

Ben Fulmer

From: Cecil Bothwell <cecilbothwell@gmail.com> on behalf of Cecil Bothwell
Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2017 11:02 PM
To: Peter Landis
Cc: councilgroup
Subject: Re: Attempted hijacking

Oh my.

I've composed a group willing to enlist others, at no expense to the City, to create the "quick, light, cheap" events that the Project for Public Spaces suggested in May 2016 ...

While the Downtown Association and LEAF and the Asheville Arts Council and others create events THAT COST THE CITY MONEY.

But my suggestions are suspect?

You are really completely either uninformed or nuts.

-C

On Jul 18, 2017, at 5:02 PM, Peter Landis <peterlandis1949@gmail.com> wrote:

A well-crafted reply, Councilman, but not a response.

Let's take this point by point.

First, most of those who replied to the survey seeking input on the future of the Haywood Street location indicated they favored some sort of "mixed use" applications for the site. "Mixed use". Not "exclusive use". Like most others, I would also like to see "plein air painting, yoga, history talks" even hopscotch competitions (how about you vs me?) and other outdoor activities. I suppose that puts me into the subversive camp as well.

Second, are you really saying that the only way for the public to enjoy city-owned property is by creating a park and nothing else? Not very imaginative. How about green space AND a low-rise, LEED certified green *building* that could serve as a center for environmental studies (your professors might like that idea) along with, perhaps, rental space for environmentally-oriented businesses and non profits. The public might like that, too.

Third, while I have great respect for the people you've chosen for your foundation, it does smack of FDR-style court packing. No need for diversity of opinion, just shared vision. Isn't that a charge you flung at the Haywood Visioning team?

And as I mentioned before, your vision is not as widely shared as you would have everyone believe. When you made "St. Lawrence Green" the election rallying cry, you succeeded--if that's the word--in attracting fewer than one out of five registered voters to the polls. Not exactly the overwhelming support you claim.

As you know from previous email exchanges, I do share your view on at least one critical issue facing Asheville--the affordable housing crisis.

But you're using the park issue as a tool to try to further your power in the Council. I find that unfortunate. No. Make that...disheartening.

--Peter

On Tue, Jul 18, 2017 at 3:24 PM, Cecil Bothwell <cecilbothwell@gmail.com> wrote:
Mr. Landis

For my non-profit to recruit a yoga instructor, a tai chi leader, a local knitting club to knit in public, some local professors to present popular science, natural history and Asheville history talks, a children's education expert to work on reading in public and a kid's activity group to do hopscotch competitions, talking with buskers to organize some music

All seems so evil and manipulative. Oh, yes. Taking over a public space.

Oh, dear, working with the Asheville Artists Yahoo group to suggest plein air painting. Subversive as can be. And I admit, the idea that Asheville folks might do coloring in public, as groups do in many other cities ... terribly scary.

Clearly an effort to seduce the public into enjoying city owned property. Dastardly as heck.

Guilty as charged.

-C

On Jul 18, 2017, at 9:20 AM, Peter Landis <peterlandis1949@gmail.com> wrote:

Mr. Bothwell,

Whether stated specifically or implied, in permitting outside organizations to plan activities for (do you mean "at"?) the Haywood location, it would seem the Council's objective was to encourage *non-governmental* entities to play a role. Not for a current member of said Council to--I'll say again--attempt to hijack the process by forming his own hand-picked "NGO".

As you say, "anyone can meet with anyone in the U.S. to discuss anything at anytime". But (as we've seen in the case of Donald Trump Jr). that doesn't necessarily mean those meetings are wise or helpful in forwarding the common good.

And isn't it "astonishingly stupid" to push for *only* a park for the Haywood site, when a majority of survey respondents indicated they are open to other possibilities as well?

With your push-poll and selective interpretation of election results (in which only about 10% of registered voters bothered to cast ballots when you made the Haywood site a rallying cry) you've already shown a proclivity for manipulation. Your People's Park Foundation is just another example.

Regards,

--Peter Landis

On Tue, Jul 18, 2017 at 5:21 AM, Cecil Bothwell <cecilbothwell@gmail.com> wrote:

Mr. Landis,

Council has approved a process of permitting organizations to plan activities for 68 Haywood. Forming a non-profit organization that will qualify for partnership with the City is the legal way that is done. Just as the Downtown Association, LEAF and other non-profits contract with the City to offer events, PPF and a dozen other entities have put in bids to activate 68 Haywood St.

As for meeting with a landscape architecture firm to explore possibilities ... it is my distinct impression that anyone can meet with anyone in the U.S. to discuss anything at anytime. In our case, we are seriously considering a fundraising campaign to garner private dollars for redevelopment of the vacant land. With a possible goal of raising millions of dollars, I think it would be astonishingly stupid not to get some idea of what is possible and what it might cost.

Thanks for your concern,

-c

On Jul 17, 2017, at 11:27 PM, Peter Landis
<peterlandis1949@gmail.com> wrote:

To the Council (including Mr. Bothwell):

As you can see from his own press release, Councilman Bothwell is attempting to hijack the duties of legitimate governmental authorities to determine the future of the Haywood Street property by insinuating his own so-called "foundation" into the process. And by misrepresenting the findings of the Haywood Visioning panel.

I would call it an attempted coup.

I call on the Council to censure Councilman Bothwell for interfering with your regulatory duties.

--Peter Landis
(Enclosure)

Press Release: People's Park Foundation/Nelson Byrd Woltz collaboration

ASHEVILLE - On Saturday, July 15th, Members of the board of the People's Park Foundation (PPF) met with landscape architects Thomas L. Woltz and Ian Quate to discuss design options for the future park at the intersection of Haywood Street and Page Avenue

in downtown Asheville. Woltz and Quate grew up in Waynesville and Asheville respectively, but currently work at Nelson Byrd Woltz Landscape Architects (NBWLA) in New York City and Charlottesville, VA.

The firm has designed prize winning public parks in 25 states, New Zealand and Australia, and embraces a relatively unique approach to their work. Woltz explained that they design based on site history and local soil, and create self contained projects that capture and use stormwater to support interconnected tree planting wells that permit the growth of an urban forest. They emphasize native plants and even urban agriculture if a site's size and setting are appropriate.

The People's Park Foundation was formed by Asheville City Councilman Cecil Bothwell earlier this summer to move ahead with activation of the space across from the Civic Center and the Basilica of St. Lawrence – a goal announced in May 2016 at the outset of the Haywood Visioning Process, but never pursued during that effort. Bothwell notes, "PPF is modeled on The Friends of Congress Square, a Portland, Maine, organization that has created hundreds of public events in a similar fledgling park without any demand for municipal funds."

During the meeting Woltz observed that in his experience cities don't remove buildings to create parks, so the fact that Asheville owns the vacant Haywood/Page properties offers a very special opportunity to create a new public space.

Coupled with the historic use of a site, NBWLA appraises the current expectations of local residents and then creates a public space that significantly engages a city's population. A core ethic of their company is to create public spaces that address environmental issues as well as public uses. You can check out the company philosophy here. <http://www.nbwla.com/firm/philosophy>

One very helpful piece of advice Woltz offered during a second informal site meeting on Sunday, July 16th, was that the City of Asheville would do well to put a hold on planned stormwater improvements on Haywood Street in the Pack Library/Civic Center area until the park is created. An environmentally sensitive design should handle, on site, all of the stormwater on the Haywood/Page property. Woltz suggested, "Why send it to the river if there's a way to use the water where it falls?"

"This meeting between the People's Park Foundation and NBWLA to advance this project makes me hopeful about the progress we're making," Bothwell observed. He added, "A short list of near term activities we're considering includes yoga, tai chi, knitting in public, popular science and local history lectures, story telling, hopscotch competitions, reading for kids, music performance, plein air painting and slam poetry. We have submitted a formal proposal to the City of Asheville to begin programming the park this August."

PPF Board members include; John Russell, Director of the Montford Park Players; Ellie Richard, founder of Education for Engaged Citizens and organizer of the annual Americans Who Tell the Truth project at the YMI Cultural Center; Ron Ogle, a local portraitist and landscape painter; Elaine Lite, publisher of Critter Magazine and founding member of Mountain Voices Alliance; Jay Fields, who currently serves as a member of Asheville's Public Art and Culture Commission, and has previously served as a board member of the Southern Appalachian Repertory Theatre, and

Stories on Asheville's Front Porch; and Asheville City Councilman Cecil Bothwell, who is up for re-election this November, and who also serves on the boards of Proyecto de las Escuelas Guatemaltecas and Biblioworks.org building libraries and schools in Guatemala and Bolivia.

Ben Fulmer

From: Gordon Smith <gordonsmith@avlcouncil.com> on behalf of Gordon Smith
Sent: Friday, July 07, 2017 12:28 PM
To: Linden
Cc: councilgroup;Executive Air;Esther Manheimer;Gwen Wisler
Subject: Re: Proposal for Pritchard Park and Basilica of St. Lawrence Park

Thanks, Linden. It's great that so many people are impassioned about this downtown site. You may be aware that City Council unanimously decided to appoint a Task Force to work on a vision for the site. That vision was approved by the Task Force on a 16-1 vote. We're now working on getting a design firm to help us design according to those recommendations, which include green space, other civic open space, and some built elements. You can read their report here:

<https://www.slideshare.net/gordonsmithasheville/haywood-st-visioning-project-final-report>

Be well,

Gordon Smith

On Fri, Jul 7, 2017 at 8:33 AM, Linden <ontjesl@gmail.com> wrote:

Proposal for Pritchard Park and Basilica of St. Lawrence Park

1. Parks do not **create** homeless populations. Measures to **remove homeless** are in the interests of residents, visitors, businesses, and public safety. The experiment of park rangers and public monitors has failed. We are being held hostage by a small minority population. This failure, furthermore, weakens commitment to additional parks.

2. Green space is not a luxury; it is a necessity.

We should not sacrifice our green open spaces: vital in a growing downtown that depends upon its attractiveness to encourage visitors and increasingly, condo-owners. Once green space is lost to bad planning, it cannot be recovered Asheville voters passed the Parks and Rec bond to underwrite costs. Access to parks can be limited to residents without losing any of the environmental, health and public safety benefits still provided to everyone.

Asheville voters have spoken loudly and repeatedly about their frustration with downtown city planning that fails to **provide parking and protect green space**. This public opinion is growing and will not tolerate **failure to listen**.

Pritchard Park

Homeless currently congregate at vacant building adjacent to S&W Cafeteria and spill over into Pritchard Park.

Create public parking structure on the current vacant building site using eminent domain on the grounds of attractive nuisance. Reclassification of Pritchard Park as "local residential membership open space" would allow lawful exclusion of others. DARN already participates in maintaining the park. The private park model is common in other countries and has proven success.

Basilica of St. Lawrence Park

The intersection across from the Civic Center is badly overwhelmed with traffic. Any additional traffic there would shut down access to downtown. Pedestrians are already at risk

Private residential membership dues would support a dog park in this location. The fence and landscaping are already in place. This supports the Downtown Master Plan of creating community and encouraging stakeholders.

The City already owns the land; local government must recognize that voters will fight any plan of short-term profit through sale to a developer.

Ben Fulmer

From: Linden <ontjesl@gmail.com> on behalf of Linden
Sent: Friday, July 07, 2017 8:34 AM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov;Executive
Air;esthermanheimer@avlcouncil.com;gwenwisler@avlcouncil.com
Subject: Proposal for Pritchard Park and Basilica of St. Lawrence Park

Proposal for Pritchard Park and Basilica of St. Lawrence Park

1. Parks do not **create** homeless populations. Measures to **remove homeless** are in the interests of residents, visitors, businesses, and public safety. The experiment of park rangers and public monitors has failed. We are being held hostage by a small minority population. This failure, furthermore, weakens commitment to additional parks.

2. **Green space is not a luxury; it is a necessity.**

We should not sacrifice our green open spaces: vital in a growing downtown that depends upon its attractiveness to encourage visitors and increasingly, condo-owners. Once green space is lost to bad planning, it cannot be recovered Asheville voters passed the Parks and Rec bond to underwrite costs. Access to parks can be limited to residents without losing any of the environmental, health and public safety benefits still provided to everyone.

Asheville voters have spoken loudly and repeatedly about their frustration with downtown city planning that fails to **provide parking and protect green space**. This public opinion is growing and will not tolerate **failure to listen**.

Pritchard Park

Homeless currently congregate at vacant building adjacent to S&W Cafeteria and spill over into Pritchard Park.

Create public parking structure on the current vacant building site using eminent domain on the grounds of attractive nuisance. Reclassification of Pritchard Park as "local residential membership open space"

would allow lawful exclusion of others. DARN already participates in maintaining the park. The private park model is common in other countries and has proven success.

Basilica of St. Lawrence Park

The intersection across from the Civic Center is badly overwhelmed with traffic. Any additional traffic there would shut down access to downtown. Pedestrians are already at risk

Private residential membership dues would support a dog park in this location. The fence and landscaping are already in place. This supports the Downtown Master Plan of creating community and encouraging stakeholders.

The City already owns the land; local government must recognize that voters will fight any plan of short-term profit through sale to a developer.

Ben Fulmer

From: Virginia Duquet <virginia_duquet@charter.net> on behalf of Virginia Duquet
Sent: Wednesday, July 05, 2017 6:37 PM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov;ashevilleparc@gmail.com
Subject: St. Lawrence Green Community Gardens

Dear City Council Members,

I am writing to let you know that I am thrilled about the new ventures being started in the former “pit of despair”. I think it is great that the people of Asheville are finding ways to use this area and make it a beautiful downtown space not an eyesore. I urge you to support these local community efforts and to prioritize them over development of the site that only benefits corporations and tourists. We do more than enough of that development already! Instead, please allow city water for the Elder and Sage gardens so that these downtown residents can continue to tend and expand their garden space more easily. As a taxpayer, I am happy to see city funds used for this purpose and am not concerned about giving away water to this group and for this purpose. Rather I consider it money well spent. Thanks for your continued support and willingness to consider solutions for this area that help Asheville residents and preserve some of our unique downtown character.

