

MINUTES ADOPTED BY THE GREENVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

July 25, 2017

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	Alice Arnold
Kerry Carlin	Myron Caspar
Mary Ellen Cole	William Gee
Chris Nunnally	

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Collette Kinane, Planner II; Renee L. Hiralal, Acting Secretary

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

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA

Mr. Gee made a motion to approve the agenda as presented, seconded by Mr. Carlin, and the motion passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

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.

Chairwoman Pearce stated that she did meet with one of the applicants for a grant to advise the method they use only. This does not affect anything else.

Minor Works COAs

2017-0013: 1003 E. Third Street; mechanical change-out - Approved

Major Works COAs

COA 17-0014: 803 E. Fifth Street

Applicant: Richard King, Dunn & Dalton Architects

Project: Installation of Backflow Device

Ms. Kinane presented the staff report. The property is a local landmark. It is in a college view local historic district. Also, it is a contributing property in the College View National Register Historic District. The Dr. L.C. Skinner House, built in 1927, is a Colonial Revival style house. This application pertains to the front yard of the property and will not affect the structures on the property. Any historic or significant landscaping of the property is not mentioned in the Local Landmark report. The Skinner family (Dr. Skinner and his wife) resided on this property until their deaths. Their children sold the property to the Gamma Beta Chapter of Sigma Sigma Sigma in 1961. Few modifications have been made to the exterior of this property. At the time of its Local landmark designation, the house was considered to

“represent one of the more architecturally ambitious residences in this neighborhood of predominantly bungalow type homes. It is one of the finest examples of Colonial Revival architecture in the city and remains important in the study of College View neighborhood and in the study of early twentieth century neighborhood development in Greenville.”
(Local landmark Report, 7-8)

This application is for the installation of a back flow prevention device in the front yard of the property. A backflow prevention device is used to protect potable water supplies from contamination or pollution. This type of device is most commonly installed when a fire sprinkler system is connected to a water main to prevent pressurized water from flowing from the fire suppression system into the public water supply. To ensure the safety of the residents of the property, a sprinkler system has been recently sensitively installed on the interior. This property is the last remaining sorority or fraternity located within the historic district to have a sprinkler system installed.

For this application, Design Guidelines 2 of Chapter 2 Life Safety and Accessibility (page 71); 1, 2, 3, and 14 of Chapter 4 Fences and Walls (page 87); 1, 2, 6, 7 of Chapter 4 Landscaping (page 94); 2, 3, 4, 5 of Chapter 4 Archaeology (page 98) are applicable.

Staff recommendation:

The installation of the backflow prevention device is a required element of a sprinkler system. It is necessary to ensure the safety of the residents of the district and also benefits the security of the property.

The proposed installation site of the device is adjacent to the sidewalk along the brick garden wall that lines Fifth Street near the intersection with Biltmore Street. The device will be located directly perpendicular to the wall and will be faced with brick to visually blend with the wall. The box will be further screened with landscaping that complement the existing bed. Because of the chosen location along the wall, a small 5' section of the wall will be disturbed and rebuilt as a result of the hot box construction and installation. If possible, Staff recommends rebuilding the wall section with the existing brick. As the terrain within the historic district will be disturbed for the construction of the box and the installation of the pipe, care should be taken to note any potential for archaeological finds.

Design Review Recommendation:

The Design Review Committee met on July 13th, 2017 to discuss this application. The committee recommends approval of this COA as submitted.

Ms. Kinane stated that Fire Marshall Bryant Beddard did attend the 7/13/17 Design Review Committee meeting to speak about the citing of the device.

Chairwoman Pearce opened the public hearing.

Mr. Richard King, with Dunn and Dalton Architect, spoke in favor of the request. He stated that GUC requires that the box location be above ground. He provided a picture of the hot box location and a technical drawing. The landscaping will be extended and the box will be screened with low plantings. The location chosen is within 100 feet of a fire hydrant. It will be far enough from the corner of the street to keep site lines for vehicles coming in and out of the intersection. The top of the wall will be 12" above the side walk. They are staying away from the mature trees at the corner in order to keep away from the roots. Also, the box will be above ground to comply with Design Guidelines. The fire department sign will be visible.

