

MINUTES ADOPTED BY THE GREENVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

April 24, 2018

The Greenville Historic Preservation Commission held a meeting on the above date at 6:00 p.m. in Council Chambers of City Hall located at 200 West Fifth Street.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Candace Pearce – Chairwoman *	Justin Edwards *
Myron Caspar *	Chris Nunnally *
Mary Ellen Cole *	Bernard Schulz *
Jeremy Jordan *	Jordan Koonts X
Blake Belch X	Roger Kammerer *

The members present were denoted by an “*” and those absent by an “X”.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Thomas Weitnauer, Chief Planner; Joe Durham, Interim Director of Community Development; and Amy Nunez, Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: Donald Phillips, Assistant City Attorney; and Kelvin Thomas, Communications Technician

MINUTES: Motion made by Ms. Cole, seconded by Mr. Nunnally, to approve the February 27, 2018 minutes as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion made by Mr. Jordan, seconded by Mr. Schulz, to approve the March 27, 2018 minutes as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

Attorney Phillips stated pursuant to North Carolina General Statute 168-388 and Section 4-H of the Historic Preservation Commission Rules of Procedure:

Conflict of Interest. No member of the Historic Preservation Commission shall participate in either the discussion or vote on any certificate of appropriateness in any manner that would violate the affected persons’ constitutional right to a fair and impartial decision maker. Prohibited conflicts include but are not limited to a member having a fixed opinion prior to hearing the matter and not willing to consider changing his or her mind; undisclosed ex parte communications with the person before the Commission, any witnesses, staff or other Commission members; a close familial, business or other associational relationship with the affected person; or a financial interest in the outcome of the matter before the board. On any other matter before the Commission where such decision by the Commission shall be in an advisory capacity only, no member shall participate in the discussion or vote on such advisory matters where the outcome on the matter being considered is reasonable likely to have a direct, substantial, and readily identifiable financial impact on the member. Decisions on either

a request for recusal by a member or objections by a person appearing before the board shall be decided by a simple majority vote. A member so disqualified will not be counted or included in the count to determine the appropriate voting majority for the issue before the Commission and will not negate a quorum of the Commission.

If a Commission member has had an ex parte communication that also needs to be disclosed at this time.

As a reminder, please keep in mind as members of the Commission, conversations among yourselves during the discussion periods of this meeting and your Committee meetings are not ex parte communications.

Secretary swore in staff and all those speaking for or against as necessary.

NEW BUSINESS

Minor Works COA

COA #2018-05 117 W. 5th Street – Humber House/State of North Carolina. Remove three dead/diseased trees. The request came with a letter from a certified arborist. – Approved

Major Works COAs

COA 18-0006: 805 Evans Street – Jones Lee House, Local Landmark
Applicant: Jim Ward, Taft-Ward Assemblage, LLC - owners
Project: Demolition of Structure

Mr. Weitnauer presented the staff report. On January 26, 2016, COA #16-01, relocation of the house to another site was approved by the Commission with the condition that staff be consulted and apprised throughout the process, most importantly, when determining siting and setback of the house at the new location. The house has not been moved so the owner has applied for a new COA to demolish the house. The property is a cottage style home by the architect George F. Barber. The property has retained most of its architectural features over the years.

Design Guidelines, Chapter 5, Demolition or Relocation of Buildings, Demolition:

1. Work with the Historic Preservation Commission to seek alternatives to demolition. Alternatives may include:
 - Restoration through state and federal tax incentives if individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places, or a contributing property in a National Register District.
 - Sale to an entity that is willing to restore it.
 - Relocation.

2. If alternatives have been exhausted, follow these guidelines for demolition:
 - Make a permanent record of a significant structure before demolition. The record shall consist of digital photographs and other documents, such as drawings, that describe the architectural character and the special features of the building. The commission determines on a case-by-case basis the precise documentation of a specific building that is required and the person who is responsible for producing that documentation. The documentation must be submitted or reviewed by the Commission before the demolition. The record is retained by the City of Greenville.
 - Work with the Commission before to identify salvageable materials and potential buyers or recipients of salvaged materials. The removal of all salvageable building materials before demolition is encouraged, and may be required depending on the significance of the building.
 - Clear the structure quickly and thoroughly.
 - Submit a site plan illustrating proposed landscaping and any other site development to be complete after demolition.