Sincerely,

Virginia Duquet
119 Estes Court
Asheville, 28806

Ben Fulmer

From: Esther Manheimer <esthermanheimer@avlcouncil.com> on behalf of Esther Manheimer
Sent: Wednesday, July 05, 2017 1:35 PM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov; Jaime Matthews; Judith Bicking; gjackson@achevillenc.gov
Subject: Re: St. Lawrence Green

Gary - can you get us some information about the timing of bringing water to the site?

On Wed, Jul 5, 2017 at 1:15 PM Judith Bicking <graphics@bicking.com> wrote:

Please supply water to the St. Lawrence Green, Elder and Sage Community Garden and please save it from development.

This garden truly represents Asheville's character – a caring community coming together to preserve a fragment of nature and to create a much needed respite in a city rapidly losing both nature and character through development.

Sincerely,
J. Bicking

Ben Fulmer

From: Judith Bicking <graphics@bicking.com> on behalf of Judith Bicking
Sent: Wednesday, July 05, 2017 1:15 PM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov
Subject: St. Lawrence Green

Please supply water to the St. Lawrence Green, Elder and Sage Community Garden and please save it from development.

This garden truly represents Asheville's character – a caring community coming together to preserve a fragment of nature and to create a much needed respite in a city rapidly losing both nature and character through development.

Sincerely,
J. Bicking

Ben Fulmer

From: Cecil Bothwell <cecilbothwell@gmail.com> on behalf of Cecil Bothwell
Sent: Monday, June 05, 2017 4:45 PM
To: Gary Jackson;Virginia Daffron;Burgess, Joel;ashevilleblade@gmail.com
Cc: Dana Frankel;Sam Powers;councilgroup;Dawa Hitch;Polly McDaniel;Cathy Ball
Subject: Re: Thanks for running the poll!

Given the overwhelming opinion of Asheville citizens, expressed in thousands of signatures on petitions for more than a decade; based on the results of the ADC polling; based on the latest online poll; there is no rational excuse for not naming the space St. Lawrence Green or St. Lawrence Park.

Continuing to refute the opinion of Asheville's citizens is simply nuts.

Staff has no power to decide what is an "adequate" name. This must be a decision by Council, in response to the will of the people who elect us.

-c

On Jun 5, 2017, at 3:55 PM, Gary Jackson <GJackson@ashevillenc.gov> wrote:

Thanks Dana. Given the circumstances, postponing any naming seems wise.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 1, 2017, at 6:21 PM, Dana Frankel <DFrankel@ashevillenc.gov> wrote:

Gary:

The intent of the poll was to get feedback for temporary identification and wayfinding purposes when the site is made available for temporary uses.

Based on feedback from the poll, some respondents may have understood this to be an official or permanent naming of the site associated with its long term use, which it was not. Our staff communications could have been made clearer.

Since the primary goal is temporary site identification and wayfinding, the address of the property "68 Haywood Street" should serve its purpose adequately.

For publicly owned properties such as buildings, parks, squares and greenways, the City has a policy in place for naming, whereas consideration is led by Council, and adoption follows a majority vote by Council. (Attached for reference.)

Please let me know if you have any feedback, questions or concerns.

Thank you,
Dana

From: Gary Jackson
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2017 9:16 AM
To: Dana Frankel <DFrankel@ashevillenc.gov>
Cc: Jaime Matthews <JMatthews@ashevillenc.gov>; Roderick Simmons <RSimmons@ashevillenc.gov>; Maggie Burleson <MBurleson@ashevillenc.gov>; councilgroup <AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov>
Subject: RE: Thanks for running the poll!

Dana:

What "naming" process follows the survey? Please research policy guidelines for naming a municipal park, including a search for Council adopted policy/resolutions and double checking with Roderick Simmons on recent precedents.

Gary

From: Cecil Bothwell [<mailto:cecilbothwell@avlcouncil.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2017 6:26 AM
To: Gary Jackson <GJackson@ashevillenc.gov>; Jaime Matthews <JMatthews@ashevillenc.gov>; Dana Frankel <DFrankel@ashevillenc.gov>
Subject: Thanks for running the poll!

It's clear that the overwhelming choice of respondents was for St. Lawrence Green or Park. (53 of 136 who offered an idea, 29 opting Green)
I'm confident that the Staff choice will follow the wishes of Asheville citizens. (Though I'm still not clear why "staff" was accorded the choice of a name.)

Thanks

-C

"The whole art of government consists in the art of being honest. Only aim to do your duty and mankind will give you credit where you fail."

- Thomas Jefferson (A Summary View of the Rights of British America, 1774)

Cecil Bothwell
@cecilbothwell
828-713-8840

<city facilities naming policy.pdf>

Ben Fulmer

From: Cecil Bothwell <cecilbothwell@gmail.com> on behalf of Cecil Bothwell
Sent: Friday, March 31, 2017 5:23 PM
To: Gary Jackson
Cc: Esther Manheimer;Cathy Ball;councilgroup
Subject: Re: RFP for design on Haywood

Meanwhile, as indicated by the park effort recommended by Mayor Manheimer, I think we need to immediately energize multiple efforts in St.Lawrence Green.

If Portland, Oregon could host 162 events last summer, why can't we do the same? Why are we reluctant to have exciting things happen on this property?

What, really, is the reluctance beyond some other goal of selling our City property?

-c

On Mar 31, 2017, at 8:57 AM, Gary Jackson <GJackson@ashevillenc.gov> wrote:

We will work it in that way. Thanks for the direction!

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 30, 2017, at 2:28 PM, Esther Manheimer <esthermanheimer@avlcouncil.com> wrote:

Gary, your suggested process below, first to PED and then to Council, looks like a good one.

On Mar 30, 2017, at 1:08 PM, Cecil Bothwell <cecilbothwell@gmail.com> wrote:

makes sense to me if the RFP is as described in this thread.
thanks
-c

On Mar 30, 2017, at 12:02 PM, Gary Jackson
<GJackson@ashevillenc.gov> wrote:

Absolutely. My preference too. A month for turnaround would be minimum. Given complexity and workloads, 6-8 weeks is more realistic.

From: Gordon Smith
[<mailto:gordonsmith@avlcouncil.com>]
Sent: Thursday, March 30, 2017 11:59 AM
To: Gary Jackson <GJackson@ashevillenc.gov>
Cc: Cathy Ball <cball@ashevillenc.gov>; councilgroup
<AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov>
Subject: Re: RFP for design on Haywood

Thanks, Gary. It would be my preference to move more rapidly.

Gordon

On Thu, Mar 30, 2017 at 11:22 AM, Gary Jackson <GJackson@ashevillenc.gov> wrote:

Cathy - Thanks for the explanation of what we typically do with RFPs.

Esther - This answers the question about what we typically do unless otherwise directed by action of Council. The key thing to remember here is that staff would, in the next month or two, would be preparing a request for proposals from design and engineering professionals. The request will be for submittals indicating their qualifications and track record of experience to perform the work, as outlined in the documents submitted to Council by the Council appointed task force. The purpose of the RFP process would be to find the best design professionals and firm(s). As with the Comprehensive Plan consultant RFP, the ultimate decision to accept the selection and authorize the contract for services would be made by Council action. This would be months from now. I presume the staff recommendation of the selected firm(s) would make a prelim stop at PED on way to regular agenda.

We have not planned on it but if you wish to add to the typical staff driven process, I concur with Cathy's suggestion for the review to occur at PED prior to full Council presentation. This extra step of policy review, could be intended to confirm staff's plan to structure the RFP - the scope of services, including infrastructure study, design work and expected leadership with community engagement (charette for example).

Gary

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Cathy Ball
<cball@ashevillenc.gov>
Date: March 30, 2017 at 10:39:42 AM EDT
To: Gary Jackson

<GJackson@ashevillenc.gov>

Subject: RE: RFP for design on Haywood

Gary,

I would note that we typically do not take the RFP back to Council but we have in some cases taken the scope of work to Council or committee for review. We did this in the RFP for the developer of the Park Maintenance property. I am not aware that we have ever informally given it to each member for independent review. This could be a real challenge to resolve the various input on the scope.

I would recommend that if we go get Council input we go to PED and then to full Council. I think we would need clear direction on the scope. (The Mayor's option #3)

Thanks for letting me provide input.

Cathy

From: Gary Jackson
Sent: Wednesday, March 29, 2017 6:14 PM
To: Cathy Ball <cball@ashevillenc.gov>
Subject: Fwd: RFP for design on Haywood

Suggest a response please.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Esther Manheimer
<esthermanheimer@avlcouncil.com>
Date: March 29, 2017 at 4:15:13 PM EDT
To: Gary Jackson
<GJackson@ashevillenc.gov>
Subject: Re: RFP

**for design on
Haywood**

What's our normal
protocol for rfps?

On Mar 29, 2017, at
3:03 PM, Gary
Jackson

<[GJackson@asheville
enc.gov](mailto:GJackson@asheville.nc.gov)> wrote:

ps

I was
planni
ng to
do
option
1

Sent
from
my
iPhon
e

On
Mar
29,
2017,
at
2:54
PM,
Gary
Jacks
on
<[GJac
kson
@ash
eville
nc.go
v](mailto:GJackson@ashville.nc.gov)>
wrote:

E
s
t
h
e

r
:
W
h
a
t
p
r
o
c
e
s
s
i
s
d
e
s
i
r
e
d
b
y
C
o
u
n
c
i
l
?
O
p
t
i
o
n
s
i
n
c
l
u
d
e
:
(
1
)

i
n
f
o
r
m
a
l
d
i
s
t
r
i
b
u
t
i
o
n
o
f
f
i
n
a
l
d
r
a
f
t
t
o
a
l
l
m
e
m
b
e
r
s
f
o
r
r
e
v
i
e

w
a
n
d
c
o
m
m
e
n
t
,
(
2
)
P
E
D
f
o
r
r
e
v
i
e
w
a
n
d
a
p
p
r
o
v
a
l
a
n
d
/
o
r
(
3
)
P
E
D
r
e

c
o
m
m
e
n
d
a
t
i
o
n
f
o
r
C
o
u
n
c
i
l
a
p
p
r
o
v
a
l
,
(
4
)
C
o
u
n
c
i
l
r
e
g
u
l
a
r
a
g
e
n

d
a
i
t
e
m
—
p
r
e
s
e
n
t
a
t
i
o
n
o
r
u
n
f
i
n
i
s
h
e
d
b
u
s
i
n
e
s
s
,
(
5
)
o
t
h
e
r
.
G
a

r
y

**F
r
o
m
:**

C
e
c
i
l
B
o
t
h
w
e
l
l
[
m
a
i
i
t
o
:
c
e
c
i
i
b
o
t
h
w
e
l
l
@
a
v
i
c
o
u
n
c

[i
l
:
c
o
m](#)
]

**S
e
n
t
:**

W
e
d
n
e
s
d
a
y
,
M
a
r
c
h
2
9
,
2
0
1
7
1
2
:
1
8
P
M
**T
o
:**

G
a
r
y
J

a
c
k
s
o
n
<
G
J
a
c
k
s
o
n
@
a
s
h
e
v
i
l
i
e
n
c
:
g
o
v
>
S
u
b
j
e
c
t
:

R
F
P
f
o
r
d
e
s
i
g

n
o
n
H
a
y
w
o
o
d

H
i
G
a
r
y
,

I
b
e
l
i
e
v
e
t
h
e
R
F
P
s
h
o
u
l
d
b
e
b
r
o
u
g
h
t
b
a
c

k
t
o
C
o
u
n
c
i
l
f
o
r
a
p
p
r
o
v
a
l
.
I
d
o
n
,
t
b
e
l
i
e
v
e
t
h
e
r
e
w
a
s
a
g
r
e
e
m
e
n

t
o
n
w
h
a
t
t
h
e
m
o
t
i
o
n
w
a
s
f
o
r
l
a
s
t
n
i
g
h
t
,
a
n
d
t
h
i
n
k
i
t
s
h
o
u
l
d
b
e
m

a
d
e
c
l
e
a
r
b
e
f
o
r
e
i
t
i
s
i
s
s
u
e
d
.

T
h
a
n
k
s
,
-
c

"
*T
h
e
w
h
o
l
e
a
r
t
o
f
g
o
v
e
r*

*n
m
e
n
t*

*c
o
n
s
i
s
t
s
i
n
t
h
e
a
r
t
o
f
b
e
i
n
g
h
o
n
e
s
t
.*

*O
n
l
y
a
i
m
t
o
d
o
y
o
u
r
d
u
t
y
a
n
d*

*m
a
n
k
i
n
d
w*

*i
l
l
g
i
v
e
y
o
u
c
r
e
d
i
t
w
h
e
r
e

y
o
u
f
a
i
l
.”*

- Thomas Jefferson (A Summary View of the R

i
g
h
t
s
o
f

B
r
i
t
i
s
h
A
m
e
r
i
c
a
,
1
7
7
4
)

C
e
c
i
l
B
o
t
h
w
e
l
l
@
c
e
c
i
l
b
o
t
h
w
e
l
l
8
2
8
-
7
1
3
-
8
8
4
0

Ben Fulmer

From: Norman C Wussow <mnpopi@charter.net> on behalf of Norman C Wussow
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 4:48 PM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov
Subject: St Lawrence Green

GREEN SPACE ONLY, PLEASE!