No one spoke in opposition.

Chairwoman Pearce closed the public hearing and opened for board discussion.

Chairwoman Pearce read the Finding of Facts for application #2017-0014 for 803 E. Fifth Street, parcel number 08146. The COA was completed and submitted on June 30, 2017. The COA application is for the installation of a backflow preventer device. A notice of hearing was published in the Daily Reflector on 7-17-2017 and 07-24-2017. A notice was mailed out to

surrounding property owners on 07-14-2017. This hearing was held on 07-25-2017. Collette Kinane presented for the City and Richard King presented for the applicant. For this application, Design Guidelines 2 of Chapter 2 Life Safety and Accessibility (page 71); 1, 2, 3, and 14 of Chapter 4 Fences and Walls (page 87); 1, 2, 6, 7 of Chapter 4 Landscaping (page 94); 2, 3, 4, 5 of Chapter 4 Archaeology (page 98) are applicable. This project is found to be congruent with the applicable guidelines.

Ms. Cole made a motion to adopt the Findings of Fact, Ms. Arnold seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Cole made a motion to approve the application based on the Design Review Committee recommendations, Ms. Arnold seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Façade Improvement Grants

2017-0015: 212 E. 5th Street (Shave on Fifth & Jenni K Jewelry)

Applicant Claire Edwards

Project: Exterior Renovations and Restoration of Transom Windows

Ms. Kinane presented the application. Ms. Claire Edwards requests funding for the removal of an awning, repair work to the transom windows, storefront window replacement, signage, and lighting. The Design Review Committee enthusiastically supports the awning removal and restoration of the transom windows that are currently covered, which would restore the exterior of the building to its original appearance. The committee chose to recommend funding only for the parts of the application that relate to the transom window restoration (transom glass, installation, and removal of the awning) at a recommended amount of **\$1,305.50**. The commission did not give funding for store front glass, labor, maintenance items, or any repairs related to maintenance. Demo, hardware, signage, electrical items, awning, and the barber pole were not considered.

For this application, four Design Guidelines were evaluated. They are as follows: historical significance, architectural impact, economic impact, and if other funding available or past awards are applicable.

Ms. Cole asked for clarification to determine how they came to \$1,305.50.

Ms. Kinane stated that reimbursement is 50% of the project, \$1.00 for every \$2.00 spent. When looking at the estimates, it needs to be taken into consideration the items that are not considered for funding. The labor of the transom is also included. They used the lowest possible figure on the glass.

Ms. Cole asked if the façade application was for the ground floor only and nothing else.

Ms. Kinane stated yes.

Mr. Nunnally asked if there is a condition for the glass to conform to the historical original.

Ms. Kinane stated that Ms. Edwards did bring a sample to the Design Review Committee meeting and that a vendor has a similar item and it appears to conform. Ms. Kinane stated that on 7/13/17 the Design Review Committee met with Claire Edwards and asked her for supplemental material including photos. She was also asked to put her bid on company letter head to clear things up.

Ms. Arnold made a motion to recommend approval of the application up to but not exceeding the Design Review Committee recommendations, Ms. Cole seconded and it passed unanimously.

The Commission asked Attorney Phillips to clarify if recommendations of the Design Review Committee are motions and if motions are made before or after Commission discussion.

Attorney Phillips read from the Façade Improvement Grant Information and Guidelines, under Process for Receiving a Grant: *4) Applications will be reviewed by staff of the Community Development Department to ensure completeness. The Design Review Committee of the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) will review all FIG applications and make recommendations to the HPC. The entire HPC will make recommendations for the applications. Those applications will be forwarded to the City Manager's Office for final approval or denial. The City Manager reserves the right to determine the number of applications per structure.*

Chairwoman Pearce asked for clarification regarding committee meetings being a work session and they provide suggestions only.

Attorney Phillips stated that committees provide recommendations. After presentation of an item, a discussion period follows and then a motion. If needed, further discussion after a motion is acceptable.

