and Museums Advisory Board (HRMAB) for review. They review the proposed master plan and then suggest changes, and then it goes to City Council for adoption, and then we look toward implementation.
d. Expectations of the CPC:
   i. Share knowledge, experiences, family history, living history, learn more about the site and help everyone in the community and Raleigh discover more
   ii. Help with development of the master plan itself. City of Raleigh planners and professionals bring some expertise, but they rely on CPC to provide information and expertise as well.
   iii. Promote – get the word out – we hope the CPC will help us spread the word and get more people involved; more feedback = better master plan

e. Responsibilities
   i. Deliberate in good faith – balance personal interests and interests of CPC and public as a whole; meets the needs of everyone involved
   ii. Represent constituents – e.g. if you’re from the Latta House Foundation (LHF) – expect you represent that group in good faith; if at any point you’re unable to continue, the CPC will decide as a group for someone to take your place to ensure that representation remains
   iii. Attend meetings – not everyone can make every meeting, but members are expected to take their role on the CPC seriously, be present, engaged, and participate. CPC members should communicate with Emma if they are unable to attend a CPC meeting.

III. Draft CPC Charter
a. Final Products (refer to Draft Charter page in binder)
   i. Vision Statement - the CPC will craft exactly what that vision of the site will look like; this will be referred to as we move along in the master planning process.
   ii. Draft Master Plan
   iii. Priorities for Phased Development – top priorities for implementing the master plan; master plan is a conceptual plan (long term vision); the planning team needs help to prioritize what should be done soonest
   iv. Proposed Master Plan

b. Consensus Building Process (refer to Consensus Based Decision Making page in binder)
   i. Five-point scale; raise hand with 1-5 fingers
   ii. 1 finger – endorse (fully support it);
   iii. 2 fingers – endorse with minor points of issues
   iv. 3 fingers – agreement with minor reservations on a certain aspect of the plan (you can request more information or abstain)
   v. 4 fingers – you have a major reservation about whatever it might be – but you won’t block the process
   vi. 5 fingers – you will block the process
   vii. Consensus = all CPC members put up 1, 2, or 3
   viii. Consensus with major reservations = at least one CPC member puts up a 4
IV. Project Schedule – (refer to Project Timeline page in binder)

i. CPC members are required to come to CPC meetings, and invited to come to public input meetings if they want to volunteer or help

ii. Above the timeline bar - planning staff give formal presentations to groups and boards.

iii. Below the timeline bar – community/public input opportunities

1) Public input meetings – April 6, June 8, August 24
2) Information tables at community events
   a. April – Mordecai plant sale
   b. June – Oberlin BBQ
   c. August – Latta Day (pending)

iv. If CPC members have any other events during these online input times, let Emma know.

v. Comments/Questions/Suggestions

1) August is too hot for Latta Day; late September/early October would be better
2) African American Cultural Festival during Labor Day weekend
3) Planning staff have connected with the City of Raleigh Museum on Fayetteville Street to reach as many people during downtown cultural events

V. Project Overview

a. Situation Assessment

i. On site there is currently an outdoor grill, covered historic well, and an historic marker.

ii. There are five restrictions on the site, as outlined by the Deed.

   1) Property will not be used for parking.
   2) Property will not be subdivided.
   3) Property will remain as a public space
   4) Must maintain a 75% mature canopy on the site (PRCR is working internally to do a health assessment of trees and assess current canopy cover)
   5) Roofed structure can only be 5% of the total property (approx. 4000 sq. ft.). This is not small, but something to consider so we don’t mislead the public. The scope needs to remain realistic.

iii. Archaeological survey – outlines where there were intact archaeological deposits. This is not a strict restriction but something to keep in mind since it’s a historic landmark. There are members on the CPC as well as internal staff from the City of Raleigh who are members of RDHC.

iv. Before the house was destroyed by a fire in 2007, there was a caretaker, but he didn’t live on site. Years before that, the Haywood family lived on the site.

b. Community Input Survey Results

i. Historic interpretation? Most people said interpretative panels;

ii. What amenities would you use? Top responses were community gardens, picnic areas, gathering spaces.

iii. Experiences? Cultural opportunities and social gatherings.

iv. These results are very similar to the concerns and recommendations from stakeholder interviews (development and gentrification of the area, suggestions on historic interpretation, opportunities for a community gathering space, preservation of large trees and open space).

VI. Review of Draft Project Goals

a. Draft Project Goals are:

i. Educate Site Visitors

   trees and open space)

interpretation, opportunities for a community gathering space, preservation of large

interviews (development and gentrification of the area, suggestions on historic

What amenities would you use? Top responses were community gardens, picnic areas, gatherings.

iv. Historic interpretation? Most people said interpretative panels;

v. Comments/Questions/Suggestions

1) August is too hot for Latta Day; late September/early October would be better
2) African American Cultural Festival during Labor Day weekend
3) Planning staff have connected with the City of Raleigh Museum on Fayetteville Street to reach as many people during downtown cultural events

iv. If CPC members have any other events during these online input times, let Emma know.

v. Comments/Questions/Suggestions

1) August is too hot for Latta Day; late September/early October would be better
2) African American Cultural Festival during Labor Day weekend
3) Planning staff have connected with the City of Raleigh Museum on Fayetteville Street to reach as many people during downtown cultural events

ii. History

1) Honor the university and the legacy of Latta.
2) Make sure to include Latta House and its history, but also be open to other historical topics. There are a lot of firsts that came out of the neighborhood.

This would be a great opportunity to tie it all together.

3) There were free people here – farmers, business people before the end of the civil war. Most people now have no idea who lived in this area prior to the 1960s.

4) Honor Oberlin Village a whole with this site.

iii. Who is the park for?

1) It’s important to attract all age groups to the park, and various interests, not just for those who are interested in history.

2) Within a ten-minute walk and ten-mile radius, there are several parks/amenities/service areas available.

3) Engage diverse communities as a goal – that’s a simple way of putting it.

4) Children coming and playing – and it’s a great place for that – that’s hard to work in when you don’t want to tear up the grass; that would be excellent if you had some ideas for how to move that forward.

5) This space has a lot of natural landscapes and natural trails – it could be a space where kids could play old fashioned games.

iv. Building and Preservation

1) A building on site could be something like the visitor center at Mordecai.

2) There is enough space for a building, and the deed restriction is approx. 4000 sq. ft. It is possible to have a space that is for more than just education. It could be for presentations, or even events. It doesn’t have to be an office building but something with a structure.

3) The exhibit that exists about the Latta House and University site (that was created in partnership with COR Museum) can reside in the space.

4) A building can protect artifacts found at the site.

5) Would restrictions of the deed prohibit rebuilding the house?

6) Make sure to clarify that preservation of historic site resources cannot be interpreted as we can’t disturb anything.

7) A goal of preserving existing historic resources does not mean that we can’t dig a hole and build a house.

8) We want to make sure Oberlin is included in the history without Latta getting lost. But everything that happened there happened within the context of the history of the area. So that’s why a building would be great.

9) Moving forward other things can be discussed in detail. Amenities can come later. Then we put all the choices on the table and prioritize. Discussion of a building will be addressed as we go through the master plan process, and at that
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VIII. Next Steps
a. Let Emma know if you’re interested in helping with the April 6th Public Input Meeting – 9:30am – 12pm at Jaycee Community Center.
b. Take flyers and post cards and pass around to local business, contacts in community.
c. Homework for next CPC meeting May 24th (Fri) 4pm at Jaycee Community Center
   i. Review the roles and responsibilities section of the Draft Charter
   ii. There are also some details and ground rules there for expectations about how we (CPC and City of Raleigh staff) treat each other; everything is in writing to remind us how we’re going to conduct ourselves
   iii. Come up with ideas for the Vision Statement
  1) Draft Vision Statement currently reads: “The Latta House & University Site will be a gathering place for the community to connect with the natural beauty of the site and learn about the site’s unique history.”

VIII. Final Questions
a. In thinking about the goals (educating, honoring legacy) will there be or are there plans in your mind now to do any additional historic research of any sort to learn more about the site and the surrounding community?
   i. We haven’t, but we can certainly look at this.
   ii. What is the budget?
      i. $85,000 for Phase I implementation. Phase I is stuff that we can put on the ground right after the master plan is approved.
      ii. Normally an outside consultant is contracted to conduct the master planning process. This time that $85,000 budget for the master planning process is saved because the master planning process is being done in-house. Phase 2 is based on outcome of the master plan. Each item/amenity will have a price tag.
   c. Any cooperation before? Would there be room for collaboration? Maybe with the university (NC State)?
   d. Is there a photographic history?
      i. They are all published in Latta’s autobiography.
      e. Are there plans (drawing plans) for the house that burned down?
         i. There was an architect that lived in the neighborhood and Eric Phoenix helped with taking measurements.
         ii. Those drawings ended up in historic resources.

5:09pm  Meeting Adjourned

Latta House Community Planning Committee Meeting
May 24, 2019
Jaycee Community Center Club Room
4:00pm – 5:30pm

Attendees:
Emma Liles (RPRCR - PDC) Max Neuwirth (LHF)
TJ McCourt (RPRCR - PDC) Dru McGill (NCSUAD)
Shawsheen Baker (RPRCR - PDC) Cheryl Crooms Williams (FOV)
Tania Tulley (Planning Dept) Karen Throckmorton (FOV)
Lisa Usutani (RPRCR - Recreation) Sabrina Goode (FOV)
Joe Cebina (RC) Kaye Webb (RHDC)
Lewis Beale (RC) Gaston Williams (RHDC)
Brittany Bryan (RC) Sam Mordecai (HRMAB)
Catherine Maxwell (RC) Alicia McGill (HRMAB)
Brandi Neuwirth (LHF)

Absentees:
Greg Paige (LHF) Kerri Burke (RC)
Anthony Cebina (RC) Richard Hayword (RC)
Dawn Leonard (RC) Anita Sawhney (UPHOA)
Jenny Camp (RC) Clodagh Lyons-Bastian (PRGAB)

Acronyms:
RPRCR – Raleigh Parks, Recreation and Cultural Resources
PDC – Planning, Development and Communications
HRM – Historic Resources and Museums
LHF – Latta House Foundation
FOV – Friends of Oberlin Village
PRGAB – Parks, Recreation and Greenway Advisory Board
HRMAB – Historic Resources and Museum Advisory Board
UPHOA – University Park HOA
NCSUAD – NC State Archaeology Department
RHDC – Raleigh Historic Development Commission
RC – Raleigh Citizen
relations during the time of Reverend Latta should be confronted. A Second CPC Member proposed that "African American" history should be specified, since the site was about educating the African American population. The Second CPC Member continued, stating that nobody should be excluded, but this park should be a place where people can tell their stories about this site, and that incorporating all history generally would be too broad. A Third CPC Member proposed that the concept of race is itself a social construction, anthropologically speaking. A Fourth CPC Member noted that, if we attempt to specifically enumerate the 3-4 "types of diversity" that we are interested in, then we are by implication leaving out the rest; and that is not the intent. A quote was read from the Latta biography, "...bring the races together in common cause..." Ultimately, it was agreed upon the "Bringing diverse communities together" accomplishes the goals that the group agreed upon, and is a better approach than calling out a "discrete, limited menu of diversity."

d. A new vision statement, "The Latta House & University Site will be a beautiful, serene gathering place for bringing diverse communities together to learn about, reflect on, enjoy, and celebrate the legacy of Reverend Latta, and the site’s unique African-American history", based on these comments and the draft vision statements reviewed during the meeting, was voted on and adopted with full consensus.