Additionally, Commissioners must follow Chapter 7, Section 9-7-17 (A) of the City's zoning ordinance, which states: *An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the relocation, **demolition**, or destruction of a designated landmark or a building, structure or site within a designated district **may not be denied**. However, the effective date of such certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of approval.*

Recommendations:

Staff: Given that the HPC is not able to deny the application, staff recommends that the HPC approve the application with a full 365 day delay and require the applicant to either:

1. Require that all documentation and plans listed in Guidelines #1 and 2 be provided to the City and require the applicant to fully document the structure and create a plan for salvaging all repurposable features and materials; or
2. Install a protective 6 foot high chain link fence around the perimeter of the structure to reduce the chance for unintentional fire damage as staff has witnessed items of vagrant(s) residing on the front porch.

Design Review Committee: The Committee met on 4/16/18 and agreed to recommend that the Commission approve the staff recommendation.

Chairwoman Pearce opened the public hearing.

Mr. Jim Ward spoke in favor of the application. For the past three years they have done everything they can to preserve and relocate this property. Before they purchased the property, there was a group that was committed to relocate the property. Unfortunately the group dissolved. Logistically the property is very risky and difficult to move and could cost \$75,000.00 or more. They need to move forward. Their genuine desire is to relocate the property but cannot continue to wait. He asked to lessen the 365 delay to 180 days.

Mr. Schulz asked if there was plans to develop the property.

Mr. Ward stated that they would like to enhance the area with amenities such as retail and parking. This would help out their retail clients while the culvert repair is going on for the next few years. Ultimately they will redevelop the property.

Chairwoman Pearce asked if his goal was still to move it.

Mr. Ward stated yes. He is open to suggestions. It will cost about \$10,000.00 to demolish the property and is willing to use that money for incentive for movers.

Chairwoman Pearce stated that there is a group that has discussed this situation with City staff and are trying to see if the house could be moved next door to the Fleming House (Chamber of Commerce). They are trying to secure tax credits to offset the cost. This property has a National Registry designation.

Mr. Ward stated that the staff recommendation of a fence to secure the property would not look nice. They are in constant vigilance of the property.

Mr. Caspar asked if redevelopment could occur around this property staying in place.

Mr. Ward stated the area would be best served to square up the area for future development.

Chairwoman Pearce stated that the property needs to be protected from damage and vandalism, hence the need for the fence.

Mr. Ward stated the fence will create an impediment and an additional cost, but he will comply.

Mr. Nunnally stated the fence would have a negative effect of the surrounding area. Landscaping and attention to the property becomes a deterrent to vagrants. If it looks good, people behave better around it. The cost of the fence is just another cost to the applicant.

Ms. Cole agreed with Mr. Nunnally and suggested protected lighting.

Mr. Jordan stated that one of the recent pictures from the staff presentation shows no meter. It appears that the electricity is off.

Mr. Nunnally suggested lights instead of fencing.

Mr. Ward agreed and will continue their quality maintenance of the grounds.

No one spoke in opposition.

Attorney Phillips stated that the Commission needs to summarize the evidence, have discussion and then propose the findings of facts.

Chairwoman Pearce closed the public hearing and opened board discussion.

Mr. Jordan stated he would like to see the lights on, in lieu of the fence, so the property doesn't appear vacant.

Mr. Kammerer agreed with Mr. Jordan.

The Finding of Facts for application #2018-0006 for 805 Evans Street. The COA was completed and submitted on March 9, 2018. The COA application is for demolition. A notice of hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on 4-10-18 and 4-16-18. A notice was mailed out to surrounding property owners on 4-9-18. This hearing was held on 4-24-18. Thomas Weitnauer presented for the City and Jim Ward presented as the applicant. For this application, Design Guidelines 1-2 of Chapter 5, Demolition or Relocation of Buildings, are applicable.

Mr. Kammerer made a motion to adopt the Findings of Facts as presented, Mr. Nunnally seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Chairwoman Pearce stated she wants the 365 day delay, lights and a fence.

Mr. Caspar stated he wants the 365 day delay.

Mr. Kammerer stated he wants the 365 day delay and would like to see the lights on.

Ms. Cole stated she would like to see the lights on.