Mr. Gee stated that an approval motion should be to approve the recommendation and not the application since final approval on the application is done by the City Manager's Office. He asked if a denial motion of the recommendation is an option.

Attorney Phillips stated yes and that recommendations can be modified. A new motion would be made with the new modified recommendation.

Mr. Caspar stated his concern was regarding Robert's Rules of Order that mentions there is discussion after a motion is made.

2017-0016 through 2017-0021: 401 Evans Street (former Frank Wilson Store)

Applicants: Tony Khoury (2nd floor) and Morris Moye, Jr. (1st floor)

Project: Extensive Exterior Restoration

Ms. Kinane presented the applications. The applicants are divided by façade and tenant as per the FIG Guidelines (thus the 6 different applications). The FIG Guidelines reads:

*2) Owners and tenants may request incentive grants separately however any tenant must have the owner's permission attached to the application, and any one application per façade is eligible for approval (**sub-divided buildings will be reviewed according to building code specifications**).*

3) If a building has multiple independent units, each unit, with a separate entrance which has a wall that qualifies as an exterior façade, may make separate application on the basis of one application per façade.

10) A building or qualified unit may receive no more than 2 grant awards the same façade with in 2 consecutive fiscal years (no stipulation that the applicants come at different times).

The following description is a summary of all work proposed to be completed. The historic name of the building is Frank Wilson Store. Frank Wilson was a clothier. The building was built in 1900. The applicants request funding for a substantial façade restoration that includes: exterior cleaning and painting, reinstallation of compatible windows, reinstallation of sunburst pediments, and installation of compatible door on north façade. The applicants presented a design plan that is closely supported by photographic evidence of the building's historic appearance.

The following is individual descriptions for work being done per application:

FIG 2017-0016 (west façade, first floor):

1. Clean brick according to guidelines
2. Paint above awning
3. Replace canopy/awning fabric
4. Remove exterior green carpet and restore tile

FIG 2017-0017 (north façade, first floor):

1. Chemically strip paint off brick
2. Repoint brick as appropriate
3. Seal brick to avoid water penetration
4. Paint brick
5. Remove false brick plaster
6. Restore original entry, window, and transom

FIG 2017-0018 (west façade, second floor):

1. Clean brick according to guidelines
2. Restore original windows
3. Add sunburst pediments to match original in photo
4. Replace terracotta parapet caps along perimeter of building

FIG 2017-0019 (north façade, second floor):

1. Chemically strip off brick
2. Repoint brick as appropriate
3. Seal brick to avoid water penetration
4. Paint brick
5. Restore original windows
6. Replace terracotta parapet caps along perimeter

FIG 2017-0020 (east façade, second floor):

1. Chemically strip off brick
2. Repoint brick as appropriate
3. Seal brick to avoid water penetration
4. Paint brick
5. Restore original windows
6. Restore original gutter system

FIG 2017- 0021 (south façade, second floor):

1. Chemically strip paint of brick
2. Repoint brick as appropriate
3. Seal brick to avoid water penetration
4. Repaint brick
5. Replace terracotta parapet caps

Ms. Kinane stated that the applicant has been in touch with the State Preservation office. They spoke about ways to sensitively strip off paint from the brick and how to proceed evaluating the condition of the brick, repair, and sealing. Ms. Kinane stated Mr. Khoury was present.

Ms. Arnold asked if the terracotta caps were part of the roof structure.

Mr. Tony Khoury said it is a wall about 18 inches thick. The caps were there before and the goal is to restore the property back to the original condition. It will be his residence.

Mr. Nunnally asked about re-pointing the brick and if there was a conversation with the Preservation Office about the type of mortar that should be used with a softer older brick.

Mr. Khoury stated there are concerns but they won't really know until they strip the paint back. He wants to keep the cost down. They took the plaster off the brick internally and the mortar joints looks fairly good.

Mr. Nunnally wanted to clarify his concern with the type of materials for the mortar on the soft brick so it won't crack after restoration.