IV. Design Alternatives Small Group Discussion (Summary)

a. Table 1 (Tania):

i. General Feedback
1) Make the goals more obvious/ placed up front
2) Let people know what they are evaluating
3) Change the front text ‘go online & tell us what you think about these design options!’
4) Bold the language also
5) Change all language of alternatives to OPTIONS
6) The website gets lost inside
7) Add it to top w/ go online & tell us what you think
8) Is it clear we want them to go to the website to leave feedback
9) Change the North Arrow
10) Keep a green bar at the bottom inside

b. Table 2 (Lisa):

i. General Feedback
1) Clarify the parking requirements note on brochure

ii. Designs Feedback
1) Design A doesn’t do much to enhance the site
2) Combine Design B & C
3) Pavilion & visitor center together
4) What was on site besides the house?
5) Want paths to be ada accessible & porous
6) Preserve location of house
7) Could like art there
8) Design B:
9) needs connectivity from tower street
10) needs a small stage for music/community events
11) needs more active elements
12) Wants more signage
13) What’s the significance of the placement of the signage

c. Table 3 (TJ):

i. General Feedback
1) Increase transparency of trees
2) Represent FUTURE TREE CANOPY in the renderings of future site designs. What is the % cover tree canopy requirement? Visualization should reflect that.
3) Fix north arrow
4) Community garden could stay... perhaps the Latta foundation could help support? Needs a lot of community support to stay.
5) Would public art in center be a ghost structure or memorial of the building?
6) Not enough educational signage, this should be the focus rather than public art.
7) No rest room?
8) Can a model of the site be created (i.e. a representation of the historic layout of the site)?

ii. Designs Feedback
1) Design A: 
   1) Path around perimeter encourages visitors to use entire site. Path should meander to guide you and tell the story.
   2) Signs could be placed in "learning zones"
   3) Not enough historic info
   4) Lacks "learning"
   5) Lots of tiny gathering spaces but no LARGE space
   6) Limited path/ site accessibility
   7) Doubts about community garden
   8) Lack of ornamental garden(s)

2) Design B:
   1) Visitors should be led to historic interpretation, not expected to go hunt it out
   2) Visitors could help with the "learning"
   3) Good combo of large & small gathering space
   4) The path cutoff through the lawn provides good option
   5) Love for the visitor center
   6) Paths are too condensed, and should be pushed to the perimeter of the site

iii. Designs Feedback
1) Design C:
   1) Love for the visitor center
   2) Paths are too condensed, and should be pushed to the perimeter of the site

iv. Designs Feedback
1) Design D:
   1) Love for the visitor center
   2) Paths are too condensed, and should be pushed to the perimeter of the site
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a. Design A:
   b. Need more historic interpretation
   c. Give examples of the public art
   d. Make sure it’s clear that it will reference LATTA
   e. Could possibly referent the house outline
   f. Statue of orphan band (?)
   g. Oops! It’s supposed to be park benches
   h. Make it a different symbology then the tables
   i. What kind of garden areas are these?
   j. Design B:
   k. Not a good sense of gathering
   l. Clarify Interpretive Pavilion
   m. That it includes gathering AND interpretation
   n. Use the interpretive symbology
   o. Remove grills
   p. The historic signage label/symbology isn’t intuitive
   q. No community garden
   r. Outdoor state w/ built in seating area
   s. Add flower garden areas
   t. Design C:
   u. Too many picnic tables
   v. More benches
   w. More creative/interactive signage by the building
   x. Historic Wayfinding!

V. Next Steps
   a. Please invite people to the June 8th open house!

Meeting Adjourned
5:45pm

July 26, 2019
CPC Meeting #3

1. Approval of Minutes

Vote: Unanimous Consensus Approval

2. Proposed Draft Master Plan Discussion

Emma Liles delivered a presentation including a Meeting Minutes review & approval, project review, and introduced the draft master plan.

*Remind CPC that they will be invited to HRM to provide comments

Are we going to try to save the trees in fair or poor health, or let them die?

Do we know how old the trees are on the site?
   - The larger White Oaks

Successional plantings? Would we bring in smaller trees or try to transplant larger trees?
   - When larger trees are moving from a field growing condition to a new site, they often don’t do as well as smaller trees
   - 2 inches in diameter and 6-8 feet tall

In addition to White Oaks, are Redbuds and Dogwoods also trees that we would have seen in this neighborhood at the time of the historical period?
   - Yes, generally speaking, they are.
   - Generally when we do plantings we would not do any cultivars or modern breeds/varieties of trees
   - The master plan will include a list of other historically appropriate plantings and tree species, including additions to this list as appropriate.

With the canopy coverage % that is supposed to be maintained according to the deed, how does that work when considering planting younger smaller trees
We are over 75% right now. So we have a buffer as we phase in new smaller trees.

The incentive is there to plant smaller trees now, so that they have a chance to grow in phases.

Proposed Master Plan Elements

- Public Art
- Pavilion & Visitor Center
- Separating out uses of interpretive pavilion and gathering space...

Do the elements we are showing here align with the goals we've established here, do they advance the Vision for the site, are they consistent with the feedback we have received from the public?

- Is there a water fountain proposed for the site?
  - In the interpretive pavilion
  - Code requirement: for each drinking fountain, you need to have a hotbox and a backflow preventer
- Interpretive Pavilion
  - Would there be any restroom facilities associated with that?
    - Confirmed at the last HRM board meeting: it is very hard to go back to a final plan and add in pieces as you move forward in the next 5-10 years.
    - Anything like a restroom or water fountain that we are interested in should be brought up now.
    - Would the restroom take up too much of the roofed area allowed for the site? The belief is that the 4,000 sf would be adequate to accommodate those facilities.
    - The outdoor bathrooms at Mordecai are in great shape. But that is a full-time staffed facility.

- Visitor Center
  - Could we share some of the comments that were not supportive of the visitor’s center idea?
  - Should we re-open the message boards on PublicInput.com/Latta so that everyone can review the full comments that were left?
  - Is the visitor’s center off the table?
  - Could we house the artifacts or host a permanent exhibit?

- Pavilion
  - Roofed or partially roofed structure to hold current exhibit and artifacts
  - Would those be behind glass?
  - Would the work be able to display those? Unless there were some control,
  - To display the actual artifacts, we would probably need climate control. Or else they would need to be assessed every few months and swapped out regularly.

If we are hoping that this site can support programming, classes, etc. then it would be necessary to provide access to a restroom to do that.

- Classes doing tours of Oberlin Village need to leave
- "I’m not crazy about a restroom on the site” they create a lot of problems, trash accumulation, vandalism, etc.
- A public event could bring in port-o-potties...
- Restrooms require CONSTANT maintenance. If we do decide to go forward, there would need to be clear guidelines about how and when they are locked, and make sure that we are being restrictive so that people could unlock them specifically for field trips. But bathrooms get filthy very quickly.

- How are bathrooms managed in other city parks?
  - They can be a real challenge
  - We set timer locks on them
  - Why would we shut the door on the OPTION for the future? If it is difficult
  - Freestanding “comfort station” next to the ball fields...
  - Is this property close enough to the Jaycee property that a comfort station on the Latta Site could be monitored and maintained by staff on the Jaycees site?
  - We should at least put restrooms on the master plan to keep the possibility open
  - Can the back entrance to Jaycee park be enhanced to help people feel safe walking through to Jaycee park?
  - Could the back entrance to Jaycee park be enhanced to help people feel safe walking through to Jaycee park?

- Could Friends of Oberlin or the Latta Foundation help manage the bathrooms?
Without Climate Control, these artifacts would need to be rotated constantly. Out of the entire city, we only have one room that is actually “climate controlled” and designed to the proper standards to be able to house artifacts.

- We did have the artifacts on display at the City of Raleigh Museum for +/- 3 years.
- The CoR Museum is monitored so that they can adjust the temperature and humidity
- What kind of artefacts are we talking about
  - Pieces of glass, brick, metalwork, lock, spools of fabric, other elements recovered from the archaeological survey
- The other option would be to have the collection brought to site, and then moved off for most times.
  - We need a 3-Dimensional model, photograph, or something that showed exactly what the site looked like in 1900.
  - The full mapping and layout of the university would need to be researched
  - A three-dimensional model of the university site would need to be a lock, security system, and climate monitoring (which does not need to be an intensive HVAC system) to secure the exhibits.
  - Could a compromise be to have something like photographs that are out there
- To be fair, the public did not get to comment on the idea of having the visitor’s center off to the side. Looking back at the design alternatives, the footprint of the visitor’s center and the pavilion, considering their position within those alternatives...
- What was the general idea of the visitor’s center? Would it be fully staffed?
  - At mordecai, a lot of HRM staff are at mordecai. Over many years, however, it was staffed by volunteers. Latta house foundation would be interested in staffing the facility. Have a place that people could go to learn about the history of Oberlin and the area, in addition to the history of the Latta site.
  - Could there have been some confusion over the idea of a visitor center? Could people have misunderstood what the vision was for the center itself? Did they understand that the vision was the Mordecai Visitor Center?
  - Why not have the opportunity to have that in the future? Could it be rebranded so that it is not the visitor center? Perhaps it is a cultural center? So that people know it is not vending machines & maps.

