



**LEESBURG BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
WORK SESSION MINUTES**

**Monday, 04 May 2015
Town Hall, 25 West Market Street
Town Council Chamber**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Edward Kiley, Vice Chairman Paul Reimers, Parliamentarian Dale Goodson, Richard Koochagian, Mark Malloy, Teresa Minchew, Dieter Meyer, Planning Commission Representative Lyndsay Welsh Chamblin, and Town Council Representative Suzanne Fox

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF: Preservation Planner Tom Scofield, Town Legal Assistant Liz Whiting Esq., and Planning & Zoning Assistant Deborah Parry

Call to Order and Roll Call

Chairman Kiley called the meeting to order at 7:00pm, noted attendance and determined that a quorum was present.

Adoption of the Meeting Agenda

On a motion by Mr. Goodson, seconded by Ms. Minchew, the meeting agenda was approved by a 6-0-1 vote (Koochagian absent).

BAR Member Disclosure:

Ms. Minchew stated she will recuse herself from the referral discussion regarding TLZM-2015-0001, Poet's Walk as her husband's law firm is representing the applicant.

Public Hearings on Continued Cases in the H-1 Overlay District:

a. TLHP-2015-0022, 209 Royal Street SE

Project: Install railing on front porch and door on east side; replace windows and siding on enclosed porch

Chairman Kiley noted the public hearing for this application has been closed.

Mr. Scofield stated some elements of the proposal have already been approved, including the front porch repair approved administratively as well as the replacement of the front door and gutters with downspouts approved by the BAR under TLHP-2015-0019. He stated the remaining proposals include installation of a front porch railing on stairs, replacement of windows, conversion of a window to a door on the east side of the house and replacement of siding and reconfiguration of fenestration on the west side enclosed porch. He noted the door has already been installed on the east side as seen in the site visit earlier.

The applicant, Michael Weber, had no additional comments.

Ms. Minchew asked if detailed drawings of the proposed porch railing had been provided.

Mr. Weber stated the railing is a standard 2x4 wood railing with an angled top rail and 1x1x1 posts.

Ms. Minchew asked if staff has conducted an analysis of the railing.

Mr. Scofield stated he requested detailed information regarding the railing at the last meeting; however, it was not provided. He stated the railing seems to be appropriate from the verbal description provided.

Vice Chairman Reimers asked the method of construction for the railing.

Mr. Weber stated the proposed railing is a standard railing kit sold by TW Perry.

Mr. Malloy asked if the photograph provided shows the proposed railing.

Mr. Weber stated the photograph was taken at a house down the street from his; however, the railing is identical to the one he is proposing.

Mr. Goodson stated while he understands the desire for replacement of the windows, he believes they are all repairable. He stated he saw one sill with minimal rot that can be repaired.

Ms. Minchew agreed with Mr. Goodson's comments stating the windows appear to be repairable. She stated she has no problem with the proposed window in the rear.

Mr. Weber asked if the Board takes into consideration the lack of functionality of the windows.

Ms. Minchew stated her belief that the windows are repairable. She stated she has seen other applicants that have fixed just the bottom sash. Further, she stated it is not the purview of the Board to state that the windows have to be operable.

Mr. Koochagian stated he does not believe there was evidence of deterioration to the extent that would require replacement of the windows. He stated he did notice one window where half of the sash stop was missing; however, that is easily replaced. Further, he stated he has no concern with the proposal for the back window.

Vice Chairman Reimers stated there was a window on the lower west side with narrow mullions which does not match any of the other windows and he would be in favor of replacing that window to match the proposed window for the rear.

Ms. Minchew concurred with Vice Chairman Reimers' comments.

Council Member Fox stated she was concerned with the window functionality; however, she understands that is not within the purview of the Board.

Mr. Meyer confirmed Mr. Scofield is in agreement with the window assessment as discussed by the Board.