The Commission agreed as a whole to accept the 365 day delay and have lighting in lieu of the fence.

Mr. Jordan made a motion to approve the application with the staff recommendation but to replace the fencing with adequate lighting immediately. Mr. Schulz seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

COA 18-0007: 408 S. Rotary Avenue – College View Historic District, Contributing Structure

Applicant: Israel Mueller and Justin Edwards, Owners

Project: Remove a rear wooden deck and replace with brick steps; install black aluminum fence or a 4 foot tall wooden picket fence; and install an in-ground swimming pool.

Mr. Justin Edwards requested to be recused since he is the applicant of this item.

Motion by Mr. Schulz, seconded by Mr. Nunnally, to recuse Mr. Edwards. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Weitnauer presented the staff report. The architectural style of the property is Dutch/Colonial/Colonial Revival. He delineated the property with pictures. The wooden deck is not original to the house and removal will not adversely affect the contributing structure.

Design Guidelines

Chapter 1, Minor Works: Staff considers the proposed removal of the wood deck to be a minor work project, not requiring HPC review. Since the applicants' other projects were in HPC's review, staff included it in this package.

The list of minor works includes the following:

19. Removal of accessory structures which are not architectural or historically significant according to the National Register nomination form.

Chapter 4, Fences and Walls:

7. If a new fence or wall is to be constructed, the design must be based on accurate documentation of a historic fence or wall, or must be a new design compatible with the historic character of the building and the district.

12. Rear yard fences shall not exceed six (6) feet in height and may not extend forward of the rear wall of the structure.

Chapter 4, Landscaping:

10. Swimming pools must be located only in the rear yard and completely screened from public view. On corner lots, pools shall be located in the portion of the rear yard furthest from the street. The fencing for the purpose of the pool security shall be in compliance with these design standards.

Recommendations:

Staff: Approval as the proposed projects are in compliance with Design Guidelines, Chapter 4, Fences and Walls, Guidelines #7-17; Chapter 4, Landscaping, Guideline #10; and removal of the wooden deck will not adversely affect the contributing structure.

Design Review Committee: The Committee met on 4/16/18 and agreed to recommend that the Commission approve the staff recommendation.

Chairwoman Pearce opened the public hearing.

No one spoke for or against the request.

Chairwoman Pearce closed the public hearing and opened board discussion.

The Finding of Facts for application #2018-0007 for 408 S. Rotary Avenue. The COA was completed and submitted on March 28, 2018. The COA application is for removal of rear wooden deck and replace with brick steps; install black aluminum fence or a 4 foot wooden picket fence; and install an in-ground swimming pool. A notice of hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on 4-10-18 and 4-16-18. A notice was mailed out to surrounding property owners on 4-9-18. This hearing was held on 4-24-18. Thomas Weitnauer presented for the City and the applicant did not speak. For this application, Design Guidelines 7 and 12 of Chapter 4, Fences and Walls, pages 88 and 89; and Guideline 10 of Chapter 4, Landscaping, pages 94 and 95, are applicable.

Mr. Jordan made a motion to adopt the Findings of Facts as presented, Ms. Cole seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Nunnally made a motion to accept that the application is in congruent with applicable guidelines. Mr. Jordan seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Kammerer made a motion to approve the application with the staff recommendation. Mr. Nunnally seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Edwards returned to the Commission.

COA 18-0008: 605 E. 5th Street – College View Historic District, Contributing Structure
Applicant: Albrecht McLawhorn, MHA Works. William Bagnell/ECU, owner
Project: Add an accessible ramp at the rear of the structure

Mr. Weitnauer presented the staff report. The property is also known as the Dail House and the former Chancellor's residence. He delineated the property with pictures. He showed a copy of the site plan with the ramp detail and elevation and within the location of the house.

Design Guidelines

Chapter 2, Life Safety and Accessibility:

1. Review proposed new uses for existing historic buildings to determine if related building code and accessibility requirements are feasible without compromising the historic character of the building and site.
2. Health and safety code and accessibility requirements must be met in ways that do not diminish the historic character features, materials, and details of the building.
5. When introducing reversible features to assist people with disabilities, diminishment of the original design of the porch or the entrance and damage of historic materials or features must be avoided to every extent possible.
6. If possible, accessibility requirements should be complied with through portable or temporary ramp or lifts, rather than permanent ramps.