- Mordecai had a master plan without a visitor center. We wanted to install the visitor center, but tried to amend the master plan to allow a visitor center on the site. The visitor center at Mordecai was pushed out of the square as part of that process, so that it wasn’t a new structure on the historic square.
- While yes, there are opportunities within Oberlin Village, this plan is specific to this site.
- Could we say “Pavilion and Exhibit Space” or remove “outdoor” or add “classroom”
- Did we come across any pavilions that have a single enclosed space?
  - If it wasn’t the whole space... is it possible to just enclose part of the pavilion and provide HVAC, etc., without triggering all of the requirements?
- We could meet the Friday following our meeting with Development Services on Monday August 5th, and reconvene the CPC on August 9th.
- Could a low brick outline of the space be used to memorialize (similar to Oberlin rising) ...
  - Even for the small footings, you would have to do archaeological excavations, which is a lot of work and time for a relatively small impact...
- Could a flower border of the something that could acknowledge the footprint of the house... without triggering any of the archaeological requirements?

It was determined that the CPC would reconvene on August 9th, following City of Raleigh Staff’s sketch plan review meeting with Development Services staff to review the code requirements and implications for a proposed visitors center vs. a pavilion structure.

Emma will send out a Meeting Summary along with a copy of the Powerpoint Presentation.
1. Approval of Minutes
2. New Project Timeline
3. Public Input Summary
4. Draft Master Plan Discussion:
   • Can we alter the design so that the path goes around, rather than through the interpretive pavilion?
   • Outdoor patio: Would this be located on the site where we currently have the stage for events?
     o Yes, this would be there as something that could function as a stage, including utility access for electricity
   • Is the potential to have a statue still on the table?
     o Yes, that is something that could be discussed during the detailed design & review process
   • Can we show some more examples or concepts of what exactly the indoor interpretive pavilion would look like? And can we show the types of programming or activities that would be hosted on the space?

   a. Consensus vote
   Consensus vote was taken on whether to show this iteration of the draft Master Plan during the next round of public input:
   • Five CPC members attended: All five voted with a “1” for full consensus

5. Prioritization Discussion:
   1. Path would have to go first in Phase 1
   2. Heavy work should be done first (like plantings and invasives removal). We would like this to be human-centered, adding paths and park.

   Comment 1:
   - Plantings
   - Site entrance
   - Paths & benches
   - Historic Signs
   - Latta House Outline

   Comment 2:
   - Site entrance is not necessarily the key thing, and could be moved down on the priority list.

   Comment 3:
   - The site is already very usable. However, what has been missing this entire time has been the historic signage. I would be concerned to leave the historic signage for last and risk running out of money.
   - Can historic signage be prioritized to make sure that at least some of it comes in?

Question about Phase 2: How likely is it that we get to phase 2? Can we do part of phase 2 without doing all of it? We want to make sure that the big project that doesn’t hold up the larger projects.

   2 ways of doing the timing/budgeting
   o Timing can be handled from the operational perspective
   o For master plan purposes, we should prioritize in terms of BUDGETING (not in terms of timing)
     • We would prefer to hear the CPC’s perspective in terms of what is most important to allocate the $80,000 budget toward
   • We could potentially break it out into Phase 2 and Phase 3
     o We will be advocating to get it done all at once rather than dragging it out between Phase 2 and Phase 3
     o For master plan purposes, we can prioritize within Phase 2, but prioritize based on budget needs
       • We can propose the budget
       • The reality is that the City will take all that we recommend, and then PRCR improvements are weighed against all other needs (public utilities, transportation maintenance, etc.)
       • We also look for partnerships as an opportunity to help make certain projects a higher priority. For example, the natural interpretive signage at the Lake Johnson Woodland Center
   • When would the City be interested in doing the programming on this site?
     o Right now that is a staff resource issue more than anything else
     o The master plan does not necessarily get into operational assignments, but instead is focusing on the built environment
     o Can the university get involved to provide programming? How can this get involved in part of the curriculum of NCSU or other universities? Something that is more holistic, not just City-driven. Broughton and other high schools should be planning field trips out here once a year to talk about the history of the area.
       • We can list potential partners and other stakeholder groups that can be included in the master plan for future programming opportunities
       • Anything of historical significance should not just be City-driven, but should be a more holistic community effort
     o How can the CPC help to reach out to doctor’s offices, etc. in the neighborhood ...
   • Phase 1 should be organized by budget priority
     o Historic Signage
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- Outline could be one of the most impactful... along with signage and outline (which supports the historic preservation and learning opportunity first, and a park play area that could be second)
- Benches & paths are the most important to make it human-centered... signage can be moved later... the historic marker is still there at the entrance.
  - But the whole project is built around articulating that history in a different way
  - The historic significance needs to be up front because of that reason
- If we are thinking about different partnerships, and motivating the university and schools to use this site, then the interpretive elements need to be in place now
- Enhanced site entrances (includes trash cans and signs)

6. Next Steps:
   - October 19th – Public Input Meeting – Jaycee Community Center – 9:30am - Noon
   - November 15th – Final CPC Meeting – Jaycee Community Center – 4:00 pm - 5:30 pm

   - Clarify: Latta HOUSE outline improvements
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1. Approval of Minutes

2. Public Input Summary:
   - Q: regarding feedback, what did those who dislike say?
     - A: they don't want anything on the site, as we heard before.
   - Q: what are the funding sources and how do we advocate for budget for future phases:
     - A: primarily 3 funding sources: parks bond, general fund and facility fees. Opportunities to advocate include: attending MP presentation to Council, talk to Council members, attend budget hearings.
   - Q: will the pavilion have electricity? If we do have elec, will be beneficial for multipurpose events
     - A: not specified in plan. The patio will have electricity.
   - Q: if RHDC requires archeological survey, maybe partner with the university.
   - Q: How do we know exactly where the buildings were? Who had the information? Previous archeological survey indicated it was hard to locate.
     - A: sandborn maps. The city has the archeological report
   - Q: (seeing the cost), the chance of getting budget for implementation looks like way down the road.
   - Q: can we add the Latta University catalogs to the MP report?
     - A: yes. Emma to follow up with Brandi. Brandi to send to CPC members

3. Draft Master Plan & Prioritization Discussion:
   - Q: regarding feedback, what did those who dislike say?
     - A: they don't want anything on the site, as we heard before.
   - Q: what are the funding sources and how do we advocate for budget for future phases:
     - A: primarily 3 funding sources: parks bond, general fund and facility fees. Opportunities to advocate include: attending MP presentation to Council, talk to Council members, attend budget hearings.
   - Q: will the pavilion have electricity? If we do have elec, will be beneficial for multipurpose events
     - A: not specified in plan. The patio will have electricity.
   - Q: if RHDC requires archeological survey, maybe partner with the university.
   - Q: How do we know exactly where the buildings were? Who had the information? Previous archeological survey indicated it was hard to locate.
     - A: sandborn maps. The city has the archeological report
   - Q: (seeing the cost), the chance of getting budget for implementation looks like way down the road.
   - Q: can we add the Latta University catalogs to the MP report?
     - A: yes. Emma to follow up with Brandi. Brandi to send to CPC members

4. Consensus Vote:
   - Three votes of 2, Seven votes of 1 → Consensus

5. Next Steps:
   i. Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Process:
      - a) Raleigh Historic Development Commission: November 19, 7:45am, Urban Design Center
      - b) Design Review Advisory Council: November 25, 5:00pm, Urban Design Center
      - c) COA Committee: January 23, 4:00pm, City Council Chambers

   ii. Master Plan Approval Process
      - a) Historic Resources & Museum Advisory Board (HRMAB) – REVIEW: November 20, 6:00pm, Mordecai Visitor Center
      - b) HRMAB – ACTION: January 22, 6:00pm, Mordecai Visitor Center
      - c) City Council: March 3, 1:00pm, City Council Chambers
APPENDIX F: CITIZEN PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING PRESENTATIONS

Latta House & University Site Master Plan
Citizen Planning Committee Meeting #1
March 22nd, 2019

Agenda
1) Project Background
2) CPC Role & Responsibilities
3) Draft Charter Review
4) Consensus Building Process
5) Project Schedule
6) Project Overview: Situation Assessment Summary, Draft Goals, & Vision Statement
7) Next Steps

Project Background
Site Context & Historic Background
The Latta University, founded in 1892, was dedicated to educating underprivileged and orphan African-American children

Project Background
Site History
1993 Raleigh Historic Landmark (House)
2002 National Register of Historic Places
2007 Latta House Destroyed, Site Resources Recovered, and Deed Conveyed
2008 Collection Processed
2009 Archaeological Survey
2010 Raleigh Historic Landmark (Site)

CPC Role & Responsibilities
Why are you here?
Provide recommendations to the Raleigh Historic Resources and Museum Advisory Board (HRMAB) for a future park program that will best meet the needs of the community

Discover, share information, and learn from each other
Develop, review, and discuss program elements
Shape agreements that resolve issues and balance multiple interests
Inform the public and the City about topics addressed in the process

Project Background
Park Planning Process
Winter 2018
• Situation Assessment
Spring 2018 – Fall 2019
• Public Input Process
Winter 2019
• Master Plan Approval Process

The Public Input Process includes Citizen Planning Committee meetings, Online Input, Public Input meetings and Event Outreach
Public input starts with general input, then alternatives are designed & presented, and finally the draft Master Plan is developed
CPC Role & Responsibilities

**Deliberate in Good Faith**
Balance interests and participate in a consensus building process

**Represent Constituents**
When reviewing issues and recommendations

**Attend Meetings**
And fully participate in each meeting

---

Draft CPC Charter Review

**Your Responsibilities**

**Vision Statement**
That describes the overall vision for the park and serves as the foundation for a range of Plan Alternatives

**Draft Master Plan**
That includes a conceptual plan rendering, Vision Statement, background information, and recommendations for stewardship of the park

**Priorities**
For phased development of the project, with consideration for existing and anticipated funding

**Proposed Master Plan**
Based on public feedback of the Draft Master Plan

---

Consensus Building Process

Consensus decision-making is a group decision-making process in which group members develop, and agree to support a decision in the best interest of the whole

1. **Endorsement** (Member fully supports it)
2. **Endorsement with minor point of contention** (Member likes it)
3. **Agreement with minor reservation** (Formal disagreement, but will not block or hold up the proposed)
4. **Stand aside with major reservations** (Formal disagreement, but will not block or hold up the proposed)
5. **Block** (Member will not support the proposed plan)

---

Consensus Building Process

Measuring Consensus:

- **Consensus** = All committee members present rate the proposal as a 1, 2, or 3
- **Consensus with Major Reservations** = All committee members present rate the proposal as a 1, 2, or 3, except at least one Committee member rates it as a 4
- **No Consensus** = Any committee member rates the proposal as a 5

---

Project Schedule

- **Existing Conditions**
- **Site Restrictions**
Community Input Survey
- 42 participants
- Opened: October 19, 2018
- Closed: December 3, 2018

What amenities would you use?