There are lots of other places for commercial interests!

Norman Wussow
4 Mayflower Drive
Asheville 28804

Ben Fulmer

From: Ann McMartin <AnnMcMartin@hotmail.com> on behalf of Ann McMartin
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 3:08 PM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov
Subject: St Lawrence Green Space

Good Afternoon City Council Members,

I am contacting you today to ask that you design the St. Lawrence vacant space into a Green Space for all of Asheville to enjoy! With so much building downtown it might be nice to have a place where people can go and relax, meet friends, and connect with nature. Downtown is becoming one big massive cement and pavement mass and we need some trees and grass to balance all the recent development. I urge you to vote to make this space a Green space.

Thank you for your consideration!

Sincerely
Ann McMartin

Ben Fulmer

From: Bonnie Cooper <bonniecooperphotography@yahoo.com> on behalf of Bonnie Cooper
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 12:26 PM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov
Subject: Park Space

Please maintain the area around St. Lawrence Church as green space/park space for all of Asheville.
Thank you,
Bonnie Cooper

Sent from my iPhone

Ben Fulmer

From: DrMaxFrontOffice <drmaxchiro@bellsouth.net> on behalf of DrMaxFrontOffice
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 8:35 PM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov
Subject: Public Park Space in Asheville

To the Asheville City Council,

I wish to register my opinion as a 20-year resident of Asheville and a past resident of places dealing with rapid business/tourist development. I have also lived on Manhattan and can attest to the vital importance of parks in enhancing the quality of life for residents and attractiveness for visitors. A city like ours will not thrive long-term laid out like a shopping mall, with businesses crowding shoulder to shoulder and a lack of green space and sky. We should take a cue from the success of the Biltmore Property which is enjoyed as much for the gardens as the house.

I am in favor of the City creating a park in the area by the St Lawrence church.

Sincerely,
Dr. Max Rouslin
81 Sheridan Rd.
Asheville 03



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Ben Fulmer

From: BellaSharpe <starpillows4u@yahoo.com> on behalf of BellaSharpe
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 6:09 PM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov
Subject: st. lawrence park

Hello City Council Member

Truly it is time to allow breathing space in downtown Asheville. The tall and empty hotels have blocked the western mountain views.

Do we really need yet another hotel with 50% combined occupancy year round.? I often visit your meetings and always ask myself "where is the vision"?

Asheville HAS the potential to become a futuristic, progressive, clean and self sufficient city, please allow some savings grace to all of the people who live and move here. Vote Green

Ben Fulmer

From: Maggie Burleson <MBurleson@ashevillenc.gov> on behalf of Maggie Burleson
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 4:41 PM
To: Brian Haynes; Cecil Bothwell; Esther Manheimer; Gordon Smith; Gwen Wisler; Julie Mayfield; Keith Young
Cc: Todd Okolichany; Gary Jackson; Cathy Ball; Paul Fetherston
Subject: Haywood Advisory Team: Final Report (unformatted)

Mayor and Council, Mr. Joyell won't have the final report with graphics ready until after tomorrow night's meeting. The Advisory Team signed off on the report last week, and a volunteer has just begin formatting it. He asked that this be shared with Council so that you would at least have the text available.

Thanks,
Maggie

Ben Fulmer

From: Neil Barrett <nemacbar@att.net> on behalf of Neil Barrett
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 3:59 PM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov
Cc: AshevilleCAN@googlegroups.com
Subject: Re: Basilica of St. Lawrence

If New York City was able to allow for a large green space, otherwise known as Central Park, in the center of Manhattan, why is it that the city of Asheville, can't commit to keeping the area in front of the Basilica "green". A park in that area would add tremendously to the character of the city and bring a certain natural beauty that would far outshine more buildings for various retail purposes.

Neil M. Barrett
nemacbar@att.net

Ben Fulmer

From: Judith Bicking <graphics@bicking.com> on behalf of Judith Bicking
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 3:13 PM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov
Subject: St. Lawrence area

I live in Asheville and think that the city-owned property in the St. Lawrence area should become green space.

Ben Fulmer

From: deemare@juno.com
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 2:28 PM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov
Subject: Green Space

Hi,

I'm really concerned about what's going to happen with that little space near St. Lawrence basilica. We really need a green space there where people can sit and relax around trees and plants to get away from the hubbub of the city. If it gets turned into business space, then we'll never have the opportunity to have a green space there again. Green spaces in cities are really important, and the larger Asheville grows, the more we'll need green spaces. It would be like a little jewel showing off another of Asheville's jewels (St. Lawrence basilica). Please turn this site into a green space for the people and to add to the beauty of our special city.

Thanks,
Ruth Stambaugh

Ben Fulmer

From: Dancewater <dancewater2@gmail.com> on behalf of Dancewater
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 12:54 PM
To: Gordon Smith; Asheville City Council
Subject: Re: Green space

Gordon -

the people of this city has made their position clear on what should be done with this area, and no matter how many task forces you organize and fund, that position is not going to change.

We can try to put people in office who actually listen to us. That is what we tried in the past, and I think it will be successful again in the future.

Susan Oehler

On Mon, Mar 27, 2017 at 12:22 PM, Gordon Smith <gordonsmith@avlcouncil.com> wrote:

Thanks for writing in, Susan. The good news is that City Council unanimously approved a Task Force to identify how to move forward with the site. That Task Force is returning its findings, after a year-long intensive examination of the site and its possibilities/challenges. It's my understanding that the Task Force is recommending a combination of passive civic space, active civic space, and some commercial elements. I look forward to hearing their presentation on Tuesday.

Thanks for your input,

Gordon Smith

On Mon, Mar 27, 2017 at 12:06 PM, Dancewater <dancewater2@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear city council:

I would like to see a park across from St. Lawrence. And if you decide to do something else, I think you will have a hard time getting reelected.

Thank you for your time,
Susan Oehler
Asheville NC

Ben Fulmer

From: Jeanine Maland <jeanine.maland@gmail.com> on behalf of Jeanine Maland
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 10:35 AM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov
Subject: St Lawrence area - your vote

I urge each of you to do the right thing for our Asheville citizens and conscious community.

Many of us view your critical city council vote as a tiny step for Life! on this fragile planet.

Vote for a fully Green Space for the St. Lawrence area. Stiffen-up your spines.

Vote for a beautiful view for the people of St. Lawrence.

Vote for Asheville residents & tourists sitting on the bench talking, discussing, reading, thinking...

Vote for the chatter of the birds; for the blooming flowers; for the variety of new life.

Thanks to each of you for your important service to Asheville - to our present and to our future.

And much gratitude to those of you who have consistently listened to and supported our passion for keeping the St. Lawrence area a FULLY GREEN SPACE.

Sincerely,
Jeanine Maland
Asheville, NC

Ben Fulmer

From: Shinesign@aol.com
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 10:34 AM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov
Subject: St Lawrence area

Please do not put big business before residents. WE live here and want that space to be used for us, a green space for the population of Asheville as well as the tourist industry to enjoy.

Thank you
Shiner Antiorio

We are Divine enough to ask and we are Important enough to Receive
Wayne Dyer

Ben Fulmer

From: Schmidt Family <fortunesmiled4@gmail.com> on behalf of Schmidt Family
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 10:30 AM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov
Subject: I believe the city-owned property in the St. Lawrence area should become green space

Dear City Council,
That area will be hopelessly congested if a hotel is built there. A park is much more valuable in many ways.
We have enough hotels, we want a park.

David Schmidt
73 Evelyn place 28801

Ben Fulmer

From: healing@billwalz.com
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 9:21 AM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov
Subject: St Lawrence Greenspace

If NYC can allow trillions of dollars of potential commercial property and tax revenue to be devoted to Central Park, the same with San Francisco and Golden Gate Park, with Chicago and Lincoln Park, Boston and the Charles River Park - and the list goes on, city after city recognizing the value of green space, supposedly higher consciousness Asheville can give up one block to the aesthetics and refinement of a small park sitting opposite the beauty of St. Lawrence. Do the will of the people not the developers!

**Bill Walz
Asheville**

Ben Fulmer

From: Keldwyn Teves <keldwyn@bellsouth.net> on behalf of Keldwyn Teves
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 9:20 AM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov
Subject: St Lawrence property

Please please please listen to the thousands of residents who have let you know over and over and over that we need and want this to be a Green space.

Our downtown is overdeveloped with hotels, stores, etc.

Last summer I tried to go downtown on a Tuesday at 1:30 to watch a film at the Fine Arts and there was not one parking space in the entire downtown area. I drove around for over 35 minutes, and finally had to come home.

Our city is no longer resident friendly during tourist season. Are we ONLY a tourist destination or do those who live here deserve some amenities we can use and enjoy? Is developer money the only thing you listen to and care about? Please listen to us. Give us this very small parcel of land for beauty and respite from the towering hotels.

With hope
Keldwyn Teves

Ben Fulmer

From: Bev O <theschlag@aol.com> on behalf of Bev O
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 8:54 AM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov
Subject: GREENSPACE

Please do not waste anymore time deciding this. The city NEEDS to provide green space downtown and the St. Lawrence property is the perfect place for it. DO THE RIGHT THING NOW!
Truly,
Bev Ohler

Ben Fulmer

From: Cynthia Heil <cheil17@att.net> on behalf of Cynthia Heil
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 8:46 AM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov
Subject: Green space at St. Lawrence

Please consider making Asheville a city for its residents, not developers, chain businesses, and tourists. They all have quite a chunk of our city now. We would like to keep what little is left for the people who live here, people who have a vested interest in our city, people who VOTE here.

Please consider the downtown residents who want a green space, maybe even a place where they can have a community garden.

Please give the residents a park at the subj. location.

Cindy Heil

Asheville, NC 28806

Ben Fulmer

From: DONALD HARLAND <dharland@bellsouth.net> on behalf of DONALD HARLAND
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 8:41 AM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov
Subject: St Lawrence Park

The City owned property in St. Lawrence should be green space. We do not need more buildings, hotels, or retail outlets in this area.

Donald Harland
Candler, NC

Ben Fulmer

From: juli Fleur <jewelfleur@hotmail.com> on behalf of juli Fleur
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 8:38 AM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov
Subject: RE St Lawrence Green

To whom it may concern,

I believe the green area should be reserved only for a park. We have enough building happening in Asheville - more green space is always a good thing. Spaces to sit and reflect and take a rest whether you are a tourist or local are needed - sometimes its hard to decide where to eat and you need a place to sit and think about it. Or maybe your cranky kid needs to run free for a bit. Im sure there are many good reasons to create a green space in that spot.

Juli Hoyer

Asheville Resident

Sent from [Outlook](#)

Ben Fulmer

From: Claire S <claire28803@yahoo.com> on behalf of Claire S
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 8:20 AM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov
Subject: Green Space Attn: J. Mayfield

Now that we have so many new hotels, surely there is enough tax revenue to create green space across from St Lawrence. Please don't let the citizens of Asheville down on this.

Also I understand that Julie Mayfield is the council member most involved with directing funds collected from the hotel tax. PLEASE devote some of these funds to fixing the sidewalks in Biltmore Village used everyday by visitors to our city. It is only a matter of time before the city is sued for these unsafe walkways.

*Thank you,
C.V. Schnedler*

Ben Fulmer

From: maryahecker@aol.com
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 8:18 AM
To: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov
Subject: Please place only a park at St Lawrence Green

Please show Western North Carolina that our local governments care more about the physical and emotional well being of its people than real estate greed.

I was born in NC 55 years ago and I firmly believe that real estate greed has about destroyed Asheville, Hendersonville and the natural environment of NC. If

Asheville is a GREEN city it does not need business at this site. If its officials were forward thinking they would recognize that a GREEN SPACE on this site

will make it more attractive to tourist, residents, and business. Have they heard that some of the most attractive, expensive built communities now include

a real organic garden in the middle. St Louis has several worthwhile parks and a Botanical Garden. Asheville has a minuscule Botanical Garden and small

city parks. The Green Space will also allow one of Asheville's most beautiful historic landmarks to be highlighted. People can go to other cities and states to

shop at the type of businesses or live in the condos some want to put on this site. If you will allow it to exist only in

Asheville will people be able to relax and

meditate in St. Lawrence Green.

Please Give Western NC this GREEN SPACE.

Mary A. G. Hecker

Ben Fulmer

From: Dean Pistor <Dean@realtyworldmarketplace.com> on behalf of Dean Pistor
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2017 11:26 AM
To: Bob Pierce;Dean Pistor;Helen Hyatt;Keith Young;Pat Dennehy;Sheneika Smith;Tiffany DE'Bellott;Todd Dunnuck;Zachary Eden;ZaKiya Bell-Rogers
Subject: RAB Members - Update

The Haywood St / Page Ave Advisory Board.

The Board is coming up on its last meeting this coming Monday. There have been some vigorous attacks aimed at disrupting the focus of the group's mission over the most recent course of events. There has been one committee member that has consistently gone against the mission of consensus during our meetings and one Council member, in support of the individual member's position, that is attempting to undermine the results coming up on the final presentation. Unfortunately, with a poor choice of words, I spoke quietly in the ear of this councilman as I witnessed him comingling and perhaps unduly influencing members as a guest at our workshop.

I apologize that my question was quoted out of context and made public; it was a sincerely concerned question in a joking whisper in the ear of the councilman about the member in question that was meant to acknowledge the strong resistance and unwillingness to budge or coexist cooperatively with the group as a whole.

I forward this message below as an example and one that was already made public in the e-mail stream to make you aware of the current questions being asked of the director of Asheville Design Center.