Council Member Fox asked how the house will appear with different types of windows installed stating that would be of concern to her if she were the homeowner.

Ms. Minchew stated you wouldn't want to have a mix of new and old on the front; however, she does not see an issue with the windows on the side and rear.

Mr. Weber stated he is not opposed to replacing the window on the lower left side as mentioned; however, he would also like to replace the window above it to match.

Ms. Minchew stated her opinion that Mr. Weber would first need to demonstrate that the upper window has the narrower mullions as noted in the lower window and does not match the other windows in the house.

Mr. Koochagian stated from the site visit it appeared that the location of the lower window may have been an open porch at one point which was enclosed whereas the upper portion on the west side could have been a sleeping porch original to the house.

After further discussion it was determined that the upper window should not be replaced unless it is demonstrated that the window is as different from the rest of the house as the lower window is.

Mr. Weber stated he believes the upper window is different and stated he would be willing to work with staff to determine if replacement of that window may be approvable.

Mr. Goodson verified the applicant did not retain the window which was removed from the east side to accommodate the side door installation. Further, he verified the full glass panel door currently installed is the preferred door.

Mr. Koochagian asked if an overhang would be installed over the door.

Mr. Weber stated he hasn't worked out the details yet; however, he would like to install an overhead piece for the side door.

Vice Chairman Reimers stated an overhang would help to break up the massing of the façade.

Ms. Minchew stated she does not believe that the replacement of the window with a door at that location has a negative impact on the house; however, she would've preferred to have had the applicant come for approval before beginning work so that the window could've been retained. She asked the material of the door.

Mr. Weber stated the door is metal with glass in the center and has a wood jam.

Mr. Koochagian expressed concern that the house now has three doors, none of which relate to each other or to the structure.

Mr. Goodson stated he is not concerned with the placement of a door in that location; however, the style of door selected is very contemporary.

Mr. Weber stated this particular door was selected with the intent of bringing natural light into the kitchen.

Mr. Meyer stated his opinion that the door would be a better fit if it were wood.

Mr. Weber noted the door previously installed on the rear enclosed porch was a solid metal door.

Ms. Minchew asked if the rear porch was previously covered with siding.

Mr. Weber stated it was covered with painted plywood.

Mr. Meyer stated the rear porch is a more contemporary addition with limited visibility.

Vice Chairman Reimers confirmed the door currently installed on the rear enclosure is solid wood.

Ms. Minchew noted there is no negative impact in the installation of the current wood door from the previous metal door.

Mr. Scofield outlined the proposed location for the window in the enclosure noting that the applicant also plans to clad the enclosure with wood German siding. He confirmed the applicant intends to install corner boards and trim to match the rest of the structure.

Mr. Koochagian stated most of the windows were void of trim while the metal door has brick mold trim and asked what the applicant is intending to match.

Mr. Weber stated he plans to install standard brick mold around the doors and window for the porch addition.

Ms. Minchew suggested that the trim match the previously approved new front door.

Mr. Weber noted none of the windows currently have trim.

Ms. Minchew stated she is still concerned with the railing as dimension drawings have not been provided and she is hesitant to base a design on another house without knowing whether approval was given for its railing.

Mr. Koochagian stated he has concern with the door on the east side; particularly because a window was removed and because it has introduced a third style of door on the house. He stated the Old and Historic District guidelines give ridged direction in terms of doors. Further, he expressed concern that drawings and dimensions have not been provided for the proposed porch railing.

Vice Chairman Reimers stated he also has concern with the lack of information provided for the railing; however, he would be comfortable with staff approval of the details.

Mr. Meyer stated he is ok with the configuration of the door on the east side; however, he is concerned that the door is metal and not wood.

Mr. Koochagian stated the guidelines read that doors should be replaced with the same size, design, material and type as used originally or sympathetic to the building's style. He stated he is struggling with the east side door as it does not fit with any of the mentioned criteria.

Chairman Kiley stated he has concern with the door installed on the east side as well.