What experiences should be provided?

2. Vote: How should this be displayed?

- Interpretive Panels
- Touch-screen Kiosk
- Building Information Display
- Audio/Visual I Spy
- Outdoor Exhibits
- Other

1. How would you share & interpret the history?

- Interpretive Panels
- Touch-screen Kiosk
- Building Information Display
- Audio/Visual I Spy
- Outdoor Exhibits
- Other

Project Overview
Situation Assessment Summary

1. Educate Site Visitors
2. Encourage Community Gathering
3. Enhance the Site’s Natural Beauty

Draft Project Goals Review

The Latta House & University Site will be a gathering place for the community to connect with the natural beauty of the site and learn about the site’s unique history.

Draft Vision Statement Review

Next Steps

April 6th
- Public Input Meeting #1
  - Day-of Volunteers
  - Help spread the word!

May 24th
- CPC Meeting #2 Homework
  - Draft Charter Review
  - Draft Vision Statement

Stakeholder Concerns & Recommendations

- Development & gentrification of the area
- Suggestions on historic interpretation
- Opportunities for a community gathering space
- Preservation of the site’s large trees & open space
Agenda
1) Meeting Minutes*
2) Charter*
3) Vision Statement*
4) General Input Results Overview
5) Master Plan Goals
6) Master Plan Design Alternatives
7) Next Steps

Citizen Planning Committee
Meeting #2
May 24th, 2019

Latta House & University
Site Master Plan

Consensus Building Process

Consensus decision-making is a group decision-making process in which group
members develop, and agree to support a decision in the best interest of the whole

1) Endorsement (Member fully supports it)
2) Endorsement with minor point of contention (Member likes it)
3) Agreement with minor reservation (Formal disagreement, but will not block or hold up the proposed)
4) Stand aside with major reservations (Formal disagreement, but will not block or hold up the proposed)
5) Block (Member will not support the proposed plan)

Measuring Consensus:
Consensus = all committee members present rate the proposal as a 1, 2, or 3
Consensus with Major Reservations = All committee members present rate the proposal as a 1, 2, or 3, except at least one Committee member rates it as a 4
No Consensus = Any committee member rates the proposal as a 5

Charter
1. Discussion
2. Adoption

Collected Vision Statements
For the safety, general well-being, and future of the Latta University site; Troy Burton, Doug Porter, Joshua Ingersoll, and Ernest Dollar shall be permanently banned from ever stepping foot on the property!
Collected Vision Statements

The Latta House and university site will be a place for bringing people of all ages, races, and backgrounds together to learn, enjoy, and celebrate Raleigh’s past, and to develop a better understanding of each other.

A beautiful, serene space with art. A place to reflect. A place to show the historical significance of the area.

Key Terms & Thoughts

The project should be a ‘goes down easy’ history lesson mixed with a site where families can go for an outing, like a picnic.

The Latta House & University Site will be a gathering place for the community to connect with the natural beauty of the site and learn about the site’s unique history and the legacy of Reverend Latta.

Draft Vision Statement

The Latta House & University Site will be a beautiful, serene gathering place for bringing people of all ages, races, and backgrounds together to learn, reflect on, enjoy, and celebrate Raleigh’s past and the legacy of Reverend Latta.

General Input:

1. Online Survey – April 5-29
2. Public Input Open House – April 6
3. Chavis Egg Hunt – April 13
4. Mordecai Plant Sale – April 27

General Input: April 2019

1. Honor the Legacy of Latta
2. Educate & Engage Diverse Communities
3. Enhance the Site’s Natural Beauty
4. Encourage Community Gathering
5. Preserve the Site Historic Resources

Master Plan Goals
Existing Conditions

Design Alternatives

1. Design A – Enhance & Inspire
2. Design B – Gather & Engage
3. Design C – Educate & Preserve

Design A – Enhance & Inspire
Design B – Gather & Engage

Design C – Educate & Preserve

Design C – Educate & Preserve
Design C – Educate & Preserve

Small Group Workshop

Public Interpretation Questions
1. Are the maps & brochure clear & easy to understand?
2. Do these alternatives adequately reflect the public input?
3. What elements are missing; Which Design Alternative should they go into?

Design Alternative Questions
1. Which elements should stay and which should go?
2. Do elements need to move to a different part of the site?

Next Steps

June 8th
Public Input Meeting #2
Oberlin Baptist Church
9:30 am – Noon

July 26th
CPC Meeting #3
Jaycee Community Center
4 – 5:30 pm
Citizen Planning Committee
Meeting #3
July 26th, 2019

Latta House & University Site Master Plan

Agenda
1) Meeting Minutes
2) Project Review
3) Tree Health Assessment
4) Public Input Summary
5) Proposed Draft Master Plan
6) Next Steps

Project Timeline
1. Honor the Legacy of Latta
2. Educate & Engage Diverse Communities
3. Enhance the Site’s Natural Beauty
4. Encourage Community Gathering
5. Preserve the Site Historic Resources

Master Plan Goals
1. Honor the Legacy of Latta
2. Educate & Engage Diverse Communities
3. Enhance the Site’s Natural Beauty
4. Encourage Community Gathering
5. Preserve the Site Historic Resources

Vision Statement
The Latta House & University Site will be a beautiful, serene gathering place for bringing diverse communities together to learn about, reflect on, enjoy, and celebrate the legacy of Reverend Latta, and the site’s unique African-American history.

Design Comparison
Tree Health Assessment

Public Input Summary: Design Alternatives: June 2019

1. Online Survey – May 31-June 25
2. Celebrate Oberlin BBQ – June 1
3. Public Input Open House – June 8
Proposed Master Plan Elements: Net Preferences

- Interpretive Pavilion
  - Net Preferences
- Outdoor Patio
  - Net Preferences

Proposed Master Plan Elements: Undecided

- Pavilion
  - General Public
  - Visitors
  - Decisions

- Visitor Center
  - General Public
  - Visitors
  - Decisions

Proposed Master Plan Elements

- Interpretive Pavilion
  - The Interpretive Pavilion will be in the main hub of historic interpretation on-site. It will house the exhibition, featuring exhibits, a display room, and a kiosk. It will provide an outdoor classroom for visiting groups of schoolchildren.

- Outdoor Patio
  - The Outdoor Patio will serve two purposes. It can be used for small events, such as theatrical performances, and it can also provide a small stage and electricity for performances or larger events, such as the annual Latta Day Festival.

Proposed Master Plan Elements

- Creative & Interactive Historic Interpretation
  - The Interpretive Pavilion will be the center of historic interpretation on-site. It will house the exhibition, featuring exhibits, a display room, and a kiosk. It will provide an outdoor classroom for visiting groups of schoolchildren.

- Enhanced Site Entrance
  - The Enhanced Site Entrance will include adding City of Raleigh’s standard park signage, increasing garden beds, and adding other elements to help draw pedestrian flow through the site.
Proposed Master Plan Elements

Historic Signage
Historic Signage will be placed along the paths in the park, to create an "Educational Trail." These signs will not only focus on the history of Rev. Latta and Latta University, but may include additional topics such as the history of Oberlin Village, Oberlin Village historic landmarks, and Raleigh African-American history.

Succession Plantings & Ornamental Gardens
Succession Plantings are areas for new tree plantings or the existing trees on site. These areas are developed to help the canopy cover maintain percentage required in the Property, deed. Ornamental Gardens will be placed by the park entrances and along the paths to contribute to the beauty of the site.

Ornamental Gardens
Ornamental Gardens will be placed by the park entrances and along the paths to contribute to the beauty of the site.

Park Benches
Park Benches will be available along the paths to provide small & intimate settings for community gatherings, enjoying the site’s beauty, and reflecting on the importance of the history of the Latta House & University Site.

Paths
The site will feature one main path that will be 6-8’ in width, and a smaller connector path to allow for universal access of the entire site. These paths will be ADA compliant, and could re-use the existing stone borders, or recovered historic bricks, as an edging feature.
Next Steps

Development Services Review
August 5th

Draft Master Plan:
Public Input Meeting
August 24th
Wilson Temple UMC: 9:30am - Noon
Friends of Oberlin Village
August 26th

Citizen Advisory Council
August 27th
Raleigh Historic Development Commission
September 17th

FINAL:
CPC Meeting #4
September 27th
Jaycee Community Center: 4-5:30pm
Agenda
1) Meeting Minutes
2) New Project Timeline
3) Public Input Summary
4) Draft Master Plan Overview
5) Priority Phasing
6) Next Steps

Public Input Summary
Draft Master Plan Options
Aug. – Sept. 2019

1. Online Survey – Aug 23-Sptember 9
2. African-American Cultural Festival– Aug 31 & Sept. 1
3. Public Input Open House – Aug 24
Proposed Elements

Proposed Elements

Proposed Elements

Proposed Elements

Proposed Elements

Proposed Elements

Proposed Elements
Proposed Elements

Latta House Outline

Option 1: No Improvements
Option 2: Temporary Improvements
Option 3: Permanent Plantings
Option 4: Paved/Gravel Outline
Option 5: Pillars
Option 6: Low Wall
Option 7: Park Benches

Parks

The Latta House Outline and surrounding landscape have a mix of paved and unpaved pathways, with a variety of plantings and seating areas. The area is designed to be accessible and inviting, with ample spaces for visitors to relax and enjoy the natural surroundings.
Interpretive Focal Point Questions

1. Site Impact
2. Artifacts
3. Restrooms
4. Classrooms

Total Preference based on Site Impact

- I prefer the **Indoor Interpretive Center**, understanding that it will have additional site impacts such as required parking, right-of-way dedication, and potential tree removal.