Recommendations:

Staff: Approval as the proposed projects are in compliance with Design Guidelines, Chapter 2, Life Safety and Accessibility, Guidelines 1, 2, 5, and 6.

Design Review Committee: The Committee met on 4/16/18 and agreed to recommend that the Commission approve the staff recommendation.

Chairwoman Pearce opened the public hearing.

Mr. Schulz asked if this was an additional ramp.

Mr. McLawhorn stated that there is an existing ramp. This new ramp will be at the rear of the house where the parking is located for easier access. The existing ramp will not be removed.

No one spoke against the request.

Chairwoman Pearce closed the public hearing and opened board discussion.

The Finding of Facts for application #2018-0008 for 605 E. 5th Street. The COA was completed and submitted on March 16, 2018. The COA application is for an addition of an accessible ramp at the rear of the property. A notice of hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on 4-10-18 and 4-16-18. A notice was mailed out to surrounding property owners on 4-9-18. This hearing was held on 4-24-18. Thomas Weitnauer presented for the City and Albrecht McLawhorn presented as the applicant For this application, Design Guidelines 1, 2, 5, and 6 of Chapter 2, Life Safety and Accessibility, are applicable.

Mr. Jordan made a motion to adopt the Findings of Facts as presented, Ms. Cole seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Jordan made a motion to accept that the application is in congruent with applicable guidelines. Mr. Kammerer seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Jordan made a motion to approve the application with the staff recommendation. Mr. Edwards seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

COA 18-0009: 601 E. 5th Street – College View Historic District, Contributing Structure
Applicant: Albrecht McLawhorn, MHA Works. William Bagnell/ECU, owner
Project: Replace existing windows; add an accessible ramp at the rear of the structure; modify a portion of a roofline at the rear of the structure with support columns; and add a masonry wall adjacent to the proposed accessible ramp.

Mr. Weitnauer presented the staff report. The property is also known as the Proctor-Yongue House. He delineated the property with pictures.

Design Guidelines

Project 1. Replace the existing windows
Chapter 2, Windows and Doors:

5. If replacement of a piece of a window or door element is necessary, only the deteriorated portion should be replaced while all else must be retained. The replacement section must match the original in size, scale, proportion, profile, materials, and detail.
6. If replacement of an entire door or window is required because of total loss or irreparable deterioration as determined by a preservation professional, the replacement must match the original exactly in profile, dimensions, and finish. Replacement of windows and doors with stock items that do not fill the original openings or duplicate the unit in size, material, and design is not permitted. Vinyl replacement windows are not permitted and snap-in muntins are not appropriate replacements for true divided light window panes.

Chairwoman Pearce opened the public hearing.

Mr. Albrecht McLawhorn, of MHAworks, spoke in favor of the request. The window replacement is to help stabilize the house. All of the vinyl, which is not original, is being removed. This will result in more keeping of the historic preservation goals. The current windows have hazardous material.

Mr. Nunnally asked if there was a preservation professional to testify that the replacement of the existing windows are necessary.

Mr. McLawhorn stated that the company he is affiliated with, MHAworks, provided the documentation for restoration due to the nature of their work. They are in contact directly

with Humber House (Historic Preservation of NC office) to what constitutes as the level of deterioration. The property was assessed with Mr. Reed Thomas (Humber House) together. All documentation was sent to SHPO to make the same assessment. The assessment has not been received yet.

Mr. Nunnally asked if the proposed replacement windows are truly divided light window panes.

Mr. McLawhorn stated yes. For state projects, proprietary products names cannot be listed. The replacement windows will be of high quality.

Mr. Nunnally stated he has a concern with congruency of the guidelines with Mr. McLawhorn giving the expert testimony that the windows are a total loss and being the applicant.

Mr. McLawhorn stated the dollar amount of restoring the windows far exceeds the value. Asbestos abatement would be necessary to restore the windows. Due to the hazardous materials, each window pane would have to be individual cut out. Replacing would allow the entire window which would include damaged sashes.

Mr. Schulz asked what he was waiting for from SHPO.

Mr. Bagnell stated they submitted their documentation and are waiting on a response.