Ms. Minchew moved to approve windows as associated with TLHP-2015-0022, 209 Royal Street SE to include the following:

1. The installation of a new window in the porch addition on the lower floor and on the west side in the enclosed portico area.
2. If the applicant can provide evidence to staff that the window above the west window is not of the same configuration and basic form as the other existing windows, then staff can approve a replacement there as well.
3. All other windows are deemed to be repairable and should not be replaced.
4. Other elements of the application will be addressed in a separate motion.

The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Reimers.

Mr. Koochagian offered a friendly amendment to include the installation of a window on the rear porch is appropriate because it is a newer addition and the replacement of the bathroom window on the west side is appropriate in that is not original to the house.

Ms. Minchew accepted the friendly amendment and the motion was approved by a 7-0 vote.

Ms. Minchew moved to continue the proposed porch railing associated with TLHP-2015-0022, 209 Royal Street SE with the following clarification:

1. This portion of the application shall be continued until such time as the applicant can provide a measured drawing and evidence that the railing has a historically compatible profile.
2. All other elements of the application will be addressed in a separate motion.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Koochagian.

Mr. Meyer stated the applicant has provided a photograph and testimony has been provided by Mr. Scofield that the railing is historically appropriate to the community.

Mr. Koochagian noted there have been cases in the past where the Board has had to refer to the documentation provided and in this case there would not be sufficient documentation.

Mr. Weber stated he would be willing to get the specifications for the railing to share with staff for approval.

Mr. Meyer stated he would be comfortable forwarding the railing to staff for review and approval.

Ms. Minchew stated she would not be comfortable accepting that amendment to her motion.

The motion was approved by a 6-1 vote (Reimers opposed).

Ms. Minchew moved to approve the proposed door on the rear enclosed porch associated with TLHP-2015-0022, 209 Royal Street SE in accordance with the following:

1. Due to the non-contributing status of the closed in porch portion of the building, the lack of visibility from the public way and the fact that the proposed door will have no negative impact as compared to the previous steel door.
2. All other elements of the application will be addressed in a separate motion.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Goodson and approved by a 7-0 vote.

Ms. Minchew moved to approve the replacement of the historic window with a door to provide access to the east elevation of the house associated with TLHP-2015-0022, 209 Royal Street SE in accordance with the following:

1. The current configuration of the door, while unconventional, given the semi-eclectic nature of this part of the building is approvable.
2. The door must be constructed of wood with details to return to staff before purchase.
3. All other elements of the application will be addressed in a separate motion.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Meyer and approved by a 6-1 vote (Koochagian opposed).

Ms. Minchew moved to approve the cladding of the enclosed porch in German siding to match the existing German siding on the building as associated with TLHP-2015-0022, 209 Royal Street SE in accordance with the following:

1. Trim corner boards and trim on the building will be constructed to match the existing to the extent possible.
2. The trim around the new door and window will be brick mold.

The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Reimers and approved by a 7-0 vote.

b. TLHP-2015-0017, 601 Catoctin Circle NE (Paxton Campus)

Project: Renovation of historic stone barn for classroom and office use

Chairman Kiley noted the public hearing for this application remains open.

Mr. Scofield stated he has reached out to the Virginia Department of Historic Resources to determine the status of the Paxton application review; however, he has not received a reply. He stated he has not prepared a staff report as he feels it best to wait until the State review has been completed.

The applicant, Beck Dickerson, stated he feels it is important to continue the dialog as the process moves forward. He stated they have discovered what they believe to be the original barn color and will attempt to match it. He stated several hangers and hinges will need to be replaced and he has found a blacksmith who has agreed to make these in the same manner as they were originally fabricated. He stated the 26 small windows in the building, of which 4 are a different size, and all are in various states of disrepair. He stated hurricane glass will be installed in the large openings on the rear for the safety of the children. Further, he said his goal is to bring the building back to its 1872 appearance.