- I prefer the **Outdoor Interpretive Pavilion** because it will minimize development impact onsite.
I prefer the Indoor Interpretive Center because it could house the artifacts on site, although it would most likely be open to the public on a limited basis.

I prefer the Outdoor Interpretive Pavilion because interpretive materials will be available anytime the park is open, although artifacts will need to be housed offsite and only brought onsite for scheduled events.

I prefer the Indoor Interpretive Center because it would provide restrooms on site.

I prefer the Outdoor Interpretive Pavilion, although accessing the nearest restroom will require walking 1/5 mile to Jaycee Park.

I prefer the Indoor Interpretive Center because I think an indoor classroom is an important use for this site.

I prefer the Outdoor Interpretive Pavilion because I think an outdoor classroom meets the need for education on site.
Consensus Building Process

Consensus decision-making is a group decision-making process in which group members develop, and agree to support a decision in the best interest of the whole.

1) Endorsement (I fully support it)
2) Endorsement with minor point of contention (Basically, I like it)
3) Agreement with minor reservation (I can live with it)
4) Stand aside with major reservations (I don’t like this, but I don’t want to hold up the group / I need more info)
5) Block (I do not support the proposal, and will do anything to make sure it doesn’t pass)

Measuring Consensus:

Consensus = all committee members present rate the proposal as a 1, 2, or 3

Consensus with Major Reservations = All committee members present rate the proposal as a 1, 2, or 3, except at least one Committee member rates it as a 4

No Consensus = Any committee member rates the proposal as a 5
Consensus Vote: Draft Master Plan

Priority Phasing Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Site Entrance</td>
<td>Creative &amp; Interactive Historic Signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Signage</td>
<td>Additional Historic Signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession Plantings &amp; Invasive Removal</td>
<td>Ornamental Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latta Outline Improvements</td>
<td>Interpretive Pavilion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Benches</td>
<td>Outdoor Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Steps

Final Draft Master Plan: Public Input Meeting
October 19th
Jaycee Community Center: 9:30 am – Noon
Citizen Advisory Council
October 22nd
Friends of Oberlin Village
October 28th

Final CPC Meeting #5
November 15th
Jaycee Community Center: 4 - 5:30pm
Raleigh Historic Development Commission
November 19th
HRMAB
November 20th
Citizen Planning Committee
Meeting #5
Latta House & University
Site Master Plan
November 15th, 2019

Agenda
1) Meeting Minutes
2) Public Input Summary
3) Draft Master Plan Document Overview
4) Approval Process Dates (Voluntary Participation)

Public Input Summary:
Priority Phasing
Draft Master Plan
Priority Phasing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Future Phase(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Signage</td>
<td>Creative &amp; Interactive Historic Signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latta House Outline Improvements</td>
<td>Additional Historic Signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Site Entrance</td>
<td>Ornamental Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths</td>
<td>Interpretive Pavilion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession Plantings &amp; Invasive Removal</td>
<td>Outdoor Patio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Benches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Succession Plantings & Invasive Removal
Outdoor Patio

Public Input Summary:

Priority Phasing
Draft Master Plan
Priority Phasing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Future Phase(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Signage</td>
<td>Creative &amp; Interactive Historic Signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latta House Outline Improvements</td>
<td>Additional Historic Signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Site Entrance</td>
<td>Ornamental Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths</td>
<td>Interpretive Pavilion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession Plantings &amp; Invasive Removal</td>
<td>Outdoor Patio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Benches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Consensus Building Process**

**Measuring Consensus:**

- **Consensus** = all committee members present rate the proposal as a 1, 2, or 3
- **Consensus with Major Reservations** = All committee members present rate the proposal as a 1, 2, or 3, except at least one Committee member rates it as a 4
- **No Consensus** = Any committee member rates the proposal as a 5

**Consensus Decision-Making:**

1. **Endorsement** (I fully support it)
2. **Endorsement with minor point of contention** (Basically, I like it)
3. **Agreement with minor reservation** (I can live with it)
4. **Stand aside with major reservations** (I don’t like this, but I don’t want to hold up the group / I need more info)
5. **Block** (I do not support the proposal, and will do anything to make sure it doesn’t pass)

**Estimated Phase 1 Implementation Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Signage</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latta Outline Improvements</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Site Entrance</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession Plantings (Invasive Removal)</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Benches</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Estimated Phase 1 Implementation Costs:** $74,000

**Estimated Future Phase(s) Implementation Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creative &amp; Interactive Historic Signage</td>
<td>$40,000 - $50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Historic Signage</td>
<td>$25,000 - $30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornamental Gardens</td>
<td>$5,000 - $6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Pavilion</td>
<td>$400,000 - $500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Patio</td>
<td>$100,000 - $150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Estimated Future Phase(s) Implementation Costs:** $600,000 - $750,000

**Approval Process Dates:**

- **Raleigh Historic Development Commission**
  - Tuesday, November 19
  - 7:45 – 8:45 am
  - Suite 100, One Exchange Plaza

- **Design Review Advisory Committee**
  - Monday, November 25
  - 5:00 – 6:30 pm
  - Suite 100, One Exchange Plaza

- **Certificate of Appropriateness Committee**
  - Thursday, January 23
  - 4:00 – 5:30 pm
  - City Council Chamber, Raleigh Municipal Building

- **Historic Resources and Museum Advisory Board**
  - Review
  - Wednesday, November 20
  - 6:00 – 7:00 pm
  - Mordecai Visitor Center

- **Historic Resources and Museum Advisory Board**
  - Action
  - Wednesday, January 22
  - 6:00 – 7:00 pm
  - Mordecai Visitor Center

- **City Council**
  - Tuesday, March 3
  - 1:00 – 3:30 pm
  - City Council Chamber, Raleigh Municipal Building
APPENDIX G: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT RESULTS

General Input

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Retain the space as a community gathering and green space while interpreting the significance of the site and former Oertel residents through public art installations and creative signage. 6 months ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Create permanent exhibit space in Jaycee Park, interpreting Latta site and story of Oertel in larger context of Raleigh’s history.” 6 months ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I’d love to see more history about the site.” 6 months ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Would like to see more history and interpretation of the site.” 6 months ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“History &amp; Importance of Oberlin Village” 6 months ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“North Carolina’s African-American History” 6 months ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Nearby Historic Landmarks dating back to Oberlin Village” 6 months ago.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average
### Raleigh's African-American History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Help people know our past
8 months ago

### City of Raleigh Historic Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RHoC - How does a site become a Historic Landmark?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feel that I should close this but do not
2 months ago

### 2009 Archaeological Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Topics (Ex. Environmental Aspects) Please write in your suggestions:

- "Did any of the Latta students contribute to site & culture? Perhaps describe education program at Latta & what impact it had in the community & importance of education & training in general."
  5 months ago

- "The tree canopy was defined property well & what benefits & impact having a significant tree canopy has on the site & the urban area in general? Perhaps describe what types of trees are on site, too."
  5 months ago

- "Would panels that inform visitors of Latta & the school & the history of area?"
  1 month ago

- "Change restrictions to clarify elements which prohibit best resource use of the site."
  1 month ago

- Creative site furniture as part of an art installation may be a clever solution, but describing it as "furniture" does not seem appropriate. A creative mobile ground that respects the site and its history while allowing for community uses and gatherings would be ideal.
  1 month ago

- "Great idea, but I think you may have a spelling error- "historic" is misspelled"
  1 month ago

- "I love the idea of adding some outdoor seating."
  1 month ago

- "Historic landmarks should be protected & conserved as a part of our heritage."
  1 month ago

- "Historic landmarks should be protected & conserved as a part of our heritage."
  1 month ago

- "Historic landmarks should be protected & conserved as a part of our heritage."
  1 month ago
### The Slate Borders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leave in Place</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would depend on the historic nature of the border. Were they constructed recently? Part of the Latta site during its history?

3 months ago

### The Grill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leave in Place</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can this be left in place?

3 months ago

### Garden Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agree with other responses that any proposed garden should be sympathetic to any previously existing historic gardens on site.

5 months ago

### Tree Plantings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimal to replicate the past

1 month ago

Should consider planting pecan trees

1 month ago
What should we keep in mind as we design?

- Make sure that it is true to the time of the original site and that it does a good job of discussing the African American history of Raleigh.

- This is a neighborhood park that is already utilized by the surrounding community. It has a wonderful history that should be better communicated, but I would hate to see it become too formalized.

- "Look for opportunities next to & near the Latta site to expand interpretive resources."

- "Please honor the natural landscape, add flowers, trees, no structures."

- "A park that invites reflection on our history, people who shaped their "times" & nature."

- "Keep the landscape open & natural - supplement w/ low maintenance perennials & bulbs. Maintain campus feel."

- "The importance of Oberlin Village community."

- "There is a Capital Trail sign near the park. What is that & does that have any implications/impacts on the park? I am super excited about the tree canopy work."

- "Should max. open area. Please do not clutter the site w/ structures. Please carefully place/locate the amenities so they do not appear obtrusive."

- The Importance of the history of ALL people should be given priority as knowledge of history aids with current understanding of all peoples.

- Getting permission to remove or redefine the restrictions to allow replication of the former Latta Buildings and such

- Communication of cultural and historical significance through storytelling and interpretive exhibits. It would be interesting to have some type of interaction with the landscape and/or house that would have been unique to students that stayed at Latta.

What do you NOT want to see at the site?

- I would not want to see faux-history created - either through a poor recreation or incongruous new site features.

- A white wash

- "Please make the site open to public 24/7. Please do not build a replica building."

- "No shelters. No buildings. Honor the nature."

- "No playground materials. May kids park around neighborhood."

- "Plenty of opportunities for play close by. So, no play equipment, please."

- Big structures, formalized spaces

- Too many design elements. I think it's best to keep the design simple, focused and period specific.
### Design Options

**What are your favorite parts of Design A?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple Historic Signage</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Areas</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Trail Loop</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Benches</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What is your LEAST favorite part of Design A?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Trail Loop</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Historic Signage</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Benches</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Areas</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you change anything about Design A?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

What changes would you make?
If there is to be public art, consider having the art tie to African American themes or all created by African American artists.

This park is dedicated to Billie Latte and his strong belief in providing education and enjoyment to African American. The site should pay tribute to his legacy by being a place of introspect and education - not a dog park or playground. There are other generic parks that can host such activities.