As the RAB Board member selected to represent RAB, my position has been for green space supported by Public and Private partnership offering a mix of uses that protect a view shed and brings eyes on a park center with mix use infill development. My focus has been on the desires of the community to preserve a green space as well as the budgets and tasks ahead of the Parks and Rec and the COA as invested. I recommended Privately funded Green Space required in the conditions offered to developers that is open to the public, meets the desires of the community to the best possible design for such and is maintained by the owner or building owners in a common area maintenance agreement.

I will forward the minutes of the last 3 meetings to our RAB board for your perusal and if anyone has comments please email me individually and I will do my best to answer your questions or provide your opinion as a group in the closing meeting.

My goal has been to provide knowledgeable input and quantify the public's opinions as presented. I hope the most recent events don't take away from the successful process over the last 10 months and the hard work by this board with the mission it was tasked while weaving the community as a whole thru consensus.

Sincerely yours in service,

Dean

Dean Pistor
Broker / Owner
Realty World Marketplace
One Page Ave Ste 109
Asheville NC 28801
Located in the Historic Grove Arcade
Office - 828.251.2507
Cell - 828.230.4422

From: Chris Joyell [mailto:chris@ashevilledesigncenter.org]

Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2017 7:13 AM

To: Alan Glines; Andrew Fletcher; Brendan Ross; Bud Hansbury; Corey Atkins; Cynthia Sampson; Dana Frankel; David Nutter; Dawa Hitch; Dean Pistor; Diana Davidson; Eric Perless; Geronimo Owen; Jaan Ferree; Jay Fields; Jeremy Goldstein; Joel Storrow; Jon Creighton; Julie Nelson; Marian Smith; Meghan Rogers; Michael Donohue; Michael McDonough; Rachael Bliss; Ruth Summers; Shannon Capezzali; Sue Robbins; Susan Andrew; Todd Okolichany; Tom Gallaher; William Eakins; Yvonne Cook-Riley

Cc: Alan McGuinn; Cindy Gray; Dave Johnson; Gardner Goodall; Guillo Rodriguez; Kendra Sarvadi; Kevin Teater; Leah Noel; Luly Abaira; Margot Ammidown Carlebach; Pierce Foster; Reb Haizlip; Roxanne Snider; Samuel Fleming; Tania McCamy; Esther Manheimer

Subject: Re: Questions

Thanks for your questions, Julie. Since I would assume that others on the team may be harboring the same questions, I thought it would make sense to reply to the full group. And I apologize for not responding sooner, but, because of the recent developments, my workload has unexpectedly grown, making it more and more difficult to get to my core responsibilities in a timely manner. [My responses will be in blue.](#) -- Chris

1. Can you explain to me how an AT member was allowed to add a residential bubble to the vision diagram after the meeting had adjourned and then that vision was sent out as representative of the entire group?

[This is an inaccurate account of the meeting on Mar 1. Please go to the Dropbox Folder: Haywood Visioning Process/Advisory Team/AC Mtg 17-03-01/Audio 17-03-01.m4a](#), where you'll find the audio recording of the meeting. I'll direct you to 1hr 15m 45s into the audio, where upon concluding the vision statement exercise, I asked the team to go up and inspect the bubble diagram Luly Abaira had just completed to ensure its accuracy. By my account, I can detect Susan, Ruth, Geronimo, Dean, Andrew, Diana, Michael D., and two other voices (Brendan, Mike McD.?) contributing to the conversation. You'll find at 1:19:15 the conversation around housing comes up. Please listen to how the conversation resolves in apparent agreement for its inclusion.

[LINK TO THE DROPBOX FOLDER](#)

2. Could you please send me a list of which AT members attended the visioning session on 3/1/17 and which AT members attended the visioning session on 3/6/17? I found it unsettling that there were at least a couple of members at our 3/6 meeting dominating the group discussion who had already had their say at the 3/1 meeting. Because of that, our group was divided as to what to do, so at the end of our meeting on 3/6/17, we had run out of time and the bubble diagram was left untouched. Were there any members who were unable to attend either session? If so, how was their input incorporated?

[For the attendees at the Mar 1 meeting, please refer to the minutes I circulated yesterday.](#)

[Since we did not have a quorum at the Mar 6 meeting, we did not record minutes \(but we did record the audio from the meeting, which can be found in the Dropbox folder: Haywood Visioning Process/Advisory Team/AC Mtg 17-03-06-alt/Audio 17-03-06.m4a\).](#)

For the Mar 6 meeting, here's who we had in attendance...

AT members: Rachael Bliss, Diana Davidson* (for Sue Robbins), Mike Donohue*, Andrew Fletcher*, Jeremy Goldstein, Julie Nelson, Dave Nutter, Ruth Summers* (* = repeat)

COA rep: Dana Frankel

ADC reps: Luly Abaira, Sam Fleming, Tom Gallaher, Cindy Gray, Chris Joyell, Guillo Rodriguez, Roxanne Snider

Guests: Cecil Bothwell, Vijay Kapoor, Rich Lee, Joe Fioccola

I'll note that your alternate, Eric Peerless, was present at the 3/1 meeting, so Friends of St. Lawrence Green also had representation at both meetings. The only member who was unable to attend either meeting was Bud Hansbury, who I conferred with separately. He was pleased with the work of the Advisory Team on 3/1, and I will be meeting with him again this morning to make sure all his concerns are being addressed.

3. When was the decision made for AT members to reference only the tabulations of the sticky notes for the final vision? Why was this decision made? And by whom?

I don't recall ever saying this, but please feel free to direct me to the minutes/audio where I said that. I think I've been consistent in saying that you are free to consider the input collected by ADC, including the 572 sticky notes collected at PPS, BBT and LEAF, along with the 37 emails that are all recorded in the H-P Feedback Database. In addition, I've added 193 comments from the Mar 8 public presentation to the database. I may sound like a broken record saying this, but I really encourage all of you to read the actual comments we've received. No summary can supplant the knowledge and insight you'll gain by reading the verbatim comments of your fellow Ashevilleians. I have been consistent in saying that they are not prescriptive, but meant to inform your decisions.

The results of the Activity Preference Survey have been available since November, and can be found in Dropbox: Haywood Visioning Process/Public Input/Activity Preference Survey/Haywood St survey results Open City Hall Asheville.docx. I have discarded the ADC effort to code responses to this survey for a couple reasons: 1) We were forcing comments thru a filter that was designed to capture input responding to the question: "What do you want to do here?" Since comments in the APS were provided in response to specific images, I realized that this coding effort was not helpful in understanding the results from the survey, 2) I received direct feedback from you (in person) and Councilman Bothwell, via a comment left in DropBox that read:

This compilation is clearly inaccurate. In the actual survey results the word PLAZA only comes up in question #15, and it is not a **BOLDED** word -hence it should be an **EXTENSION** here, not a **PRIMARY**. And where did the underground parking come from? Don't see it anywhere in the reported results. And how did pop-ups get conflated with "mixed use" in the second block here? Mixed use and multi-use are not the same thing.

I felt you both made some valid points that reinforced the futility of attempting to code these comments, so I removed the coding summary from consideration. You are encouraged to consider the results of the APS. I would never say that AT members should ignore that input (1,019 respondents, 537 registered users).

I also made mention of other sources of data, including the Friends of St. Lawrence Green 2015 survey, ADA's recent survey, DARN's internal survey, Vanderbilt's internal survey and other sources that exist, and that you were at liberty to

draw from those sources as well. I made reference to those sources in the January minutes, but you asked that I remove them, and I have.

4. Why wasn't the AT emailed a copy of the bubble diagram that was shown at the public meeting on 3/8/2017 prior to that meeting? The bubble diagram that was shown was not the same one that I saw at the end of our meeting on 3/6/17. Who changed it? Who made one large bubble combining the (4) Education, Business incubator, Local Retail and Local food that used to be separate? Who added the term housing to that same bubble? Who changed the word residential to housing? Who added the word mixed use to that bubble? Soon, I we will be asked to vote on the final vision and with all of those ideas enveloped in one large "mixed use" bubble, it appears we will be forced to vote either/ or with controversial "residential"- (now named housing) clumped in.

ADC designer Luly Abaira completed the bubble diagram image at 1AM on the morning of Mar 8. I'll remind you that Luly is a volunteer with a day job, and this was the earliest she could get to it.

The ADC team and City staff, all of whom are very familiar with how bubble diagrams function, felt that the diagram we produced from the Mar 1 meeting could be interpreted too literally--mixed use bubbles encircling the civic space--to the point that it connoted design. It was suggested that to make the diagram more abstract, we should include all the mixed use functions in one bubble. In an effort to achieve clarity, I decided that the bubble should be labeled "mixed use" because that describes the functions depicted in the bubble. From the conversation on Mar 1 and the email discussion that followed, it was clear that team members

We are now creating a table of uses and amenities for the meeting on Mon, Mar 20. That should help the team parse out the various proposed elements. Bubble diagrams are useful to designers, but our presentation on Mar 8 informed us that the public had difficulty comprehending the diagram's purpose and function. We still intend to include a bubble diagram in the final report (as designers will benefit from its inclusion), but the table will make that information much more accessible to the public.

5. Both you and Andrew announced at the public meeting that 600 sticky notes were collected and tabulated. I have never heard that number before. It was always 500 sticky notes. Is it 500 or 600? Where did the extra hundred come from?

Please see my response to Q.3. Or refer to the public input database that you've had access to for nearly six months. I believe if you go back and listen to the audio from our meetings, you'll see that I have been saying "roughly 600 stickies" since we collected the data in August.

6. Why aren't the AT members shown emails, letters, reports, bubble diagrams, graphs, or presentations to City Council or the public in advance? Why do we have to attend the council meeting or public meeting to find out what is being presented? Why was council sent a report supposedly from the AT without our knowledge or being given a copy? Just because we have a "spokesperson" for our group, does not mean we shouldn't be privy to anything (in advance) that goes out to Council or the Public on our "behalf."

Time constraints, labor constraints, and the endless process of 17 people editing anything. When the Advisory Team meets and takes part in activities that spell out these reports, diagrams, etc, we then do our best to reproduce that input in the form of reports, diagrams, etc. I would be inviting a monumental task in asking 17 members to then edit the work, and still have enough time to produce a final version for presentation.

7. We always seem to run short of time and have to scramble to complete important tasks quickly at the end of meetings. In order to avoid this, could you please tell us before hand in detail, what form the final meeting on 3/20/17 will take? Since we do not have consensus, how will we come to a final bubble diagram and vision? If we take a vote, will we vote on each bubble? On each word inside the bubble? Will the votes be written, verbal or a raise of hands? Will the votes be anonymous? When will we be given the written vision statement? Some members expressed interest in helping write the vision statement, how will input be received and incorporated? When will we see the written narrative regarding the bubble diagram?

You are correct in observing that we have had trouble sticking to our agenda. I can assure you that that will not be the case on Mar 20. We will attempt to reach consensus on every part of the final report, including the vision statement, site analysis, and program. When we begin the review of each section, we will ask for a straw poll (show of hands) to gauge consensus. If we believe we are close, we will try to identify the sticking points that are preventing the group from reaching consensus. If after a brief discussion around those sticking points (for instance, what is meant by "education"), we determine that consensus is unachievable, we will have a vote, seeking a supermajority. For our purposes, a supermajority is defined as two-thirds votes, similar to the requirement to amend the US Constitution, ratify a treaty, or override a presidential veto (I think we have some good precedents there). In our case, with Buncombe County officially removing itself from the Advisory Team, we are left with 17 voting members. A supermajority will constitute 12 votes. Those dissenting votes will be recorded (by name) and each dissenting vote will have a limited time to state their concerns, which will be recorded and included in the final report.

We're working on the narrative for the program (aka bubble diagram). I circulated a draft of the vision statement yesterday. I'll do my best to incorporate the input of the group, noting that 17 people wordsmithing a statement can become unwieldy. Again, the goal is consensus, but we can move to a vote if necessary.

On Sun, Mar 12, 2017 at 3:34 AM, Julie <mountainsbeach@gmail.com> wrote:

March 12, 2017

Hi Chris,

Hope you are doing well. A lot has happened in the last week in regard to the AT. Before we move forward to the last meeting of the AT on 3/20/17, I have a lot of questions about the process—what has occurred recently and what will take place on 3/20/17.

During our Saturday workshop on 2/18/17- we spent most of the day broken up into groups, moving from table to table and creating flip chart pages of uses and amenities. At the end of the day, we were broken up into 3 tables to create vision bubble diagrams using the flip chart information.

The table I was at was not referring to the flip chart pages to guide the vision, some members just started adding things like parking and museum. At the next meeting on 3/1/17 in which only part of

the AT could attend, the 3 bubble diagrams were distilled into one. Parking, museum and residential did not make the cut.

I heard that the meeting had ended, folks had dispersed and a bubble entitled residential was added to the vision by an AT member. This diagram was then sent out in an email by you and depicted as the work of the entire group, to the remainder of AT.

In that same email, you asked the remainder of us to review the sticky note tabulation results prior to our next meeting on 3/6/17 with no mention of us reviewing the APS tabulation results.

Thinking maybe this was an oversight, I sent out an email to you and the group, reminding everyone of the top three overall public input results from sticky notes & APS.

At the onset of the meeting on 3/6/17, you announced that my email to the group produced an “elephant in the room.” I was then asked to “explain” my email. When I reiterated the importance for the AT to look at both sticky note & APS results, I was informed that the AT is not using the results of the APS in regard to our final vision, only the sticky notes. I was really surprised and confused by this.