Jennifer Lassiter, ARC of Loudoun, asked what the priorities of the Board are in terms of this project noting they are limiting exterior changes to the extent possible.

Mr. Meyer stated it seems the applicant is going forward the proper way and everything he is hearing seems to be on point.

Ms. Lassiter stated she would prefer to maintain the interior rafters which would require that insulation be installed above the rafters and the roof height increased by 4 inches.

Mr. Goodson verified the original roof had previously been replaced.

Mr. Dickerson stated he is hesitant to have the Board wait for the State's decision before moving forward.

Mr. Scofield stated as a Certified Local Government, a partnership exists between the Town, State and Federal Government to ensure the historic preservation of the district. He stated in other states where he has worked the State Department of Historic Resources has deferred their review to the local body; however, he is unsure as to whether that will be the case here. He stated he is attempting to speed up the process by getting some sort of indication from the State as to their findings with respect to the proposed exterior alterations so that the Board can move forward with its process.

Mr. Dickerson stated he has also been attempting to contact the Virginia Department of Historic Resources noting the tight timeline attached to this project.

Mr. Scofield stated he was able to determine that the State has a specific electronic submittal system for information and asked if Mr. Dickerson's proposal was submitted in that fashion.

Mr. Dickerson stated he consulted with someone who does these submissions regularly and was told that the submission had to be printed on photographic paper. He stated he did not submit the information electronically.

Mr. Scofield stated he would be happy to help with the electronic submission as needed.

Mr. Koochagian suggested scheduling a site visit to better understand the proposed alterations.

Ms. Minchew stated the Board needs a staff report in addition to the site visit to ensure that both approval processes are moving forward.

Mr. Goodson stated there could be a reconciliation process done quickly once the State approval is received, if needed.

There was further discussion regarding the state CLG process and the compressed timeline associated with this project.

It was the consensus of the Board to continue discussion at their May 18th meeting, schedule a site visit as soon as possible and have a staff report provided prior to the visit.

- c. **TLHP-2014-0115, 112 Edwards Ferry Rd NE**
Project: Demolish contributing building for courthouse expansion
- d. **TLHP-2014-0116, 110 Edwards Ferry Rd NE**
Project: Demolish contributing building for courthouse expansion
- e. **TLHP-2014-0117, 108 Edwards Ferry Rd NE**
Project: Demolish contributing building for courthouse expansion
- f. **TLHP-2014-0118, 106 Edwards Ferry Rd NE**
Project: Demolish contributing building for courthouse expansion
Chairman Kiley noted the public hearing for these applications remains open.

Mr. Scofield noted the Board was provided with a copy of the Board of Supervisors staff report for their May 6th meeting. He stated the reason for tonight's meeting was that the County's project manager had asked the consultants at Dewberry, Inc. to prepare a conceptual sketch of the Edwards Ferry Road NE frontage to show how it would look with the buildings at 110 and 112 Edwards Ferry Road in place.

Mr. Meyer stated it appears from reading the staff report that the County is really looking at saving one building as opposed to two.

Mr. Scofield stated it is his understanding from the County staff that they have considered the possibility that 112 Edwards Ferry Road remain in place.

Peter Hargreaves, Loudoun County Courthouse Project Manager, stated the design team wanted to go on record with the Board of Supervisors that out of all four structures on Edwards Ferry Road, they would not recommend that 112 Edwards Ferry Road be removed. He stated that does not speak to the other three structures; however, no one on the team had mentioned saving any of the buildings and he felt this was the appropriate time to mention this to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Meyer stated his concern was the report contains many cost estimates for redesign of the project to save the structures and he is not sure after seeing that information if the Board of Supervisors will entertain the discussion.

Mr. Hargreaves stated the Board requested that the design team present numbers for a 75 year time period.