Perhaps make the path a little more meandering. Add an area for art installations and education information. Also add an area for outdoor activities and performances.

This plan seems more passive than active. The single point focus on the public art will not be a compelling reason for people to visit/impact the site.

Please do not complete the walking trail loop. Leave the land as natural as possible. There is no need to disrupt this land.

Create path to access the site for those with a need for that (perhaps wheelchairs/blinds/friends).

Enhance the historic signage.

Eliminate the park benches.

Leave the land natural.

Any landscaping in the middle of the path interfere with open areas where children currently play.

Have the simplicity and focus on natural beauty in mind.

I like most of the design. I live at 1065 Parker, and love seeing kids play in the large open area of the park. A large public piece of art would eliminate this a play area/gathering place for kids.

A walking trail fits exactly what our neighborhood needs.

More signage might be nice - what would the gardens be like, and who would keep them up?

I was not do the walking trail loop. Leave the land as natural as possible. There is no need to add construction here on this land.

What are your favorite parts of Design B?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71%</td>
<td>Creative &amp; Interactive Historic Signage</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43%</td>
<td>Outdoor Community Event Space</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Interpretive Pavilion</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Creative Site Furniture</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Grilling Area</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are your LEAST favorite parts of Design B?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72%</td>
<td>Grilling Area</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43%</td>
<td>Interpretive Pavilion</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Creative Site Furniture</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Outdoor Community Event Space</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Creative &amp; Interactive Historic Signage</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What would you change about Design B?

Building a large public pavilion would ruin the current open atmospheres of the park, especially if it is in any area where we want individuals to learn about and reflect on the unique history of the site. Encouraging the pavilions should not be included in any plan due to the historic and community-sensitive nature.

A large structure would take away the unique open spaces, something that is very unique in a city neighborhood.

Adding more benches throughout the area and those with shade if possible would be beneficial. The benches would offer a place for reading historical signs and taking in the reflection. Several tall grills, picnic areas, and grilling/picnic areas provide space for outdoor events. A few garbage cans and street furniture to maintain the regular maintenance and cleaning which would not be provided.

Building a large public pavilion would damage the chemistry, like a beach or a theater, etc.

Maintaining the natural spaces, without adding construction, playfields, playgrounds, etc, is the best way to preserve this unique site in the neighborhood.

There’s a strong preference to keep the park’s natural space and provide more natural structures. The open spaces on the property are precious and rare in the city. It’s a policy to plan to gather with friends and neighbors to enjoy a moment of solitude, support educational events, and activities regarding the history of the Latta House.

Leave the grill like they plan the potential of activating the site and engage, please add a marker to the lower side of the site.

The structure is built a different part of the site off to the side by we’ll add many of the comments about the natural area being disturbed.

The design improves the parks natural beauty, but such a small area, it seems like it’s left an outdoor area as a small park.

Garden Park is a nice place away and this is a pavilion.

Clean the park.

Not enough historical signage, I understand the concerns with 10-300 but this doesn’t go with the pavilions and outdoor areas. If more natural/organic materials were used, they could reflect the historical context of the site, especially if it is not in the center of a city. The grills are fine, but maybe should be shifted more into a corner.

All of the proposed amenities are available. Grills away in a park house. Please leave the park for leisure for the future.

The historical location of the house should be made visible within the design. The park should be within the historical signage to raise awareness of the site and neighborhood.

Some space is too general to make comfortable to agree with it. However, having support having multiple outdoor areas. A few garbage cans and street furniture to maintain the regular maintenance and cleaning which would not be provided.

If grills are added, please add them with the interpretive sections of the site and grilling/ picnic areas.

First, the idea of a place for community and gathering, the same sense an events space is right.
What are your LEAST favorite parts of Design C?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Center</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables &amp; Park Benches</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Trail</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Areas</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Historic Signage</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What would you change about Design C?

- Again, any type of structure that is built right in the middle of the park will completely take away from the use of the beautiful land.  I am not a fan of historic signages, but I think its store is in a simple and useful manner.
- 2 Agrees

- Picnic areas do not do a building on the history.  Please pay homage to the natural beauty of the important land.
- 3 months ago
- 1 Agree

- The walking trail needs to be really great.  I love the many walking trails in this design but wide open spaces like in design B still having walking trails in much more useful.  To be able to have another place in the neighborhood for people and walking would be great.
- 2 months ago
- 2 Agrees

- Quieter and education to reflect the historical mission.
- 2 months ago
- 1 Agree

- This design would make the park both unique and functional if the visitor center can also be used for community events.
- 1 week ago
- 1 Agree

- Picnic tables can be open, any tables should be off the side and not in a shaded area.  Suggested are very welcome.
- 4 months ago

- This structure located a different part of the site off to the side.  It would add a lot of the context about the situation, as well as this building can be used for the actual building and new to explore or interpret the house.  The walking trail will not need to be over the house footprint.
- 4 months ago

- This design completely changes the park's small, linear, wooded character.  It's too small a park for a visitor center.  A multiple-leaf snail shape, with meandering paths, rather than historical signage, is all that Latta's needs to be the destination is already.
- 4 months ago

- No a structure on the historic footprint of Latta House and Farm.  Latta will tour you for history.
- 4 months ago

- I like the walking trails, gardens, and the signage is placed.  Visitors center is too close to the middle of the site.
- 6 months ago

- I have the idea of an interpretive center.  This site needs a significant amount of space and investment to tell the important stories of the Latta family and Old Mill Village.  Historic context can be added to tell the story of current conditions, for interpretation by the number of people suggesting ways to reclaim the site.  It would be helpful to determine the messages of the space.  The interpretive center would be many functions — especially to bring people together to learn about the Latta and Old Mill through signage, interaction, etc.
- 6 months ago

- The individual who gifted the land to the City of Raleigh restricted the property from having a structure built.  This is not a design question.
- 6 months ago

- All of the proposed amenities are outside 2 blocks away in city parks, near the Town of Cary.  Latta has some art and information, and keeps the park as natural as possible in the right approach.
- 6 months ago

- The visitor center should be reflective of the location of the historic structure and the history of the Old Mill.  Programming should be completed with a visitor center will be used.  Otherwise, a visitor center is not necessary.
- 6 months ago

- Walking trails should include historic signage.  Not sure what “simple heritage signage” means.  To the focus of the park will be the education and the immediate importance to Village story, and foremost, the want “simple” to conserve 2 signs as if the history isn’t a side line objective.
- 6 months ago

- By placing the signs, the double loop of the walking trail known open space that is, to me, one of the sites compelling features.
Which is your favorite Design?

- **Design A**: 25%  
- **Design B**: 16%  
- **Design C**: 24%  
- **A combination of two designs**: 29%

### Design A

- **Design A** is the most appealing. Leaving it as a beautiful green space, with historic signage is the best option.
- **25%**

### Design B

- **Design B** is a perfect opportunity to preserve the history of Latta University and the Ebenezer neighborhood.
- **16%**

### Design C

- **Design C** is a great idea. However, it needs a space for education, community gathering and celebration. It should have a more open area for gatherings.
- **24%**

### A combination of two designs

- **Combination** is a great idea. It should include both the green space and the historic signage.
- **29%**
Any other comments?

- Design C plus the addition of an outdoor event space would be ideal. Lots of plantings, flowers to make the space inviting. Public art that is meaningful to the historical aspects as well. So excited for the space to come alive and share the stories of the past.
- 4 months ago  
  - Agree

- Design D:
  - Include visitor center and memorize position
  - National Historic Park
  - Move outdoor reading/relaxation area
  - Something that relates to Latta house footprint
- 4 months ago  
  - Agree

- N. I. D.: the desire to preserve the natural area of the old Latta University site, but that site and the entire village is about history.
  - I am not sure how much history can be conveyed through a park with signage and no buildings. Such a strategy would draw people there to learn more about the area, and that is what is needed. It is large enough for both a park and a pavilion at Visitor Center.
- 4 months ago

- There should be a building of some sort for educational purposes (all the history of Latta and the village), entertainment, speeches, and gatherings. I think this site is large enough to fill everything shown on all of these options without ruining the natural setting.
- 4 months ago

- Inside my grandparents' home in other parks, I have seen lovely buildings for playing and art. I would like Latta to be a park that would allow people to enjoy the park while they experience the history and beauty of this park.
- 4 months ago

- Some naturalistic signage and nothing else.
- 4 months ago

- Keep historical and information about the historic nature of the place.
- 4 months ago

- Design A, vivid colors, and garden(s) design of historic significance is important and maybe to keep signage small enough.
  - 5 months ago

- Design A without the public art structure would be great. Then the history, spruce up the gardening. Leave the open space.
- 5 months ago

- I absolutely adore less is more. We don't need buildings that are just boxes and the neighborhood is natural gathering space. A place where neighbors and families can come together. A place where families can plant. Everyone needs a bit more of nature in their lives, and public spaces and walking trails are huge draws.
- 5 months ago

- I like the simplicity of A, but it might be nice to have more plants and some signage and maybe more signage about the history.
- 5 months ago

- Design C is a combination of A and C. I think it is ideal. It would preserve and honor the history while serving as a good place for walks and public art.
- 5 months ago

- Keep in mind, just signage and nothing else.
- 6 months ago
### Draft Master Plan Options

**Where do you live?**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you think these Proposed Elements support the Master Plan Goals, Vision Statement, and the public input feedback?</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Park</td>
<td>17% Strong Disagree</td>
<td>13% Disagree</td>
<td>20% Agree</td>
<td>41% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative &amp; Interactive Interpretive Signage</td>
<td>19% Strong Disagree</td>
<td>7% Disagree</td>
<td>20% Agree</td>
<td>64% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Historic Signage</td>
<td>0% Strong Disagree</td>
<td>4% Disagree</td>
<td>28% Agree</td>
<td>61% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Site Entrance</td>
<td>0% Strong Disagree</td>
<td>6% Disagree</td>
<td>31% Agree</td>
<td>67% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Benches</td>
<td>3% Strong Disagree</td>
<td>3% Disagree</td>
<td>36% Agree</td>
<td>58% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Path</td>
<td>9% Strong Disagree</td>
<td>3% Disagree</td>
<td>23% Agree</td>
<td>65% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession Plantings</td>
<td>3% Strong Disagree</td>
<td>3% Disagree</td>
<td>33% Agree</td>
<td>64% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornamental Gardens</td>
<td>0% Strong Disagree</td>
<td>11% Disagree</td>
<td>38% Agree</td>
<td>45% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Focal Point</td>
<td>20% Strong Disagree</td>
<td>11% Disagree</td>
<td>24% Agree</td>
<td>45% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

71 respondents
Do you have any comments about the Proposed Elements? Commenting on the proposed elements helps us ensure the site is developed in a way that reflects the community's values and aspirations.