1. Can you explain to me how an AT member was allowed to add a residential bubble to the vision diagram after the meeting had adjourned and then that vision was sent out as representative of the entire group?
2. Could you please send me a list of which AT members attended the visioning session on 3/1/17 and which AT members attended the visioning session on 3/6/17? I found it unsettling that there were at least a couple of members at our 3/6 meeting dominating the group discussion who had already had their say at the 3/1 meeting. Because of that, our group was divided as to what to do, so at the end of our meeting on 3/6/17, we had run out of time and the bubble diagram was left untouched. Were there any members who were unable to attend either session? If so, how was their input incorporated?
3. When was the decision made for AT members to reference only the tabulations of the sticky notes for the final vision? Why was this decision made? And by whom?
4. Why wasn't the AT emailed a copy of the bubble diagram that was shown at the public meeting on 3/8/2017 prior to that meeting? The bubble diagram that was shown was not the same one that I

saw at the end of our meeting on 3/6/17. Who changed it? Who made one large bubble combining the (4) Education, Business incubator, Local Retail and Local food that used to be separate? Who added the term housing to that same bubble? Who changed the word residential to housing? Who added the word mixed use to that bubble? Soon, I we will be asked to vote on the final vision and with all of those ideas enveloped in one large "mixed use" bubble, it appears we will be forced to vote either/ or with controversial "residential"- (now named housing) clumped in.

5. Both you and Andrew announced at the public meeting that 600 sticky notes were collected and tabulated. I have never heard that number before. It was always 500 sticky notes. Is it 500 or 600? Where did the extra hundred come from?

6. Why aren't the AT members shown emails, letters, reports, bubble diagrams, graphs, or presentations to City Council or the public in advance? Why do we have to attend the council meeting or public meeting to find out what is being presented? Why was council sent a report supposedly from the AT without our knowledge or being given a copy? Just because we have a "spokesperson" for our group, does not mean we shouldn't be privy to anything (in advance) that goes out to Council or the Public on our "behalf."

7. We always seem to run short of time and have to scramble to complete important tasks quickly at the end of meetings. In order to avoid this, could you please tell us before hand in detail, what form the final meeting on 3/20/17 will take? Since we do not have consensus, how will we come to a final bubble diagram and vision? If we take a vote, will we vote on each bubble? On each word inside the bubble? Will the votes be written, verbal or a raise of hands? Will the votes be anonymous? When will we be given the written vision statement? Some members expressed interest in helping write the vision statement, how will input be received and incorporated? When will we see the written narrative regarding the bubble diagram?

I thank you in advance for taking the time to answer these questions in an effort to clarify things.

Respectfully,

Julie Nelson

AT member

--

Chris Joyell, Executive Director
Asheville Design Center
67 Broadway Street
Asheville 28801

Mailing Address:
PO Box 1524
Asheville, NC 28802

Cell: [828.782.7894](tel:828.782.7894)

chris@ashevilledesigncenter.org
www.ashevilledesigncenter.org

Ben Fulmer

From: Julie <mountainsbeach@gmail.com> on behalf of Julie
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2017 3:25 PM
To: esthermanheimer@avlcouncil.com; gwenwisler@avlcouncil.com;mailto:Cecil Bothwell;brianhaynes@avlcouncil.com;juliemayfield@avlcouncil.com;gordonsmith@avlcouncil.com;keithyoung@avlcouncil.com
Subject: Julie Nelson Haywood St. Advisory Task Force
Attachments: March 12 questions to Chris.docx

Dear Mayor, Vice Mayor and Council Members,

I am forwarding this email with attachment to each of you as an example of what I have personally had to do for 9 months to get to the truth of what is going on in these task force meetings (and maybe more importantly) in between the meetings. Chris Joyell has not responded to my questions as of the writing of this email.

The questions I am asking Chris are not because I have missed a meeting or failed to take notes at a meeting, it is because this task force seems to be operating on its own and I am trying to find out why.

I have not missed one task force meeting in 9 months. In addition to task force meetings, we had subcommittee meetings- in which I missed one. I attended both City Council meetings in which we presented the temporary installation ideas and the recent public presentation of the draft vision on 3/8/17. I have notes from every meeting, emails, photos, tape recordings, etc. that document my deep concerns about the processes that have led to the "draft" vision and ultimately will lead to what will be presented to you on 3/28/17 as the "final" vision.

I have nothing personal to gain financially, politically or otherwise from serving on this task force and I serve on no other boards or commissions. I am simply an Asheville resident who has given freely and generously of my time as a volunteer on behalf of the greater good of the residents of Asheville and have been burnt in the process.

Let's not let Councilman Bothell's letter detract from the real story here. I, as a volunteer on a council appointed citizen task force, during meetings, have been publicly bullied, belittled and silenced with no intervention from the paid group facilitator Chris Joyell or chairman Andrew Fletcher.

Dean Pistor calls me a bitch during a meeting and he explains it away by calling it “ a poor choice of words for a friendly exchange...” Respect for another task force member is not demonstrated in this way and it was in no way friendly.

In addition, the minutes of the meetings never reflected these outbursts of Dean or other members of the task force. When I phoned Chris to ask him why, he simply stated that he “did not want to throw anyone under the bus.”

Although I was at all times in favor of a park- (as the representative for the Friends of St. Lawrence Green and the 5,000 residents who signed petitions asking council to preserve the city owned property for future use as a public green space and opposing the sale of the property for commercial development), if the majority of citizen input reflected differently I was committed to delivering those findings. That's what a democratic process looks like, and it's NOT what happened... Findings were altered or discarded, words were added, input totals & tabulations misrepresented, the city online survey dismissed, meeting minutes left out what happened, were re-worded in a positive light or totally misquoted was actually said, etc.

Task Force members, supported by facilitator Chris Joyell, feel empowered to come to their own decision and NOT act as a representative group. The charts & bubble diagram shown in the public presentation on 3/8/17 were not created by consensus of the task force members nor did they accurately depict publicly derived input.

It saddens me to have to watch this citizen task force process being hijacked. Nine months of time and effort, in my estimation, wasted.

It is my duty to inform, only you can do something about it and it is my sincere hope that you do so.

Sincerely,

Julie Nelson

Asheville City Resident

Haywood Advisory Task Force Member

Attachments area

Ben Fulmer

From: Julie Mayfield <juliemayfield@avlcouncil.com> on behalf of Julie Mayfield
Sent: Saturday, March 11, 2017 6:28 PM
To: 'councilgroup'
Subject: Haywood street process
Attachments: Haywood Mins 3.8 12.8.pdf; Haywood Street Process.docx

Hi all – in an effort to refresh all of our memories about the Haywood Street property discussion, I've attached the minutes from our December 2015 and March 8, 2016 meetings. I have also reviewed the video and summarized both the minutes and video in the attached, bullet-point document. I did not attached the PED minutes, but I summarize them as well, and they are available on the city's website – as are the videos, of course.

My thinking is that gaining a common understanding of where we started and what we asked for will help us find the path forward. I offer this for information only and not discussion by email.

Thanks
Julie

Ben Fulmer

From: Sandra Brooks <sandra@mymosaicrealty.com> on behalf of Sandra Brooks
Sent: Wednesday, March 08, 2017 8:36 AM
To: keithyoung@avlcouncil.com
Subject: Pit of Despair

How long will you do studies and ask for opinions about this? It has been clear for years that most residents want a simple green park to break up the starkness of downtown concrete and provide a safe buffer for St. Lawrence. Please do what is right and vote this way.

Sandra Brooks, Broker
MOSAIC Community Lifestyle Realty

Ben Fulmer

From: Cecil Bothwell <cecil@braveulysses.com> on behalf of Cecil Bothwell
Sent: Tuesday, March 07, 2017 3:06 PM
To: Brian Haynes; Keith Young
Subject: Deeply flawed process

Fellow Council members:

I attended two meetings of the Haywood Street Visioning Task Force, as an observer. I feel I need to inform you all about what I witnessed at their workshop on Saturday, Feb. 18.

This was a full morning meeting, 9 a.m. to 1 p.m., aimed at creating their vision presentation for Council. "Ground Rules" were posted on the wall, starting with a requirement that participants respect each other (and reportedly posted at each meeting).

Twice during the morning, Dean Pistor (appointed as a representative of the Recreation Board), came to whisper in my ear. Gesturing at Julie Nelson he said, "Why did you appoint that bitch? She is f-ing everything up." Then again, with something like the same wording "I can't stand that bitch" etc. What Nelson was doing was quietly representing her view as representative of the Friends of St. Lawrence Green, and referring to the list of preferences expressed by citizens in the various surveys conducted over the past several months.

I suggested that he was telling me more about himself than about Nelson. When I spoke to Nelson about it afterward she told me that his actions over the course of the work had reflected the same attitude, with him calling her down on at least 2 other meetings to the extent that other task force members were uncomfortable. Chris Joyell never stopped him or corrected him during the meetings. This type of behavior thwarts others on the task force from speaking their minds for fear of attack or reprisal. When she discovered that these outbursts and on many occasions other members comments were not recorded in Chris Joyell's minutes of the meetings, Joyell told her that he didn't want to throw anyone under the bus.

As I watched the process on Feb. 18, in which the Task Force was divided into three groups to create "bubble diagrams), I watched Pistor lunge across the table aggressively when Nelson was speaking, putting his fist down. In my view, completely unacceptable.

But further, and this is something that reflects a deeper problem, we appointed Pistor in his capacity as a member of the Recreation Board, which certainly suggested to me that he was there to represent the perspective of that body. However, at that meeting and at a

subsequent meeting I attended on March 3, he insisted on parking, private development, sale of the property, etc. and etc. None of which, to my understanding is in the purview of the Rec Bd. (Perhaps his real estate office location at 1 Page has something to do with his perspective on the site.)

Again, I have learned that this has been his viewpoint from the first meeting and throughout the process.

Nor is this my only concern about the Task Force effort. I have combed through the data provided on Dropbox and compared it to Summary Reports and found that language has morphed, that unrelated ideas have been lumped so that multi-use becomes mixed-use, food trucks and farmers markets called “retail” as if they were the same as store fronts, and etc. As a specific example from the March 3 meeting, after the group had reached agreement on a sort of consensus “bubble diagram” and after I left the meeting (which was supposedly over) and other people including Joyell had left, Pistor and Ruth Summers apparently added “Residential” to the uses listed.

Meanwhile, the survey done via the City Web site was so ambiguous that not only could respondents imbue whatever meaning they liked to the 20 photos, but the interpretation of answers results in pretty much any set of “facts” one wishes to derive. (If for example you lump tailgate market, park benches, and plaza as requests for mixed-use you can use the data to support development. If you add them to the request for green space and shade you can derive an entirely different preference for open space and multi-use. Given the dozens of different views expressed in the survey it would seem that a glossary defining terms would have provided a better starting point.)

To represent results as agreed upon by the entire group when they are altered helter-skelter, and clumped according to someone’s biases, is fraudulent.

Finally, and very troubling to me, is that at least one e-mail to the entire Task Force, includes the apparent intent of Joyell to violate public records law. He wrote:

"THIS INFO IS FOR INTERNAL PURPOSES ONLY--PLEASE DO NOT DISTRIBUTE THIS INFO BEYOND THE TEAM. PLEASE RESPECT YOUR COLLEAGUES' WORK AND THE PROCESS WE HAVE UNDERWAY. THIS IS ONLY A DRAFT, AND I WANT THE TEAM TO REMAIN CONFIDENT THAT THEY CAN CARRY OUT THEIR WORK WITHOUT THE FACEBOOK PEANUT GALLERY MUDDYING THE WATERS."

I refer you to the law:

§ 132-1. "Public records" defined.

(a) "Public record" or "public records" shall mean all documents, papers, letters, maps, books, photographs, films, sound recordings, magnetic or other tapes, electronic data-processing records, artifacts, or other documentary material, regardless of physical form or characteristics, made or received pursuant to law or ordinance in connection with the transaction of public business by any agency of North Carolina government or its subdivisions. Agency of North Carolina government or its subdivisions shall mean and include every public office, public officer or official (State or local, elected or appointed), institution, board, commission, bureau, council, department, authority or other unit of government of the State or of any county, unit, special district or other political subdivision of government.

Perhaps we need to see all of the e-mails related to this Task Force?

Cecil Bothwell
cecil@braveulysses.com
cecilbothwell.com
828-713-8840
POB 1877
Asheville 28802

Ben Fulmer

From: Keith Young <keithyoung@avlcouncil.com> on behalf of Keith Young
Sent: Friday, April 15, 2016 11:08 AM
To: Kjgent81@gmail.com
Subject: Fwd: May Vacancies for City Boards & Commissions
Attachments: bdapptments1.doc

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "Maggie Burleson" <MBurleson@ashevillenc.gov>
Date: Apr 15, 2016 8:21 AM
Subject: May Vacancies for City Boards & Commissions
To: "Brian Haynes" <brianhaynes@avlcouncil.com>, "Cecil Bothwell - Email" <cecil@braveulysses.com>, "Esther Manheimer" <esthermanheimer@avlcouncil.com>, "Gordon Smith" <gordonsmith@avlcouncil.com>, "Gwen Wisler" <gwenwisler@avlcouncil.com>, "Julie Mayfield" <juliemayfield@avlcouncil.com>, "Keith Young" <KeithYoung@avlcouncil.com>
Cc:

Please circulate as much as possible.

Thanks,

Maggie

Maggie Burleson, MMC, NCCMC

City Clerk

City of Asheville

Post Office Box 7148

Asheville, N.C. 28802

828-259-5601 (phone)

828-259-5499 (fax)

Ben Fulmer

From: Maggie Burleson <MBurleson@ashevillenc.gov> on behalf of Maggie Burleson
Sent: Friday, April 15, 2016 8:21 AM
To: Brian Haynes; Cecil Bothwell - Email; Esther Manheimer; Gordon Smith; Gwen Wisler; Julie Mayfield; Keith Young
Subject: May Vacancies for City Boards & Commissions
Attachments: bdapptments1.doc

Please circulate as much as possible.