Mr. McLawhorn stated since the property is on the National Registry, SHPO needs to render a response. They believe it will be similar to his findings that the windows are deteriorated.

Mr. Kammerer stated the replacement windows is a wood product, mostly made of wood.

Chairwoman Pearce stated they will not be able to start work until they hear from SHPO. She stated the Design Review Committee acknowledged they would follow the response from SHPO and not hold up the applicant.

Mr. Nunnally stated they need to follow the Design Guidelines which states windows and doors must be retained. Before they can make a finding, he suggests professional testimony from someone other than the applicant or a response from SHPO that the windows are beyond repair. Without that, he doesn't feel that he can vote that the proposed is congruent.

Mr. Bagnell stated that renovating this property was a compromise ECU made with the City. They have a significant investment in this property. Doing these upgrades is to be good partners.

Mr. McLawhorn suggested only approving the removal and preservation of the windows until such time both parties can agree. In order to stabilize the structure, the windows are the most critical part.

Mr. Schulz asked if staff could follow up with SHPO and suggested the Commission could approve the request pending the SHPO response.

Attorney Phillips stated that are four projects under this one COA. All conditions shall be stated after the public hearing.

Mr. Schulz stated that the staff recommendation is to approve the windows pending the SHPO approval.

Attorney Phillips stated that another alternative is to table the full request until the SHPO response is received.

Chairwoman Pearce stated that ECU stated the funds used for this project needs to be used by June 30, 2018 or else they lose it. To defer their guidelines to SHPO is not a bad thing. The ultimate goal of the HPC and staff is to approve pending the SHPO response as the final word.

Mr. Thomas Weitnauer continued the staff presentation.

Project 2. Accessible ramp

Chapter 2, Life Safety and Accessibility:

3. Review proposed new uses for existing historic buildings to determine if related building code and accessibility requirements are feasible without compromising the historic character of the building and site.
4. Health and safety code and accessibility requirements must be met in ways that do not diminish the historic character features, materials, and details of the building.
7. When introducing reversible features to assist people with disabilities, diminishment of the original design of the porch or the entrance and damage of historic materials or features must be avoided to every extent possible.
8. If possible, accessibility requirements should be complied with through portable or temporary ramp or lifts, rather than permanent ramps.

Project 3. Modify a Portion of a Roofline at the Rear of the Structure with Support Columns

Regarding the Roof: Design Guidelines, Chapter 2, Roofs:

8. New roof features, such as skylights and dormers must be installed on a discrete slope of the roof hidden from the public in a manner that avoids loss or damage to historic features and minimizes the impact on the historic character of the property.

Regarding the Columns: Design Guidelines, Chapter 2, Additions:

5. Additions must be designed so that they are compatible with the historic building in mass, materials, color, and proportion and spacing of windows and doors. Either reference design motifs from the historic building, or introduce a contemporary design that is compatible with the historic building.

Project 4. Add a Masonry Wall Adjacent to the Proposed Accessible Ramp

Chapter 4, Fences and Walls:

7. If a new fence or wall is to be constructed, the design must be based on accurate documentation of a historic fence or wall, or must be a new design compatible with the historic character of the building or district.
9. Generally, new fences or walls should be constructed to follow property lines and not to abut existing structures.
17. Fences or walls may not be used to screen front yards. Privacy fences must be limited to side and rear yards. If possible use wooden privacy fences to screen parking areas, mechanical equipment, or other intrusive site features on residential properties. Relate privacy fences and walls for commercial buildings to the materials to the building or adjacent fences and walls.

Mr. Weitnauer showed roofline and support column, masonry wall, and ramp drawings and elevations.

Recommendations:

Staff:

- 1. Replace the Existing Windows:** Approve the Certificate of Appropriateness as submitted as the proposed design is in compliance with the intent, relative to the specific physical deteriorated and hazardous conditions of the existing windows, of the City of Greenville's Design Guidelines, Chapter 2, Windows and Doors: Guidelines #1-6, pending approval by the SHPO.
- 2. Accessible Ramp.** Approve the Certificate of Appropriateness as submitted as the proposed design is in compliance with the City of Greenville's Design Guidelines, Chapter 2, Life Safety and Accessibility: Guidelines #1, 2, 5 and 6.
- 3. Modify a Portion of a Roofline at the Rear of the Structure with Support Column.** Approve the Certificate of Appropriateness as submitted as the proposed design is in compliance with the City of Greenville's Design Guidelines: Chapter 2, Roofs, Guidelines #1, 2, 5 and 8; and Additions, Guidelines, 1-10.
- 4. Add a Masonry Wall Adjacent to the Proposed Accessible Ramp.** Approve the Certificate of Appropriateness as submitted as the proposed design is in compliance with the City of Greenville's Design Guidelines, Chapter 4, Fences and Walls, Guidelines #7, 9, and 17.