Mr. Khoury stated they have used various resources at their disposal. He wants as much historic related items as possible.

Ms. Arnold commended Mr. Khoury for all his foresight. It is a very ambitious project and a lot of work and research has gone into this project.

Mr. Khoury stated that he is part of downtown Greenville business area. He and his wife had a dream to live down town and they are very excited.

Ms. Kinane stated that for all these applications, Design Guidelines evaluated were as follows: historical significance, architectural impact, economic impact, and if other funding available or past awards are applicable. The property received a façade grant of \$2500.00 for an awning in December 2001 and \$2500.00 for expenses related to an awning in June 2001.

FIG 2017-0016 (west façade, first floor)

Ms. Kinane stated the Design Review Committee recommended the following: FIG 2017-0016 (west façade, first floor): **\$3,100.00.**

Mr. Caspar made a motion to accept the Design Review Committee recommendation and Ms. Arnold seconded the motion.

Mr. Caspar asked about the vertical columns and the architecture of the building.

Mr. Khoury stated he thinks the columns are an architectural feature.

Chairwoman Pearce stated they are columns that structurally hold the building (exterior and interior walls) together and keep it from swaying.

A vote on the motion was taken and it passed unanimously.

FIG 2017-0017 (north façade, first floor)

Ms. Kinane stated the Design Review Committee recommended the following: FIG 2017-0017 (north façade, first floor): **\$5,000.00.**

Mr. Gee made a motion to accept the Design Review Committee recommendation and Mr. Carlin seconded.

Ms. Cole asked how long it would take to complete the project.

Mr. Khoury stated they will do a test strip case removing some paint. They will look at the condition and try to figure it out to see if they need to repaint it. The estimate is a huge range in excess of \$10,000 even if they do not paint it. The process is going to be slow and deliberate. The goal is aggressive to occupy the building by December 1st of 2017.

A vote on the motion was taken and it passed unanimously.

Attorney Phillips stated the Guidelines indicate all approved work must be completed within 9 months of the signed contract.

FIG 2017-0018 (west façade, second floor)

Ms. Kinane stated the Design Review Committee recommended the following: FIG 2017-0018 (west façade, second floor): **\$5,000.00.**

Ms. Arnold made a motion to accept the Design Review Committee recommendation and Mr. Caspar seconded.

Ms. Cole had a question on the application about the use of the first floor.

Mr. Khoury stated it will be used for retail space, an office, or something similar.

A vote on the motion was taken and it passed unanimously.

FIG 2017-0019 (north façade, second floor)

Ms. Kinane stated the Design Review Committee recommended the following: FIG 2017-0019 (north façade, second floor): **\$5,000.00.**

Mr. Nunnally made a motion to accept the Design Review Committee recommendation, Ms. Arnold seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Kinane stated that the remaining two applications were initially recommended to not be approved due to the lack of visibility from the public right of way. However, it was noted that these façades are visible from the upper levels of the public parking garage. After a review and recommendation of all of the preceding applications, a small remainder of funding was available.

FIG 2017-0020 (east façade, second floor)

Ms. Kinane stated the Design Review Committee recommended the following: FIG 2017-0020 (east façade, second floor): **\$594.50.**

Chairwoman Pearce stated that the Design Review Committee believed that all these applications qualified to receive a grant but they are out of funds. She stated there is a piece of pvc on the back that needs to go away because it doesn't drain well.

Ms. Kinane stated the Design Review Committee felt that by authorizing the full amount allotted without any remainder left over, it expressed the need for this program and potentially allow for a better likelihood of being able to request more funding.

Chairwoman Pearce stated that it is July and they already have so many qualified applications. She stated more funding should be available.

Mr. Nunnally made a motion to accept the Design Review Committee recommendation and Mr. Gee seconded.

Mr. Caspar had a question about the original gutter system.

Mr. Khoury pointed out a pipe in a picture of the second floor green arched window. This pipe is a metal aluminum gutter system that originally went to the back of the building down into a sump pump. The neighbors were having flooding issues so a pvc pipe was placed so that the water would drain out to the front sidewalk. The goal is to reroute the drain with steel or aluminum to the back of the building and coordinate with GUC to make sure there are no flooding issues.