Thanks,
Maggie

Maggie Burleson, MMC, NCCMC
City Clerk
City of Asheville
Post Office Box 7148
Asheville, N.C. 28802
828-259-5601 (phone)
828-259-5499 (fax)

Ben Fulmer

From: Gwen Wisler <gwenwisler@avlcouncil.com> on behalf of Gwen Wisler
Sent: Wednesday, April 06, 2016 6:49 PM
To: mary hugenschmidt; Esther Manheimer; Gordon Smith; Keith Young; Brian Haynes; Julie Mayfield; Cecil Bothwell
Subject: Re: At-Large Nomination, Asheville Design Center's Committee, Haywood Street Property

Thank you, Ms Hugenschmidt. We appreciate your input.
Best,
Gwen Wisler

On 4/6/2016 5:41 PM, mary hugenschmidt wrote:

My husband and I have been residents of Asheville for over forty years and clearly remember the dismal, lifeless downtown area with its empty, boarded up buildings. It had few public spaces, and no places with trees or plants or spots for people to sit and enjoy the city. As urban trends turn to accessibility, healthy environments, the function of natural elements in city design, and respect for historic places, incorporating green areas has risen in importance to both a city's health and to its appeal.

I am also a volunteer with the Buncombe County Extension Master Gardeners. **Gary Anderson**, one of my fellow volunteers has applied to be an at-large member on the committee led by ADC to determine the use for the vacant property on Haywood Street across from the Civic Center and the historic St. Lawrence Basilica. As you can see from his application, Gary has a significant amount of experience working with public projects. I would like to strongly encourage you to vote for him as one of the at-large members. The bullets below describe how both the city of Asheville and the Extension Master Gardeners can benefit from Gary's contributions to the committee.

The city of Asheville could benefit from participation of EMGVs in the following ways:

1. The creation of a vibrant green space would not only reflect the beauty of the city but would provide residents and visitors a living interaction site maintained by trained volunteers sharing research-based gardening knowledge and information through four seasons.
2. There are over 100 Buncombe County Master Gardeners with decades of proven commitment willing to use their varied backgrounds and education to design, plant, and maintain a downtown garden site.
3. Gardens that combine horticulture with art, education, and design that would be available to residents and visitors of all ages and all backgrounds, integrating and showcasing the efforts of local entities in the arts, such as museums, libraries, the symphony, schools, etc.

The Extension Master Gardener Volunteers would benefit in the following ways:

1. A way to further the Master Garden mission which is to provide research-based urban horticulture education and gardening support to city and county residents.
2. A demonstration garden geographically convenient in a downtown location for many master gardeners to support.
3. An opportunity to interact with local gardeners and gain insights on their current gardening questions in order to adapt the EMG programs in a way that best serves the community.
4. Increasing the reach and visibility of the EMG program by working with arts councils, museums, landscape architects and local artists.

Thank you for your consideration of **Gary Anderson** as an **at-large member of the Asheville Design Center's Committee** on ways to develop the Haywood Street Property.

,

Mary Hugenschmidt
437 Beaverdam Road
Asheville, 28804

Ben Fulmer

From: mary hugenschmidt <hugenmb@gmail.com> on behalf of mary hugenschmidt
Sent: Wednesday, April 06, 2016 5:41 PM
To: Esther Manheimer;Gwen Wisler;Gordon Smith;Keith Young;Brian Haynes;Julie Mayfield;Cecil Bothwell
Subject: At-Large Nomination, Asheville Design Center's Committee, Haywood Street Property

My husband and I have been residents of Asheville for over forty years and clearly remember the dismal, lifeless downtown area with its empty, boarded up buildings. It had few public spaces, and no places with trees or plants or spots for people to sit and enjoy the city. As urban trends turn to accessibility, healthy environments, the function of natural elements in city design, and respect for historic places ,incorporating green areas has risen in importance to both a city's health and to its appeal.

I am also a volunteer with the Buncombe County Extension Master Gardeners. **Gary Anderson**, one of my fellow volunteers has applied to be an at-large member on the committee led by ADC to determine the use for the vacant property on Haywood Street across from the Civic Center and the historic St. Lawrence Basilica . As you can see from his application, Gary has a significant amount of experience working with public projects. I would like to strongly encourage you to vote for him as one of the at-large members. The bullets below describe how both the city of Asheville and the Extension Master Gardeners can benefit from Gary's contributions to the committee.

The city of Asheville could benefit from participation of EMGVs in the following ways:

1. The creation of a vibrant green space would not only reflect the beauty of the city but would provide residents and visitors a living interaction site maintained by trained volunteers sharing research-based gardening knowledge and information through four seasons.
2. There are over 100 Buncombe County Master Gardeners with decades of proven commitment willing to use their varied backgrounds and education to design,plant, and maintain a downtown garden site.
3. Gardens that combine horticulture with art, education, and design that would be available to residents and visitors of all ages and all backgrounds, integrating and showcasing the efforts of local entities in the arts, such as museums, libraries, the symphony, schools, etc.

The Extension Master Gardener Volunteers would benefit in the following ways:

1. A way to further the Master Garden mission which is to provide research-based urban horticulture education and gardening support to city and county residents.
2. A demonstration garden geographically convenient in a downtown location for many master gardeners to support.
3. An opportunity to interact with local gardeners and gain insights on their current gardening questions in order to adapt the EMG programs in a way that best serves the community.
4. Increasing the reach and visibility of the EMG program by working with arts councils, museums, landscape architects and local artists.

Thank you for your consideration of **Gary Anderson** as an **at-large member of the Asheville Design Center's Committee** on ways to develop the Haywood Street Property.

Mary Hugenschmidt
437 Beaverdam Road
Asheville, 28804

Ben Fulmer

From: Robert Pierce <bpierce366@gmail.com> on behalf of Robert Pierce
Sent: Tuesday, April 05, 2016 9:12 PM
To: Todd Okolichany
Cc: Dean Pistor;Helen Hyatt;Keith Young
Subject: Re: Haywood Street Community Visioning Advisory Team Invite

Todd,

I appreciate your reasoning but, for the record, I disagree with limiting term participation on the Haywood Street Visioning Team to one person per organization. **I propose you make the limit 2 per organization. Logic dictates that 2 heads are better than 1.** My understanding was this team is supposed to represent all ideas and limiting membership stifles that process.

However, as per your directive, I can only designate one RAB representative to be on the Team. I therefore choose **Dean Pistor** to be the RAB representative based on his relevant experience. If you reconsider your position and allow 2 representatives per organization, **Helen Hyatt** would be that second person.

Thanks in advance for your consideration on this.

Bob Pierce
RAB Chair.

On Tue, Apr 5, 2016 at 4:37 PM, Todd Okolichany <TOkolichany@ashevillenc.gov> wrote:

Bob –

Thanks for your nominations and for your enthusiasm (as well as Helen's and Dean's interest) in the Haywood Street visioning effort. We're excited to kick-off this project soon and looking forward to having representation from the Recreation Advisory Board. However, in fairness to the other organizations that are nominating one member to the Advisory Team, I must ask that the Recreation Advisory Board also nominate one person to serve on the team.

The city would like to ensure that there is broad representation on the Advisory Team, but that there is also an equitable distribution of members to ensure that the visioning effort for Haywood is fair and impartial, with no organization having more members on the team than the others.

Thank you for your understanding and I look forward to having either Helen or Dean on the Advisory Team.

Best,

Todd Okolichany, AICP, LEED AP ND

Planning & Urban Design Director

From: Robert Pierce [mailto:bpierce366@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, April 05, 2016 10:45 AM

To: Todd Okolichany <TOkolichany@ashevillenc.gov>

Cc: Helen Hyatt <helenhyatt@charter.net>; Dean Pistor <dean@realtyworldmarketplace.com>; Todd Dunnuck <todd@kenilworthnc.com>; Debbie Ivester <divester@ashevillenc.gov>

Subject: Re: Haywood Street Community Visioning Advisory Team Invite

Todd,

I would like to take the liberty of nominating **both** Helen Hyatt and Dean Pistor from the Recreation Board to be on the Haywood St. Community Visioning Advisory Team. Both of these individuals are well qualified and have volunteered. Dean brings much experience in real estate and land use matters and Helen, being new to Asheville, brings a set of fresh eyes to the table. This will add even more perspective to the what appears to be shaping up as a very diverse Team.

Thanks for all that you do.

Bob Pierce,

Chair

Recreation Advisory Board

On Wed, Mar 23, 2016 at 3:08 PM, Todd Okolichany <TOkolichany@ashevillenc.gov> wrote:

Dear Community Member –

The City of Asheville requests your help in designating one member of your organization to participate on an Advisory Team that will provide input on a visioning process for city owned properties at 68-76 Haywood Street and 33-37 Page Avenue in downtown Asheville (see attached map). The Asheville Design Center (ADC) will lead the visioning process in coordination with City staff.

The Advisory Team will be involved throughout the community visioning process. The scope of the Advisory Team includes, at a minimum, the following:

- Kick-off meeting with ADC and City staff on the project
- Review of site analyses of the Study Area, as submitted by ADC
- Participation in a workshop to explore creative ideas for implementation and management of vibrant civic spaces
- Work in collaboration with the ADC and City staff to plan and implement public visioning workshops
- Review public input and provide feedback to the ADC in the preparation of the final draft visioning document
- Sharing information about the project regularly through community connections

Advisory Team members will need to commit to the process from April 2016 – December 2016. The total hours anticipated to fulfill the role of an Advisory Team member are about 30 hours. In addition to areas of expertise related to your organization, skills in strategic planning, collaboration and public engagement will be especially beneficial to the success of the team.

The outcomes of the visioning process will be designed to inform future actions on the subject sites and surrounding rights-of-way (the “Study Area”), which may include a future design competition and/or a Request for Qualifications/Proposals. Engagement with local stakeholders and property owners will inform a long-term vision for the properties.

At this time, city staff requests your help with designating one member of your organization to serve on the Advisory Team. Your organization’s involvement is important and will give it a voice in the community visioning process for the Study Area. We respectfully request that you submit your nomination by Monday, April 11th to Todd Okolichany, Planning & Urban Design Director, tokolichany@ashevillenc.gov.

The Advisory Team will have representation from the following organizations (in no particular order), plus three at-large members:

- City of Asheville Recreation Board;
- Asheville Downtown Commission;
- Historic Resources Commission of Asheville & Buncombe County (HRC);

- Public Art and Cultural Commission (PACC);
- Buncombe County liaison;
- Asheville Downtown Association;
- The Basilica of St. Lawrence;
- Friends of St. Lawrence Green;
- Grove Arcade;
- Battery Park Hotel/Vanderbilt Apartments representative(s);
- Downtown Asheville Residential Neighbors (DARN);
- Asheville Area Chamber of Commerce;
- U.S. Cellular Center; and,
- Asheville Buskers Collective.

We look forward to your participation!

Best regards,

Todd Okolichany, AICP, LEED AP ND

Director

City of Asheville | Planning & Urban Design

PO Box 7148 | Asheville, NC 28802

ph: [828.259.5840](tel:828.259.5840) | **fax:** [828.250.8945](tel:828.250.8945) | tokolichany@ashevillenc.gov

Ben Fulmer

From: Robert Pierce <bpierce366@gmail.com> on behalf of Robert Pierce
Sent: Friday, March 25, 2016 2:29 PM
To: Barry Mundt;Dean Pistor;Forrest Merithew;Helen Hyatt;Kimberly Reed;Pat Dennehy;Robert Pierce;Todd Dunnuck
Cc: Keith Young;Debbie Ivester
Subject: Fwd: Haywood Street Community Visioning Advisory Team Invite
Attachments: Study Area.pdf

RAB Members,

See Todd Okolichany's message. The City is looking to create an Advisory Team to make a recommendation on what to do with the City-Owned land near the St Lawrence Basilica, and wants a representative from the RAB to be on that team. This is a great opportunity for the RAB to help the City decide the best use of these parcels that have been at the center of some controversy. The members of the team will represent a broad spectrum of opinions on the property so any recommendation will probably be the result of much discussion and compromise.

If anyone is interested, please let me know. I need to let the City know by Monday, April 11 so please let me know by Friday, April 8.

Thanks for all that you do.

Bob Pierce

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Todd Okolichany <TOkolichany@ashevillenc.gov>
Date: Wed, Mar 23, 2016 at 3:08 PM
Subject: Haywood Street Community Visioning Advisory Team Invite
To:

Dear Community Member –

The City of Asheville requests your help in designating one member of your organization to participate on an Advisory Team that will provide input on a visioning process for city owned properties at 68-76 Haywood Street and 33-37 Page Avenue in downtown Asheville (see attached map). The Asheville Design Center (ADC) will lead the visioning process in coordination with City staff.

The Advisory Team will be involved throughout the community visioning process. The scope of the Advisory Team includes, at a minimum, the following:

- Kick-off meeting with ADC and City staff on the project

- Review of site analyses of the Study Area, as submitted by ADC
- Participation in a workshop to explore creative ideas for implementation and management of vibrant civic spaces
- Work in collaboration with the ADC and City staff to plan and implement public visioning workshops
- Review public input and provide feedback to the ADC in the preparation of the final draft visioning document
- Sharing information about the project regularly through community connections

Advisory Team members will need to commit to the process from April 2016 – December 2016. The total hours anticipated to fulfill the role of an Advisory Team member are about 30 hours. In addition to areas of expertise related to your organization, skills in strategic planning, collaboration and public engagement will be especially beneficial to the success of the team.