Design Review Committee: The Committee met on 4/16/18 and agreed to recommend that the Commission approve the staff recommendation for the accessible ramp; modification to the roofline with columns; and addition of masonry wall adjacent to the accessible ramp.

Regarding the project to replace the existing windows, the Design Review Committee agreed to recommend that the Commission approve the replacement windows with the condition that the proposed composite products are 80% wood, pending prior approval by the SHPO and viewing a window sample.

No one spoke against the request.

Chairwoman Pearce closed the public hearing and opened board discussion.

The Finding of Facts for application #2018-0009 for 601 E. 5th Street. The COA was completed and submitted on April 2, 2018. The COA application is for replacement of existing windows; add an accessible ramp at the rear of the structure; modify a portion of the roofline at the rear of the structure with support columns; and add a masonry wall adjacent to the proposed accessible ramp. A notice of hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on 4-10-18 and 4-16-18. A notice was mailed out to surrounding property owners on 4-9-18. This hearing was held on 4-24-18. Thomas Weitnauer presented for the City and Albrecht McLawhorn presented as the applicant. For this application, Design Guidelines 5 and 6 of Chapter 2, Windows and Doors, pages 34-36; Guidelines 1, 2, 5, and 6 of Chapter 2, Life Safety and Accessibility, pages 71-72; Guideline 8 of Chapter 2 Roofs, pages 20-21; Guideline 5 of Chapter 2 Additions, pages 77-78; and Guidelines 7, 9, and 17 of Chapter 4 Fences and Walls are applicable.

Mr. Jordan made a motion to adopt the Findings of Facts as presented, Mr. Kammerer seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Jordan made a motion to accept that the application is in congruent with applicable guidelines and Mr. Edwards seconded the motion. Those in favor: Jordan, Edwards, Kammerer, Caspar, Schulz, Pearce, and Cole. Those against: Nunnally. Motion carried.

Mr. Nunnally explained his vote. He believes that the replacement of the existing windows is premature determination.

Mr. Jordan made a motion to approve the application with the staff recommendation and the condition replacement of windows is approved only if/when SHPO approves it. Mr. Schulz seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Public Comment Period

Mr. Bill Bagnell spoke. He provided an update of the four houses (behind 601/605 E. 5th St) on tract for demolition on/or after May 7, 2018. Asbestos removal in the interior needs to be done prior to demolition. It will not be noise disturbing or intrusive. MHAworks will assemble the documents for the properties and send that to SHPO. At this time he is not prepared to share information regarding the future of these properties.

Committee Reports

Design Review. Chairwoman Pearce stated they met to review tonight's COAs.

Publicity. Chairwoman Pearce stated they met and discussed the "This Place Matters" campaign that is working very well. Mr. Israel Mueller has graciously facilitated the Facebook page presenting pictures and follow up comments as well as history and old photos. Flyers are being distributed to encourage everyone to take pictures. Mr. Koonts is coordinating with Uptown Greenville. Mr. Edwards is coordinating the reception for May 22, 2018 in the City Hall Gallery. Mr. Weitnauer is assisting in mailing out the invitations for the reception. The City Public Information Officer will be marketing in May. So far that office has produced flyers and assisted with photos. She extended an invitation to everyone to help in their preservation efforts and reception.

Selection. Chairwoman Pearce stated they met. They discussed and agreed to postpone the Preservation Awards until May 2019 due to insufficient nominations.

Announcements/Other

Chairwoman Pearce encouraged everyone to participate in the "This Place Matters Campaign".

With no further discussion, Mr. Caspar made a motion to adjourn, Mr. Nunnally seconded, and it passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 8:03 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Thomas Weitnauer, Chief Planner
Interim Historic Preservation Planner