Ms. Shade stated in preparing the estimates, four scenarios were considered; (1) including retaining the four structures and redesigning the proposed courthouse building to a smaller footprint by adding an additional story totaling \$5.8 million, (2) leaving the floorplan design as is and removing the backs from the structures a 106, 108, 110 and 112 Edwards Ferry Road totaling \$1.8 million, (3) leaving the structures at 110 and 112 Edwards Ferry Road NE totaling around \$1 million, and (4) retaining and restoring the structure at 112 Edwards Ferry Road totaling \$894,000. She stated she

was also asked to calculate the additional staffing costs over 75 years and arrived at an approximate total of \$250,000.

Mr. Hargreaves stated the biggest difference in this staff report versus the previous staff report is an attempt to identify unknown costs.

Ms. Shade stated she was asked tonight to provide sketches to show what may change if two of the houses remain. She stated the team looked at every possible permutation of the buildings and found that there is no way to retain all four structures and fit the proposed 92,000 square foot building on the site. She provided the latest sketch stating that everyone in this office agrees the proposed courthouse should be a background building to the houses remaining on the Edwards Ferry Road elevation. She outlined the altered design stating a stairwell was removed to create a greater distance from the structure at 114 Edwards Ferry and overall the building was made to appear more neutral. She stated there is a great demand for space on the first floor; however, the design team was able to create modulation in the façade of the second story as requested by the Board.

Mr. Meyer stated the proposed courthouse is beginning to look more like a background building.

Mr. Malloy stated he believes the building design is moving in a positive direction.

Mr. Meyer left the meeting at 9:16pm.

There was further discussion regarding the revised drawing as well as how it relates to the existing courts campus and the adjacent residential scaled structures.

Mr. Koochagian asked why the sketches shown tonight depict only two of the four structures.

Mr. Hargreaves stated the sketches brought forward at the last meeting depicted all four structures. He stated he was trying to reach a compromise position with the Board of Architectural Review and the Board of Supervisors; however, he understands that such a compromise to retain only two structures is not available because of the guidelines which constrain the Board of Architectural Review. He stated his goal now, particularly in highlighting 112 Edwards Ferry Road, is to communicate to the Board of Supervisors that there is value in saving the structures.

Chairman Kiley stated he cannot properly evaluate the proposed courthouse structure until he knows how many of the existing structures the Board of Supervisors will allow to remain on this portion of Edwards Ferry Road.

Mr. Hargreaves stated two weeks ago at the Board of Supervisors meeting the vote was close to allowing two of the structures to remain because they recognized that as a compromise that was suggested by Town staff; however, now the sides are further apart.

Mr. Malloy noted the number of houses to remain will not be settled at this meeting; however, discussion can continue regarding the building architecture.

Chairman Kiley stated he does not feel he cannot properly review the building architecture until a decision has been reached as to how many of the structures will remain on Edwards Ferry Road. He stated the Board of Supervisors has already approved design concept 5-D and in order for that to change they will have to be presented with an alternative design.

Mr. Hargreaves stated the design will still have to go through a separate COA process.

Chairman Kiley stated the concept provided tonight is closer, but he is not saying this is acceptable.

Ms. Minchew stated it is beneficial for everyone to figure out how we will get clarity on how many buildings will remain on the site.

Chairman Kiley stated the only way to get clarity on that issue is for the Board to take action on the applications and for the County to then appeal that decision to the Town Council, if desired, for a final vote.

Ms. Minchew asked how the Board can move forward without endangering the rest of the review.

Ms. Whiting stated the BAR is beholden to the design guidelines and the mission given by the Town Council. She stated the Board may conclude under the guidelines that it cannot approve the demolition and then within the findings for the decision communicate whether some of the structures are more valuable to the preservation of the Historic District.

Chairman Kiley stated it is not a matter of degrees of value.

Mr. Goodson suggested the potential of crafting a vote to deny the demolition of the structures while including a potential recommendation to Council as to how to move forward under potential appeal.

Ms. Minchew stated she believes the Council would like to receive guidance from the Board.