The outcomes of the visioning process will be designed to inform future actions on the subject sites and surrounding rights-of-way (the “Study Area”), which may include a future design competition and/or a Request for Qualifications/Proposals. Engagement with local stakeholders and property owners will inform a long-term vision for the properties.

At this time, city staff requests your help with designating one member of your organization to serve on the Advisory Team. Your organization’s involvement is important and will give it a voice in the community visioning process for the Study Area. We respectfully request that you submit your nomination by Monday, April 11th to Todd Okolichany, Planning & Urban Design Director, tokolichany@ashevillenc.gov.

The Advisory Team will have representation from the following organizations (in no particular order), plus three at-large members:

- City of Asheville Recreation Board;
- Asheville Downtown Commission;
- Historic Resources Commission of Asheville & Buncombe County (HRC);
- Public Art and Cultural Commission (PACC);
- Buncombe County liaison;
- Asheville Downtown Association;

- The Basilica of St. Lawrence;
- Friends of St. Lawrence Green;
- Grove Arcade;
- Battery Park Hotel/Vanderbilt Apartments representative(s);
- Downtown Asheville Residential Neighbors (DARN);
- Asheville Area Chamber of Commerce;
- U.S. Cellular Center; and,
- Asheville Buskers Collective.

We look forward to your participation!

Best regards,

Todd Okolichany, AICP, LEED AP ND

Director

City of Asheville | Planning & Urban Design

PO Box 7148 | Asheville, NC 28802

ph: [828.259.5840](tel:828.259.5840) | **fax:** [828.250.8945](tel:828.250.8945) | tokolichany@ashevillenc.gov

Ben Fulmer

From: Maggie Burleson <MBurleson@ashevillenc.gov> on behalf of Maggie Burleson
Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2016 11:24 AM
To: Brian Haynes; Cecil Bothwell - Email; Esther Manheimer; Gordon Smith; Gwen Wisler; Julie Mayfield; Keith Young
Subject: April Bd/Com Vacancies
Attachments: bdapptments1.doc

Please circulate as much as possible.

Thanks,
Maggie

Maggie Burleson, MMC, NCCMC
City Clerk
City of Asheville
Post Office Box 7148
Asheville, N.C. 28802
828-259-5601 (phone)
828-259-5499 (fax)

Ben Fulmer

From: Gwen Wisler AVL City Council <gwenwisler@avlcouncil.com> on behalf of Gwen Wisler AVL City Council
Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2016 8:35 AM
To: Maggie Burleson
Cc: Esther Manheimer; Brian Haynes; Cecil Bothwell - Email; Gordon Smith; Julie Mayfield; Keith Young
Subject: Re: Haywood Street Advisory Team Questions for Application

Yes. That's right.
Gwen

On Mar 15, 2016, at 8:27 AM, Maggie Burleson <MBurleson@ashevillenc.gov> wrote:

If I'm understanding Gwen, I could re-word to say "What relationship, if any, do you have with any of the other **Haywood Street** Advisory Team groups?"

Okay?
Thanks,
Maggie

From: Esther Manheimer [<mailto:esthermanheimer@avlcouncil.com>]
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2016 7:14 PM
To: Gwen Wisler; Maggie Burleson; Brian Haynes; Cecil Bothwell - Email; Gordon Smith; Julie Mayfield; Keith Young
Subject: RE: Haywood Street Advisory Team Questions for Application

Do you mean other advisory committees or commissioners? Like downtown commission?

From: Gwen Wisler [<mailto:gwenwisler@avlcouncil.com>]
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2016 4:30 PM
To: Maggie Burleson <MBurleson@ashevillenc.gov>; Brian Haynes <brianhaynes@avlcouncil.com>; Cecil Bothwell - Email <cecil@braveulysses.com>; Esther Manheimer <esthermanheimer@avlcouncil.com>; Gordon Smith <gordonsmith@avlcouncil.com>; Julie Mayfield <juliemayfield@avlcouncil.com>; Keith Young <KeithYoung@avlcouncil.com>
Subject: Re: Haywood Street Advisory Team Questions for Application

What relationship, if any, do you have with any of the other Advisory Team groups?
(I would like to make sure we don't duplicate representation on the Advisory Team.)
Thanks,
Gwen

On 3/14/2016 3:59 PM, Maggie Burleson wrote:

Todd crafted the three questions below to be included with the applications. Please let me know ASAP if these are okay. I need to begin advertising tomorrow (March 15) – with application deadline on April 6 at 5.

Thanks,
Maggie

- a. What do you want the Advisory Team to achieve for this project?
- b. Please describe your experience with conducting or participating in a community visioning process, master plan or other related project. What was the outcome?
- c. As a member of the Advisory Team it is expected that you will be fair and impartial during the community visioning process. Please indicate whether or not you have any conflicts with this statement.

Below will be the statement I use to solicit applications:

1. Scope of the Project:

The City of Asheville will be undertaking a community visioning process for city-owned properties at 68-76 Haywood Street and 33-37 Page Avenue in downtown Asheville. The city has retained the Asheville Design Center (ADC) for this effort, who will work with city staff to facilitate the community visioning process. The outcomes will be designed to inform future actions on the subject sites and surrounding rights-of-way (the "Study Area"), which may include a future design competition and/or a Request for Qualifications/Proposals. The project's scope will include strategic planning and coordination with an Advisory Team, key stakeholders, as well as the broadest community interests who express a desire to participate in an open, democratic "town hall" process of consensus building. Engagement with local stakeholders and property owners will inform a long-term vision for the properties, while also serving to identify opportunities for temporary installations to enliven the space now and suggest appropriate permanent uses on the site over time.

The city envisions that the final deliverable of this project will include a full exploration of site constraints and opportunities and publicly-informed expectations, priorities and considerations for the Study Area. The document will be a culmination of community ideas and strategic planning for the Study Area that will help to inform future actions, rather than determine a definitive design for the Study Area.

2. Scope of the Advisory Team:

ADC will work with city staff to form an Advisory Team for the public visioning process and implementation plan. The Advisory Team will have representation, at minimum, from the following organizations (in no particular order), plus three at-large members:

- City of Asheville Recreation Board;
- Asheville Downtown Commission;
- Historic Resources Commission of Asheville & Buncombe County (HRC);
- Public Art and Cultural Commission (PACC);
- Buncombe County liaison;
- Asheville Downtown Association;
- The Basilica of St. Lawrence;
- Friends of St. Lawrence Green;
- Grove Arcade;
- Battery Park Hotel/Vanderbilt Apartments representative(s);
- Downtown Asheville Residential Neighbors (DARN);
- Asheville Area Chamber of Commerce;

- U.S. Cellular Center; and,
- Asheville Buskers Collective.

The Advisory Team will be involved throughout the community visioning process. The scope of the Advisory Team includes, at a minimum, the following tasks:

- Kick-off meeting with ADC and city staff on the project
- Review of site analyses of the Study Area, as submitted by ADC
- Workshop with the Advisory Team to explore creative ideas for implementation and management of vibrant civic spaces
- A follow-up session with the Advisory Team to explore techniques and best practices for the public visioning workshops
- Input and attendance from the Advisory Team regarding two public workshops
- Follow-up presentation from ADC to Advisory Team to report on the input received from the workshops
- Review of final documentation, as submitted by ADC, that will include a full exploration of site constraints and opportunities and publicly-informed expectations, priorities and considerations for the Study Area, including presentation of the draft visioning document to the Advisory Team by ADC

Maggie Burleson, MMC, NCCMC
 City Clerk
 City of Asheville
 Post Office Box 7148
 Asheville, N.C. 28802
 828-259-5601 (phone)
 828-259-5499 (fax)

Ben Fulmer

From: Cecil Bothwell <cecil@braveulysses.com> on behalf of Cecil Bothwell
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2016 6:44 AM
To: Mark Brenner
Cc: Keith Young;brianhaynes@avlcouncil.com
Subject: Re: Beaucatcher Greenway

Hi again Mark,

I'm not opposed to the Beaucatcher Greenway, I'm concerned about priorities. The plans will not be wasted if we re-order priorities. Engineering is engineering, and putting the plans on the shelf (if a majority on Council agree with me) doesn't mean not doing it.

The \$3.5 million estimate for Beaucatcher (and that is a ballpark price - we'll supposedly have more concrete numbers fairly soon) does not include the destination parks at each end (although we own or have rights of way for the entire project).

How about completing the park at the southwest end first, with access via Reservoir Rd. That way people can drive or bike to the park to enjoy the view. The greenway trail is already used by mountain bike folks and hikers, so that would improve access in the interim.

The TDA grant is for \$1.1 million. That can be renegotiated. The other part of the TDA grant is for an Amboy Rd. section which is already under construction.

The justification for the TDA grant was an estimate that the greenway system would generate 50,000 heads in beds in the first year after completion of those two parts. Frankly, I think that is nutty, but the TDA has its ways of figuring.

In the near term my bet is that the overlook park would generate more tourist traffic than the ridge top greenway - so perhaps we could convince the TDA to let us use the money for the park, instead.

Meanwhile we have riverside greenways that need to be built out, at far lower cost per mile. With the RADTIP project moving forward quickly, my preferred order of construction would be Hominy, then Amboy to Azalea Park along the Swannanoa, then Beaucatcher.

Anyway, that's my current thinking. I'm definitely not anti-park, anti-greenway, anti-exercise, pro-obesity or necessarily right about any of this!

Thanks for weighing in,

-c

On Mar 10, 2016, at 3:31 PM, Mark Brenner <mbrenner@warren-wilson.edu> wrote:

Cecil,

Thanks so much for your very thoughtful response. I really appreciate you taking the time out of what I am sure is a very busy schedule to write a personal reply. I admire your work on City Council, particularly your concerns with environmental issues.

In these times of tight budgets, I am glad that you have concerns about fiscal responsibility.

However, my understanding is that the Tourism Development Authority granted the City \$1.7 million specifically for the Beaucatcher project as part of the River to Ridge initiative. It would not seem like good fiscal policy to turn that money down, in addition to wasting the money already spent for design fees. I appreciate wanting to expand the Hominy Creek Greenway, but West Asheville already has numerous greenways and the neighborhood by the proposed Beaucatcher Greenway is underserved in terms of parks and greenways.

I feel that Beaucatcher does provide connectivity. It is next to downtown, Mission Hospital, McCormick Field, many new apartments, the residential neighborhood around McCorick Field, and close to the soon to be renovated Livingston Apartments which will extend to Biltmore. It will connect to other greenways such as Town Branch Greenway as the system expands. It will connect to two future mountain parks, including White Fawn Park which I believe will be constructed with privately raised money and not City fees.

I respectfully disagree with labeling greenways as high cost "entertainment". In addition to providing transportation options, it would give citizens an opportunity to get exercise and experience the natural world. We have a major obesity problem in the US, and providing easy opportunities for people to exercise has been shown to have major health cost savings. Additionally, greenways make a city more livable and desirable for companies to locate here.

While other greenways could provide this health benefit, what is unique about the Beaucatcher Greenway is its natural setting so close to the urban environment. As a professor of Environmental Studies I have introduced my students to the many studies extolling the positive impact that being in nature has on mental health. The book "Last Child in the Woods" by Richard Louv summarizes much of this information in what he calls Nature Deficit Disorder. Again, it is not simply a psychological benefit. Economists have documented the cost savings from providing urban dwellers with nature experiences, and many people have little opportunities to experience nature in Asheville. This past weekend I volunteered my time teaching science to a group of 7th grade students through a program called BOOST. This program works mostly with urban African American kids from Durham. The kids were awesome, but when we did some field sampling I was shocked to hear how few of the them ever actually got out in nature. The Beaucatcher Greenway would link to a historically African American neighborhood and provide some beneficial nature experience for these residents.

I know you are a strong environmentalist and that you are a big proponent of the St. Lawrence Green, so I'm puzzled at your lack of support for the Beaucatcher Greenway and associated parks. I hope you will see these benefits to our community and reconsider your position on this project.

Respectfully,

Mark

On 3/9/16 7:14 PM, Cecil Bothwell wrote:

Hi Mark,

I support greenways.

My concern about the current plan for Beaucatcher is principally fiscal.

If we build it as planned, together with stormwater controls, it appears the price tag is about \$3.5 million for a 1.5 mile greenway (plus whatever development costs are incurred to develop the two parks.

That is an enormous investment in a section of greenway that doesn't accomplish what we currently intend our greenways to achieve - connectivity. It is essentially an entertainment feature.

For the same money we could complete a lot of the lower elevation connectors we need (for example Hominy Creek deep into West Asheville.)

That's the consideration I've raised - about perhaps postponing Beaucatcher in favor of greenways that will serve more people and be more utilitarian.

Thanks for your comments.

-c

On Mar 9, 2016, at 2:48 PM, Mark Brenner <mbrenner@warren-wilson.edu> wrote:

Mr Bothwell,

I am writing to express my support for the Beaucatcher Greenway. This will be a unique asset for Asheville because it will be the first higher elevation greenway in Asheville, providing access to a natural wooded area just minutes from downtown. It will connect to two future parks with overlooks to enjoy the views of Asheville, which most people can't enjoy without having to drive to a trail. There are a number of apartments and houses being constructed in the area, so this will be beneficial to these residents as well as downtown residents and workers. Asheville is miles and miles behind other progressive cities in terms of constructed greenways, so it is important to continue supporting greenways to not only provide safe and healthy options for transportation and recreation but also to attract businesses and their employees.