We have very big open green spaces left in the city. Enlarging the park with new signage and interpretive exhibits can help ensure the site continues to thrive as a community center.

The proposed structures are appropriate for the park's overall scale and will not be noticeable for quiet enjoyment of nature.

The site has such rich, understated history that it would be disappointing to see the future vision for the site lost on the horizon.

I think the design is smart and well thought out. It's great that it's developing more community spaces.

It's hard to imagine how the site could be developed in a way that doesn't recognize its importance.

I think the design is very strong and will be a great addition to the city. It's important to maintain the existing green spaces.

I don't think the design is strong enough to be noticed. It's important to consider the existing green spaces.

I think the design is very strong and will be a great addition to the city. It's important to maintain the existing green spaces.

I think the design is very strong and will be a great addition to the city. It's important to maintain the existing green spaces.

I think the design is very strong and will be a great addition to the city. It's important to maintain the existing green spaces.

I think the design is very strong and will be a great addition to the city. It's important to maintain the existing green spaces.

I think the design is very strong and will be a great addition to the city. It's important to maintain the existing green spaces.

I think the design is very strong and will be a great addition to the city. It's important to maintain the existing green spaces.
We need to make sure that an emphasis on the history of the site is preserved.

Even though the master plan identifies an interpretive facility (i.e., visitor center or pavilion), due to the site constraints and public comments, perhaps this facility должен be not necessary at this time. A historical interpretation and signage with minimal alteration to the parcels may be move to keep with the requirements of the deed and respect the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I prefer the Outdoor Interpretive Center because it will minimize development impacts.</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer the Outdoor Interpretive Center, understanding that it will have additional site impacts such as required parking, roadway delineation, and potentially tree removal.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer the Outdoor Interpretive Center because interpretive materials will be available anytime the park is open, although artifacts will need to be housed offsite and only brought onsite for scheduled events.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer the Outdoor Interpretive Center because it would contain the artifacts on site, although it would most likely be open to the public on a limited basis.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$2$ respondents

$2$ respondents

$1$ respondents

$2$ respondents

$2$ respondents

The site should honor the knowledge, inspiration, and commitment to education and self-sufficiency and place the men and women who built it. Right now the area is getting lost and it is easy for this to be a hangout spot or place to other meanings. Wayside elements are important but should not be overbearing and allow visitors to enjoy the site's full knowledge of what took place here and the context surrounding to evolution.

Brick lane(s) can use the pavement instead as part of the interpretive focal point or the creative & interactive interpretive signage. Instead they are the only physical connection to the site that is left to the base of the railroader.

The interpretive focal point should be in scale with the site and add to the site rather than replacing the site or moving the site. Would definitely learn to the open structures.

So excited to see this Master Plan moving forward.

Great idea for the idea of the engaging gathering area. The building that was here should be honored.

Great idea for the idea of gathering places and stages.

The site should be utilized fully where people can contribute to Raleigh's and North Carolina history and reach out from the 1870s. So the thinking of the design team is to collaborate with the site. The space is large enough to contain the park atmosphere and for education and interpretation the history of the site. Filling the proposed historical elements envisions the past not just away from the historic park space. Anyone new to the site or an expert need to be respectful of what was there before and what was before was before made it attractive to those who want to be in the area now.

It's important for people to have an opportunity to collaborate the constructions and success of someone who was a huge impact on the education of Raleigh during the 1870s years. A facility like this can reinforce the educational and non-educational. A facility like this will provide an area for educational and others to gather in educational, and other forms of celebration on their history and emphasize the historical legacy of this location and the DeLoach community. Raleigh can be focused on Raleigh that are unaware of our history. We are lucky to have a park established in the exact area where the history was formed.

Add a changing photo exhibit.

Add a changing photo exhibit so there is more to experience each visit.

Fantastic idea. We should like to see a water feature, a lovely, adds amenity to any environment.

Resources in Raleigh – many people gather there. Leave those spaces natural.

The interpretive focal point should be open and not enclosed. Open or will be more inviting and encourage more interaction. It will also be more cost effective to maintain, including resources should be avoided. These will attract an unavoidable element. The parks have been for recreation. It would be awesome.

Let's build a good plaza.

Think that the interpretive area and onsite signage is important as possible learn and remember what was there and why it made the paths, benches, and planting are great for a collective to enjoy. Parking parking will be an issue. Do like to see some kind of designated parking, maybe some space rather still allowing a couple of the roads around the perimeter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I prefer the Outdoor Interpretive Center, although accessing the nearest resource will require walking 15 miles to downtown Raleigh.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer the Outdoor Interpretive Center because it would provide recreation on site.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer the Outdoor Interpretive Center because it would contain the artifacts on site.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you have any other comments about the pros & cons between these two options?

The renderings are beautiful. Can't wait for this project to begin. I think the selection of the indoor interpretive center can add a lot to the site and surround it in the neighborhood.

1 month ago
2 Agrees

Bathrooms on site are a must. It is totally inconceivable one important public restroom that related buildings at a site like Latta are open to the public. The bathroom should be immediately available, especially true with regard to people who have certain health and physical challenges, and for senior citizens.

1 Agrees
1 month ago

I think the distance control for amenities is important to consider. Small bathrooms is a powerful way to experience and learn about history. It would be a shame if artifacts had to be moved to the site anytime someone wanted to teach about material culture there. Bathrooms as long as they are staffed and maintained are a good idea. Groups of school do not visit the living history site and allow people to gather, tell stories, and learn about African American History in full.

1 month ago
1 Agrees

Would be happy with either option (interpretive center or outdoor learning) because both are necessary to learn the history of the site and allow people to gather, tell stories, and learn about African American History in full.

1 month ago
1 Agrees

Suggest continue to explore a hybrid space. Part indoor opening into a larger pavilion in good weather.

1 month ago
1 Agrees

Maybe a hybrid where an indoor space opens into a pavilion for expanded use.

1 month ago
1 Agrees

Bathrooms? Why would we add bathrooms here? There are some at park and why in the world can't there any at Bobble Oldham House? Which frequently used by families. We live here and don't want bathrooms or as ornament one site or around the corner.

1 month ago

I think a structure of any kind is a poor use of tax payer money. Agree with the comment below regarding bathrooms and seating. Signage for education, trails, and park benches would be perfect. This is a neighborhood park drawing more traffic to an area where parking is already an issue would be a terrible idea.

1 month ago
1 Agrees

I am very concerned that there is even a consideration to have bathrooms on this site. An indoor pavilion BBC parking lot will greatly impact the natural environment of this historic landscape... makes me very sad.

1 month ago
1 Agrees

Keep it natural as possible.

An interpretive area either indoor or outdoor is necessary to educate visitors and current residents that prior to their physical presence there was a thriving black community in this area that resided thousands of students, provided training in various trades and served as an employment for children. Would love a wonderful opportunity to keep learning.

1 month ago

Bathrooms on site a must. The idea of accessing the Trail Site at the Park is totally inconceivable and impractical. Even small children often must answer immediately. This is especially true for persons who may have certain health and physical challenges, and for senior citizens.

1 month ago

I think an outdoor interpretive site allows more flexibility. The greater drawback is the inability to ensure amenities on site.

1 month ago

I think the outdoor interpretive Center would be more flexible and could be completed sooner. Wonder if funds would be available to complete the outdoor interpretive Center anytime soon.

1 month ago

I don't like either option and would have to see a position of any kind. These are business questions. Just keep it natural.

1 month ago

A structure of any kind is absurd. Please don't do this to this space.

1 month ago

Any kind of structure for this location is not appropriate. The is a neighborhood park in a residential area and the open green space is the best use. Keep it that way with signage and limited impact.

1 month ago

This site begs to have no structure.

1 month ago

Bathrooms on site bad idea for sun. Not needed.

1 month ago

Volunteers could help staff center & events.

1 month ago

The interpretive center building does not appear to be sustainable for such a small site. The impact to the site outweighs the limited benefits it could potentially provide. Would like to see option available to winter 2017.

1 month ago


Which Latta House Outline Option do you prefer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1: Involved Outline</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2: No Improvements</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3: Permanent Planting</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4: Temporary Improvements</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5: Low Wall</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 6: Railings</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Option 1: Involved Outline**
  - This option involves more interaction and is suitable for a more active environment.

- **Option 2: No Improvements**
  - This option keeps the area as it is, with minimal changes.

- **Option 3: Permanent Planting**
  - This option includes permanent plantings and may require regular maintenance.

- **Option 4: Temporary Improvements**
  - This option involves temporary improvements that may need to be updated periodically.

- **Option 5: Low Wall**
  - A low wall could be a functional element, offering a place to sit and perhaps some privacy.

- **Option 6: Railings**
  - Railings could add safety and aesthetic value to the area.

Anyone who has a preference can leave a comment below.
Final Draft Master Plan & Priority Phasing

Do you support the Latta House & University Site Final Draft Master Plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Views</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 40% Fully support this plan: 14 votes
- 30% Basically like this plan: 12 votes
- 20% I am live with this plan: 6 votes
- 8% I don't really like this plan: 3 votes
- 3% I am definitely opposed to this plan: 1 vote

Do you have any comments on the Final Draft Master Plan?

- 283 votes

The enhanced entry is such a nice addition. It seems to have a nice balance between green space and structure.

- 283 votes

The path should be 8 ft and the width of the old house should be in the outdoor paths - they should be the same. If you have to have separate features, make the old house feature not be paved but instead maybe a brick low wall with grass in the middle. Kids could use the wall for a balanced beam type play feature. Issue openings where the owners to the house and driveways to the front porch with a separate wall. Can you provide an example of what you are planning for the pathway? How would you describe what you mean by an environmentalist presence in those two locations? Like other, I am concerned that there would be maintenance. Also really hope the City is pursuing the purchase of land between the property and Chelford to extend the open space in the way of Cleveland. With so much new multi-family housing going up, more park space will be helpful.