Chairwoman Pearce stated the building is on a crawl space. It has vents in the sidewalk. The raised front sidewalk encroached on the front level of the building.

Ms. Cole asked if it is possible to defer a decision on 2017-0020 and 2017-0021 until funding is available.

Ms. Kinane stated yes, that could be done but we have no timeline for a potential of finding that out. Also, depending on construction guidelines, they would like to adhere to, they would not be able to do any work on these two facades prior to making a decision.

Mr. Khoury stated he would consider withdrawing the last two applications.

Ms. Arnold stated that with the aggressive timeline of construction, it would be favorable to either allow the applicant to withdrawal or accept the Design Review Committee recommendation.

Chairwoman Pearce asked when he could apply for a grant on the same façade if the application was approved.

Ms. Kinane stated the guidelines does not give a specific amount of wait time with the exception of the fact that you can only receive 2 grant awards for the same façade within 24 months.

Chairwoman Pearce stated we would like to have qualified grants in place that we don't have money for. Deferring the request does not let the applicant continue his work.

Mr. Caspar made an amended motion for funding for \$594.50 to restore the original gutter system only. No second made on the motion. Motion dies.

A vote on the original motion was taken and it passed unanimously.

FIG 2017-0021 (south façade, second floor)

Ms. Kinane stated the Design Review Committee recommended the following: FIG 2017-0020 (south façade, second floor): **no funding available.**

Chairwoman Pearce stated that the Design Review Committee thought that the request was a qualified application for a grant, but cannot be funded at this time.

Ms. Cole made a motion accept the Design Review Committee recommendation for funding if funding is to become available and Ms. Arnold seconded. (no vote made)

Mr. Nunnally stated that the Design Review Committee's recommendation was one of priorities and that the recommendation should be modified to state something other than \$0.00 granted.

Mr. Caspar asked if the request could be tabled.

Mr. Gee recommended that it be referred back to the Design Review Committee until funding is available, Mr. Caspar seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Cole asked if the City Manager would know about this application.

Ms. Kinane stated yes. Although it would not go as a recommended approval, it would a line item in a memo regarding all applications that have been received.

Chairwoman Pearce stated that when the new City Manager arrives, she will provide information about the HPC and the work they have accomplished.

Ms. Kinane stated that Mr. Khoury also submitted a Local Landmark application for this property.

Local Landmark Report Review

Tar River Navigation Locks submitted by Vince Bellis

Ms. Kinane stated the application was submitted in June by Vince Bellis. She stated she is working on correcting the report to the new NC Local Landmark Guidelines which became effective end of May/beginning of June 2017. More information will be added to the report. She reviewed information about what a local landmark is.

Landmark designation is an honor. It signifies recognition that the property is important to the heritage and character of the community and that its protection enriches all the community's residents. The following types of properties can be designated as historic landmarks:

Buildings, Sites, Areas, Objects, and

Structures. The term "structure" refers to a construction with a main purpose other than shelter. Examples are vehicles, roads, bridges, tunnels, canals, dams, fences, prehistoric earthworks, lighthouses, kilns, silos, windmills, gazebos, and bandstands. (this applies to the Tar River Locks)

Prerequisites for Designation of Landmarks

Before a local governing board may designate any historic landmarks, these steps must have been taken:

- 1 - The local governing board must have established a historic preservation commission or a historic landmarks commission.
- 2 - The commission must have established rules of procedure and design guidelines.

Procedure for Designation of Landmarks

1. The commission investigates the historical, prehistorical, architectural, or cultural significance of each property proposed for designation.
2. The commission submits a report of this investigation to the State Historic Preservation Office.
3. The State Historic Preservation Office has the opportunity to review the report and to make nonbinding comments on the substance and effect of the proposed designation.
4. The city or county attorney drafts an ordinance designating the landmark.
5. The commission and the local governing board hold a joint public hearing or separate public hearings on the proposed landmark designation ordinance.
6. The commission may recommend to the local governing board that it adopt or reject the proposed ordinance.
7. The local governing board adopts or rejects the proposed ordinance. Before adopting the ordinance, the local governing board may amend the ordinance as it deems necessary.

