

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 Utsumi (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	HRMAB – Historic Resources and Museum Advisory Board
PDC – Planning, Development and Communications	UPHOA – University Park HOA
HRM – Historic Resources and Museums	NCSUAD – NC State Archaeology Department
LHF – Latta House Foundation	RHDC – Raleigh Historic Development Commission
FOV – Friends of Oberlin Village	RC – Raleigh Citizen
PRGAB – Parks, Recreation and Greenway Advisory Board	

I. CPC Meeting #1 Minutes

a. Full consensus vote

II. Draft CPC Charter

a. Full consensus vote

III. Vision Statement Discussion

- a. CPC Member proposed a vote to change goals and vision statement, and asked to clarify if these could be changed in the future. With consensus of the CPC, yes, changes are allowed
- b. CPC Member raised concern about the site having art, due to concern over the quality and selection of art & artist. Numerous CPC Members involved in the Raleigh Arts Commission and/or Public Art & Design Board clarified the process, and assured that there was a very deliberate oversight of the selection process.
- c. Discussion commenced on how to address “Raleigh’s past” and the “site’s unique history” in relation to race. A CPC Member proposed that the “Goals” or “Vision Statement” should specifically call out the history of black and white people in Raleigh, rather than a non-specific reference to diversity. The CPC member continued, stating that both black and white perspectives should be represented, and that the complexity & complication of black-white

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

ii. Designs Feedback

- 1) Don’t put anything within the outline of the building
- 2) Public art could be the footprint
- 3) Visitor Center
- 4) Location is bad
- 5) Should have bathrooms
- 6) Need not be totally enclosed
- 7) Design C has best trails
- 8) Call it an information trail
- 9) Community Garden is low on list of importance
- 10) Put Benches & Tables under trees
- 11) Add electricity to site
- 12) Designated outdoor event space

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:
- 2) Path around perimeter encourages visitors to use entire site. Path should meander to guide you and tell the story.
- 3) Signs could be placed in "learning zones"
- 4) Not enough historic info
- 5) Lots of tiny gathering spaces but no LARGE space
- 6) Design B:
- 7) Large focal gathering space is good, so is flexibility of pavilion use
- 8) Limited path / site accessibility
- 9) Doubts about community garden
- 10) Lack of ornamental garden(s)
- 11) Visitors should be led to historic interpretation, not expected to go hunt it out
- 12) Design C:
- 13) Good combo of large & small gathering space
- 14) The path cutoff through the lawn provides good option
- 15) Love for the visitor center
- 16) Paths are too condensed, and should be pushed to the perimeter of the site

i. Table 4 (Emma):

1. Designs Feedback

Community Planning Committee (CPC) Meeting

5.24.19

- 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!

5:45pm **Meeting Adjourned**