- 134 votes

Agreed with the thoughts above - there is too much going on on the outside. The space is fine, but the space is too big to support two additional buildings. We have Joyce park nearby with plenty of space for points and events; let us remember Nathaniel Cannon.

- 134 votes

An outdoor pavilion is a design element that seems to originate from the natural triumphs in space.

- 134 votes

I like the idea of having historical interpretation at the site and 3D mapping of the history of the site, the better.

- 134 votes

Notice the comments below that “less is more.” There is a lot going on at the site, and would prefer the spaces to be minimal and retain as possible. In particular, the different areas and outdoor paths are of most concern. It is not desirable to have these maintainance and visits to the museum is the better.

- 134 votes

I like the RESTRAINT of this plan; as I was opposed to extensive horticulture as shown in earlier plans. The pathways will be for BIDA with BBQ for people who don’t like to walk on the grass. It will be for to do what sort of interpretive historic interpretations you come up with.

- 134 votes

I like many components of this plan, but wish there had been every more interesting interpretations of space. Like a cultural museum where artists could be rented and displayed, there would be regular events like outdoor and indoor events could take place, cultural activities could happen, there could be permanent and rotating exhibit space, events could be catered, etc. All of that things can be happen in this plan being proposed, but time frames is a needed opportunity for a unique cultural and historic center that celebrates Morgan Latta, the school, Civil War rifle, and African American history and culture in Cleveland and SC.

- 134 votes

I like the idea of lots of creative historical signage, maybe even interactive signage. The ideas proposed in commons for wildlife, native, and medicinal plants are great. An interpretation of the original house is also a great idea. This can draw particular attention to the legacy of Morgan Latta.

- 134 votes
I don’t see a great inclusiveness of what environment for the student part. I see this as an example of the way, how things that are done at this university in this 20th century with modern techniques. Are we taking care of something that is new, with a design that leaves to students the history of Latta University history and development.

Also, within the context of this being a public park, I have to see some space given to a place that is closer to the university and encourage the planting of trees, as parks and amenities are often the place where students will be.

I think the comment below about including more native plantings is a part of these plantings in this way we can promote health through its education and health.

6 months ago

Thank you for listening and making the right changes for our neighborhood.

1 week ago

We need to remember the spirit of the University, the mission of the University should be highlighted, as well as how that mission was carried through the years by generations of students present and to come. If we lack a park, we lack a public, a public park. National Park, etc. The areas is going to work on it. Is it making a replica of the house and the University or University?

1 day ago

Will the entire university is not let any more. Own unaffiliated. Land ownership and in the spirit of commemoration on the city, status, country, and world would be incorporated in the record of the history of the land.

1 day ago

We will have some very interactive educational places where the Latta house was to provide more education on the property. There would be some areas that parks, everything together so that the rich history is told.

1 day ago

Great job, CAT and stuff it’s nice to see that both the general public and planning committee is considered.

1 day ago

Love the greenery. Looks beautiful. Looking forward to bringing my dog for a walk.

1 week ago

Love the greenery. Looks beautiful. Looking forward to bringing my dog for a walk.

1 week ago

Well, it seems to me that the house, Latta house is the key feature to much of the Latta. Wilkerson. It was reconstructed after the fire. It has received its own identity and in the context of the house, it is not to be seen integrative sense is connected to it. It is not to be a community living museum that can be rented. It will be used in the future. It is a park in its base. Not being a park for the community living museum.

1 day ago

If the house has never been restored, after the fire, there are more community guidelines in place that will allow it to getting more experience to keep up. Until the Latta school that has rules and regulations for plants and plants. It is a way of planting something, why not do we have the ability to bird people in a food court is telling people, bird friendly perches, that need food.

1 day ago

We don’t have interactive places and amenities throughout the site that is concentrated in parks. Would be great if they could incorporate native plants that support purpose inside the ornamental gardens. Needs need to see some native more plants to see the succession plantings.

1 day ago

I would like to see more benches. Otherwise, fully support this plan.

1 day ago

I would like the outline of the original house. Latta house to be stones embedded into the ground to be more visual and 3 dimensional. Perhaps some of the other major buildings as well.

1 day ago

Not enough room. Limit too many plantings going in, no play space area, pavement too small

1 day ago

Parking at Jaycee with pedestrian connection to Latta Site

2 months ago

How would you prioritize the suggested Phase 1 Elements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Signage</td>
<td>Rank 1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latta house Outline Improvements</td>
<td>Rank 2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Site Entrance</td>
<td>Rank 3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths</td>
<td>Rank 4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession Planting &amp; Invasive Removal</td>
<td>Rank 5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Benches</td>
<td>Rank 6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How would you prioritize the suggested Future Phase(s) Elements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creative &amp; Interactive Historic Signage</td>
<td>Rank 1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Historic Signage</td>
<td>Rank 2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornamental Gardens</td>
<td>Rank 3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Pavilion</td>
<td>Rank 4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Paths</td>
<td>Rank 5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you have any other comments about the proposed Priority Phasing?

Not to be repetitive, but additional features are on the bottom of the priority list. Enhancing the park with historic signage, beautification of the grounds, and adding park benches would be nice. Losing one of the very few open green spaces we have in our city neighborhood is not incredibly important as Raleigh continues to grow.

19 min ago  
5,469 views  
187 likes

I am NOT interested in succession plantings nearly as much as invasive removal. Anything invasive or dangerous to the public (like poison ivy) needs to be removed. If SHP.

14 min ago  
3,435 views  
72 likes

To be truly meaningful SHP must push the envelope to allow the re-creation of the major components of Latte. Otherwise it is just an old park with no meaning... no lasting legacy... to be lost over time. Work Williamsburg and Chuck's Ridge Village. Latte.

14 min ago  
2,585 views  
84 likes

Invasive and invasive removal are longtime projects, sometimes requiring years. Signs and benches require months to fabricate and can be installed whenever the weather is good and a crew is available. The Latte House outline also falls into this category, since necessary materials would be relatively easy to pressure. The cultural historic significance gives it priority over the park benches. Historic buildings should be handled softly. If at all, they will need to be maintained. Unless they are rented out every weekend, they will become a drain on the park budget.

17 min ago
### Public Input

Please answer how much you agree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Data Table]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Engagement Evaluation Results

Here's the feedback from the community engagement sessions.

- [Data Table]

---

**LATTA UNIVERSITY HISTORIC PARK MASTER PLAN | APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX H: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>NA - I didn’t participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETHNICAL INFORMATION WAS CLEARLY COMMUNICATED THROUGHOUT THE PUBLIC INPUT PROCESS</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHNICAL FEEDBACK WAS GATHERED EFFECTIVELY THROUGHOUT THE PUBLIC INPUT PROCESS</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I FOUND IT EASY &amp; CONVENIENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PUBLIC INPUT PROCESS</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHNICAL PUBLIC INPUT PROCESS WAS ASSessed WELL</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 respondents

I am impressed with the amount of outreach done for this project.
9 hours ago

I strongly suggest results may be skewed by those with concern about how active a space the Latta site may become. Fundamentally that is a real fear. But buying 340k from a historic site includes the likelihood that the community at large may want to enhance the historic site to more fully be a part of the fabric of the larger community.
9 hours ago

MACPHERSON

Please answer how much you agree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>NA - I didn’t participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think information was clearly communicated at events.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think information was clearly communicated on the flyers, postcards, &amp; signs</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think information was clearly communicated on the websites.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 respondents

I feel the events chosen for the event outreach were well suited for this public input process.
14 hours ago

I feel the events, postcards, & signs were well placed for this public input process.
14 hours ago

I feel the websites were designed well for this public input process.
14 hours ago

Meetings at 4PM on Fridays are a poor choice for any meaningful public input. Friday afternoons are a busy time engaging in last minute work or weekend planning.
14 hours ago
If you did not participate in an aspect of the process, please let us know why.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Public Input Meetings</th>
<th>Online Survey</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Outreach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The timing was inconvenient</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The location was inconvenient/too far away</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had prior engagements</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not know they were happening</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not think it was a good use of my time</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Input Meetings</th>
<th>Online Survey</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Outreach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Input Meetings</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 respondents

Late Fridays are a finish-up week and slip into the weekend times.
CITIZEN PLANNING COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I felt comfortable with the level of responsibility asked of me as a member of the CPC.</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understood my role as a CPC member in the Master Plan Process.</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like my input as a CPC member was valued and incorporated into the final Master Plan.</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information was communicated clearly by City Staff throughout the Master Plan Process.</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Staff did a good job facilitating discussion at CPC meetings.</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 respondents

What would you change about the Citizen Planning Committee and/or the Master Plan Process?

I am not used to such a bureaucratic process, which at times I found annoying & frustrating, but I guess that's the way you have to go when you have a group with disparate opinions.

Good process. I felt that everyone had a voice and concerns were addressed respectfully and thoughtfully.

Nothing.

Emma has done an excellent job in the preparation of all materials. Her organizational skills are excellent and very much appreciated.

I think there was survey participation atrophy in the end, and perhaps confusion over how the various surveys differed in goal & information. Not sure how to adapt the process to address this, except perhaps one fewer survey.

City Staff did a good job facilitating discussion at CPC meetings. Response: marked between neutral and agree. Depending on the meeting, I appreciated the activities we did for discussion. I did not love the consensus building process. I felt like I often did not express concerns because I did not want to slow down the process.

I thought Emma did a good job leading the group.

Steep learning curve (for me), but meaningful process.

Staff was outstanding.

Staff did a fantastic job. Very professional!

The selection of the CPC participants and the cross section provided diverse input. Thank you to all City staff that supported the process.

Otherwise all city staff did an excellent job!

I think that ideally there would be a way to gather more feedback at events and to incorporate this information more into the report. I'm not sure how many people at events later took the survey.

Other Comments?

I thought Emma did a good job leading the group.

Steep learning curve (for me), but meaningful process.

Staff was outstanding.

Staff did a fantastic job. Very professional!

The selection of the CPC participants and the cross section provided diverse input. Thank you to all City staff that supported the process.

Otherwise all city staff did an excellent job!

I think that ideally there would be a way to gather more feedback at events and to incorporate this information more into the report. I'm not sure how many people at events later took the survey.