8. On adoption of the ordinance, the commission must notify owners and occupants of each designated landmark and the appropriate local government officials.

Before recommending that a property be designated as a historic landmark, the commission must investigate the property's significance and find that

- 1 - It has special historical, prehistorical, architectural, or cultural significance **and**
- 2 - It shows integrity of design, setting, workmanship, materials, feeling, or association.

Criteria for Significance

To have special significance, a property should meet at least one of these criteria:

- 1 - It is associated with events that have contributed significantly to our history.
- 2 - It is associated with the life of a person significant in our past.
- 3 - It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction.
- 4 - It represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values.
- 5 - It has yielded or is likely to yield important historical or prehistorical information.

Aspects of Integrity

A property has integrity if it is able to convey its significance to the observer. In other words, the significance can be seen or experienced, not just imagined. These aspects of properties contribute to their integrity:

- "Design" refers to the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property, as it was originally conceived. It includes such elements as organization of space, proportion, scale, technology, ornamentation, and materials.
- Setting. A property's "setting" is its physical environment (including natural or man-made features) as it relates to a property's functions, its significant role, or its design. Setting refers to the character of the place where a property played its significant role.
- "Workmanship" is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during the period in history or prehistory when a property was created.
- "Materials" are the physical elements that originally were combined to form a property. It must be an actual historic property, not a re-creation.
- "Feeling" is a property's expression of the historical or aesthetic sense of a particular period of time. A property has integrity of feeling when its physical features together enable it to evoke a sense of its historical character.
- "Association" is a property's direct connection with a significant event or person. It must be sufficiently intact to convey the connection to an observer.

Appendix E. This is for any other information the local governing board deems necessary.

Ms. Kinane showed pictures and maps of the Tar Locks area.

Chairwoman Pearce asked if the State did not approve the application, it still could be approved as a local designation.

Ms. Kinane stated yes. She stated that prior to making a recommendation to City Council to landmark this property, a discussion and vote that specifically deems this property to be of special significance and define it in terms of historic, prehistoric, architectural, cultural and also define its integrity.

Mr. Caspar stated it would be a privilege while serving on this board to approve such a recommendation for the Tar River Locks. He applauded the work of applicant Vince Bellis and Collette Kinane.

Attorney Phillips stated that before the Commission can make any recommendation to City Council, by statute, it must meet the findings.

Public Comment Period

No public comments were provided, as no one from the public attended.

Committee Reports

Design Review. Chairwoman Pearce stated they met regarding tonight's applications.

Publicity. Ms. Arnold stated that there is no report at this time.

Selection. Mr. Gee stated they did not meet.

Announcements/Other

Ms. Kinane stated the City's Neighborhood Liaison has approached her with a potential project. They are working with the Police Department to form more neighborhood associations in the West Greenville area. As part of their idea, they would like to have a postcard size flyer with historic photos, the historic neighborhood name and historic fun facts on the front side. They asked if the Publicity Committee would help with the initial research gathering for this idea.

Chairwoman Pearce had an announcement. This is an election year. A member of the Commission is running for election. She encouraged members to wear their name tags, send letters and ask people what their stance is on historic preservation.

Ms. Kinane stated about a year ago there was an application about moving the Jones Lee House. They are close to finding a new location before the end of the year.

Mr. Gee asked for an update regarding the homes around the ECU Chancellor's house.

Ms. Kinane stated she recently spoke with Mr. Buck (of ECU). He said they were still planning to advertise the properties twice but there was no date.

Mr. Gee asked if they needed to do anything specific to ask City Council for more funding.

Chairwoman Pearce suggested formalizing a resolution at the next meeting.

With no further discussion, Mr. Gee made a motion to adjourn, Ms. Arnold seconded, and it passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 8:37 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Collette Kinane, Planner II