Many of the concerns regarding the Beaucatcher Greenway are completely overblown. As an environmental biologist, I can tell you that this is not an old growth forest and the impact over a 1.25 mile stretch of greenway is minimal, since most of it follows an old road bed. I understand that there are four or five condos at the Sky Club whose residents oppose the greenway, but I hope we don't sacrifice this greenway for the sake of a few residents who don't want the greenway coming close to their property.

Just a reminder that every year, greenways are mentioned in the Mountain Xpress Best of WNC lists. The vast majority of Asheville residents want more greenways so I would appreciate you supporting the Beaucatcher Greenway as well as future greenways.

Dr. Mark Brenner

Environmental Studies
Warren Wilson College
828-771-3701

Ben Fulmer

From: Cecil Bothwell <cecilbothwell@gmail.com> on behalf of Cecil Bothwell
Sent: Wednesday, January 27, 2016 2:38 PM
To: Michael Lewis
Cc: councilgroup
Subject: Re: "The Park"

Hi Mike,

I figure different folks might have different facts. Seems to happen a lot these days, at least on the national and state levels.

A while back the City Economic Development Department estimated that a potential big structure there would generate \$60,000 a year in property taxes.

An alternative view is that parks always increase property values in surrounding parcels. So it is arguable that the tax benefits even out, though in hard to quantify ways.

(A further alternative is that the immediate neighbors of the Haywood property include significant nonprofit/tax exempt properties. But taxing churches is not on the City's immediate agenda.)

The best way other cities prevent what you call "a mess" is to activate the spaces. (The national solution is, obviously, to raise the minimum wage and enact a national infrastructure strategy to put people back to work.) Pritchard is deemed a problem due to several interlocking issues. There isn't anything to "do" there, other than to hang out ... except when there are activities like the drum circle, when pretty much no one out of earshot views as a problem.

It is the closest park to the homeless service providers downtown, and when those facilities are closed during the day their clientele congregate in Pritchard and present a visual "mess" whether or not the people present are actually a "problem."

St. Lawrence Green (or whatever name) would be similarly positioned in terms of geography.

One solution to the "mess" issue is to have the space "activated" with installations and activities that draw more "regular" citizens into the mix.

Another is to relocate homeless services out of downtown. (I note that the reason our homeless services are where they are is because Downtown was depressed and cheap. Now it is upscale and rising. I would guess that the service providers will move out of downtown as the real estate market offers fiscal incentives to relocate.) The big picture, as mentioned above, is to disrupt the greed economy, raise the minimum wage, fund infrastructure repairs/improvements ... but I'm sure you're voting for Sanders (with me) so that will solve that.

Many of us have worked toward a public space in front of the Civic Center and Basilica for more than a decade. The DTMP appendices suggest that this location is ideal for a public park.

I think we can make something great happen.

Cheers,

-C

> On Jan 27, 2016, at 10:48 AM, Michael Lewis <mlewis6956@charter.net> wrote:

>

> Looks like the debate over what to do with the property across from the basilica is coming to an end. I probably should have brought this up a long time ago, since I have been thinking about it for a while. Like most issues these days, both sides have their arguments regarding what should be done with the property, but neither side seems to have given a well-rounded presentation to support its position.

>

> Some folks want to sell the property to a developer and see the City reap the tax revenue from whatever structure goes up there. The other side wants to see a greenspace put there. However, nobody seems to have offered an estimate of the tax revenue a structure would generate. Likewise, nobody on the other side has offered a plan to keep the proposed greenspace from becoming a mess like Pritchard Park has become.

>

> Without betraying your hand before the vote, can you tell me the facts? Briefly?

>

> Mike

>

> --

> Michael N Lewis

> 48 Gracelyn Rd.

> Asheville, NC 28804

> 828-252-3684

> mlewis6956@charter.net

>

Ben Fulmer

From: Eloise Brinson <brinsonell@gmail.com> on behalf of Eloise Brinson
Sent: Thursday, January 07, 2016 10:34 AM
To: Cecil
Bothwell;esthermanheimer@avlcouncil.com;keithyoung@avlcouncil.com;gordonsmith@avlcouncil.com;juliemayfield@avlcouncil.com;brianhaynes@avlcouncil.com;gwenwisler@avlcouncil.com
Subject: Re: Park at Basilica

You're Welcome.

On Thu, Jan 7, 2016 at 9:43 AM, Cecil Bothwell <cecil@braveulysses.com> wrote:

My mistake. I see that it is a Presbyterian undertaking.

And thanks for letting me know about your concerns.

-c

On Jan 6, 2016, at 6:17 PM, Eloise Brinson <brinsonell@gmail.com> wrote:

Oh I didn't know it was a Catholic Charity Group. I was under the impression that it was National Church Residences out of Ohio. At least that's who I worked for as a Volunteer downstairs in the central office. I'm not Catholic. I'm not going to get into an argument with you Mr. Bothwell. I live here. I know what goes on. It has to do with Citizen Rights and the people that live in this building are not only Citizens of the Great City of Asheville, NC but also of the Great State of North Carolina and the The Greater United States of America. We have have rights. Even people with Mental Illness. I have that as well (Mental Illness). We get that no one regulates absolutely anything that happens at Battery Park. It is an unfortunate testament to the misunderstood discrepancies of the people of this area. One I thought after all my years of work and service I would not be subject there with.

What I do want to emphasize is that my Opinion on the Public Park has shifted. My votes in the Fall election were based on that opinion. We are in desperate need of affordable parking in Downtown Asheville. We have two Parks currently. From my Understanding the Police Department is having a difficult time maintaining one of them and that costs Tax Payer dollars. I was and still am one of them, A Taxpayer. I like the idea of green space but in reality we are surrounded with it and when I really want to be a part of it I go to the Forest. With the current situation between Battery Park and Vanderbilt I realize that opening a park in this area would open the door for these dejected Smokers to facilitate and fellowship however Non Smokers would probably be a offended. Not to mention maintenance. There is more. I was totally in favor of it but as time goes by I see a side of it that no longer appeals to me. I am from Raleigh and have watched the growth that occurred there over the past 30 years. 10 of which I lived and worked in. I was raised in the country (Wilson County, NC). I came to Asheville like so many others to start over. Find and make my dreams here. For a while that looked like a very real possibility however after the divorce and death of my Late Husband I have been forced into a very bitter reality. This city is not kind to some people. Just like other cities some of us get lost between the cracks. Yet many of these people continue to vote and support Environmental efforts the best way they can. All deserved to be heard.

I understand and appreciate your stance. We are both Peacemakers and have those Wonderful Peace T Shirts from On a Roll. At least that is where mine was purchased. However this is a matter that I feel is shifting into the wrong direction.

I just want to state my opinion. That's your job from the way I understand it. I help elect you with my vote and then possibly you listen to my concerns. Is that a problem Councilman Bothwell ? By the way. You are one of the people I have voted in the past.

I have contacted Dr. Mumpower and N.A.M.I. concerning this situation because it is in my belief that the person concerned in this matter does not have the ability to advocate for her own rights. If it would have been myself I would be doing the same thing that I am doing now . The Bible I read, though not Catholic teaches me that the number one Golden Rule of all time is to "LOVE THY NEIGHBOR AS THYSELF". Just attempting to express a little of that.

Thank you so much for your concern and that of the remaining Council Members. I would love to hear some of their feedback as well.

Sincerely,

Lori
Eloise L. Brinson

On Wed, Jan 6, 2016 at 3:25 PM, Cecil Bothwell <cecil@braveulysses.com> wrote:

Ms. Brinson,

The allocation of apartments in the Battery Park Apartment building is not in any way controlled by the City of Asheville.

If decisions about those apartments are unfair, I am sad to hear it. But that is a matter for the Catholic charity group that owns the building, not the City.

-C

On Jan 6, 2016, at 2:18 PM, Eloise Brinson <brinsonell@gmail.com> wrote:

The Woman that resided in the Roof Garden Apt. Still resides at Battery Park however she was forced to give up her Apt. so and move to the third floor. The Apt. was repaired and then instead of moving the former tenant back in Ms. Hanrahan. When I spoke to the Resident that previously had the apartment today she told me she had not choice in the matter. That's not fair. If the park is a private matter then perhaps it is time to remove it from Public Debate. I for one and sick and tired of listening to it. Especially in light of current Political Shifts.

Thank you,

Lori
Eloise L. Brinson

On Wed, Jan 6, 2016 at 2:10 PM, Cecil Bothwell <cecil@braveulysses.com> wrote:

Ms. Brinson,

My information is that apartment assignments in the Battery Park building are based on tenure and a waiting list. While I am not familiar with details of any particular apartment assignment, I would have to guess that Clare Hanrahan

had put in a request at some point and gradually moved up the list.

As for the City spending millions, it is our hope that development of St. Lawrence Green will be principally funded through private donations.

Best regards,

-c

> On Jan 6, 2016, at 2:02 PM, Eloise Brinson <brinsonell@gmail.com> wrote:

>

> Hello Mayor Manheimer and Respective Council Members,

>

> As I write I am very angry and frustrated. I live at Battery Park. As of today Clare Hanrahan, the Activist fueling much of the Park decision in this area, is being moved to the Roof Garden Apartment at Battery Park. The person that had her new apartment was possibly Mentally Ill and FORCED to give her apartment up. That is not fair.

> I am no longer in favor of the Park Development movement across from Basilica. What I see happening is the City spending Millions of dollars to develop an City Public Ashtray or a space of Hippies, Environmentalists and or Potheads. Not something that would be environmentally sound. It is unfortunate. I did not feel this way at first but base on what I am seeing occur I simply do not agree.

>

> I voted of you currently seated. I know that doesn't really mean anything but at 300 plus lbs. I wanted to weigh in.

>

>

Thank you so much,

>

>

>

Lori

>

Eloise L. Brinson

Ben Fulmer

From: Keith Young <keithyoung@avlcouncil.com> on behalf of Keith Young
Sent: Tuesday, December 29, 2015 2:13 PM
To: Cecil Bothwell
Subject: Re: Two issues and a meeting some time?

On Tue, Dec 29, 2015 at 10:41 AM, Cecil Bothwell <cecil@braveulysses.com> wrote:
good
see you both soon
-C

On Dec 28, 2015, at 3:12 PM, Keith Young <KeithYoung@avlcouncil.com> wrote:

Sounds good Cecil...I'll touch base w/Brian if you have not done so yet.

On Sat, Dec 26, 2015 at 6:40 AM, Cecil Bothwell <cecil@braveulysses.com> wrote:

Hi Keith, Brian,

1. I'd like to put fundraising for St. Lawrence Green on the agenda soon. We don't need a "plan" in order to start raising money, and we ought to start accepting donations while people are excited about the idea.

I would argue we need to create a separate account for donations. If you both agree, I will put it on the agenda.

2. Some Kenilworth residents are very upset about a planned development below Harvest House. Maybe they have contacted you? They've asked me to ask you both if you have time to visit the site.

Meeting?

I'd like to meet with both of you (or each of you, separately) before long — to talk about how we can help each other move issues through Council. Do you have time? My schedule is quite flexible right now.

Merry Christmas and Happy New Year!

-C

Ben Fulmer

From: Cecil Bothwell <cecil@braveulysses.com> on behalf of Cecil Bothwell
Sent: Saturday, December 26, 2015 6:41 AM
To: keithyoung@avlcouncil.com;brianhaynes@avlcouncil.com
Subject: Two issues and a meeting some time?

Hi Keith, Brian,

1. I'd like to put fundraising for St. Lawrence Green on the agenda soon. We don't need a "plan" in order to start raising money, and we ought to start accepting donations while people are excited about the idea.

I would argue we need to create a separate account for donations. If you both agree, I will put it on the agenda.

2. Some Kenilworth residents are very upset about a planned development below Harvest House. Maybe they have contacted you? They've asked me to ask you both if you have time to visit the site.

Meeting?

I'd like to meet with both of you (or each of you, separately) before long — to talk about how we can help each other move issues through Council. Do you have time? My schedule is quite flexible right now.

Merry Christmas and Happy New Year!

-C

Ben Fulmer

From: Cecil Bothwell <cecil@braveulysses.com> on behalf of Cecil Bothwell
Sent: Wednesday, December 09, 2015 10:53 AM
To: Jillian Wolf
Cc: Randal Pfleger (via Google Docs); Mary Lou Kempf; councilgroup
Subject: Re: St. Lawrence Green letter to the City

Hi Jillian,

I'm copying this to all members of City Council.

The process for decision making about St. Lawrence Green has been handed to the Planning and Economic Development Committee (Councilwoman Gwen Wisler - chair).

Since that just occurred last night, no schedule for consideration will be available immediately.

Thanks for the input. The ABFPC is a clear stakeholder in this discussion.

-C

On Dec 9, 2015, at 10:48 AM, \jillian \wolf <bisoncrow@gmail.com> wrote:

Cecil, below is a brief letter we would like to offer up in support of edibles on the St Lawrence land plot. Where do we send it, and what is the deadline?

Jillian Wolf
ABFPC Land Use Cluster

Land Use Cluster of the Asheville Buncombe Food Policy Council

The Land Use Cluster, and the Asheville Buncombe Food Policy Council, is committed to advocating, supporting, and implementing policy to support food systems infrastructure in Asheville and Buncombe County. We foresee vibrant food system infrastructure (production, processing, and distribution facilities) throughout the city and county **on both private and public land**. We recognize that there are many competing possible land uses for the current parking and storage lot across from the Basilica and US Cellular Center. We urge decision-makers and stakeholders to consider the feasibility of including demonstration and production gardens, as well as small fruit plantings on the site, to be designed, installed, and maintained through collaborative community, volunteer, business, and COA efforts.