Chairman Kiley appointed Mr. Goodson and Ms. Minchew to work with Mr. Scofield and Ms. Whiting to develop a companion resolution to go along with the Board of Architectural Review decision under potential appeal.

Vice Chairman Reimers noted if all four structures are demolished, the proposed courthouse structure may need to be more of a monument and less of a background building.

Mr. Koochagian stated he takes exception to the cost estimates for redesign as he feels that had these discussions occurred between the County and the Board at the beginning of the process, there may not have needed to be a building redesign.

Ms. Shade stated no one is saying the redesign costs are the fault of the Board.

Mr. Koochagian stated there is a perception, especially in reading the local media that the Town, town staff, and the Board are causing a cost increase and he takes exception to that.

There was discussion regarding the even application of the guidelines for public and private development projects.

Chairman Kiley stated he would like to have these applications decided at the previously scheduled special meeting on May 13th.

Mr. Hargreaves noted he would not be available to attend a meeting on May 13th.

Ms. Minchew suggested the discussion and vote take place at the May 18th BAR meeting as previously scheduled.

Chairman Kiley stated he would prefer that this be done at a special meeting where it is the only topic on the agenda.

There was further discussion regarding how to craft the motion, findings and supplemental resolution for vote.

Chairman Kiley stated he will be out of Town on May 6th and asked if another BAR member could attend the Board of Supervisors meeting that evening.

Ms. Minchew stated she would plan to attend.

There was further discussion regarding the timetable for potential appeal of a denial or approval to the Town Council and potentially the Circuit Court.

Mr. Malloy noted some steps had been made at this meeting regarding the courthouse building design and asked how that will proceed.

Mr. Hargreaves stated nothing can move forward until a final decision is reached regarding the four structures on Edwards Ferry Road.

Mr. Koochagian asked if there is absolute certainty that May 18th is a viable date for the Board's decision and that there would be no technicality that would allow the buildings to be demolished.

Ms. Whiting stated the County specifically named May 18th as the date.

Ms. Minchew asked at what point the Board should consider giving guidance as to the footprint of the proposed building.

Chairman Kiley noted the applications currently before the Board pertain only to the demolition of the four structures on Edwards Ferry Road.

Mr. Koochagian stated the process for review of demolition applications includes the determination of a viable design for post demolition plans.

Chairman Kiley noted the Board does not have that element.

Ms. Shade stated, when appropriate she would like to present the whole design and master plan for the new and existing campus comprehensively and not in a piecemeal fashion.

Mr. Koochagian requested that the design guidelines are read and understood prior to that submittal.

Mr. Malloy stated it would be helpful to have a work session discussion prior to final design of the proposed building to allow for input from the Board.

Chairman Kiley noted that the Board spent 8 separate meetings on the Courthouse Square application. He stated each meeting was very productive because the applicant was responsive in making adjustments.

Ms. Shade stated the design project is being placed on hold and she plans to meet with County staff to discuss the best time to move forward with the project, which will likely be in November or December once the reviews have been completed.

Old Business

None

New Business

a. Referral: TLZM-2015-0001, Poet's Walk Memory Care, Oaklawn, Land Bay MUC 2

Mr. Scofield stated this referral is for the Oaklawn development which was proffered into the H-2 Guidelines. He stated once the project has received its rezoning approval from the Planning Commission and Town Council the design elements of the building will come back in a formal application for Board review. He stated the site plan and elevations provided meet the guidelines in general; however, there are some elements which remain to be addressed.

Chris Gleckner, representative for the applicant, addressed the Board. She stated Jervis Hairston with Poet's Walk and Jack Williams with Paciulli Simmons were available to answer questions as needed. Ms. Gleckner provided the context for the location noting it is surrounded by Battlefield Parkway, Miller Drive, Oaklawn Drive and Brown Roan Drive. She stated the existing zoning designation of PRN allows for the construction of a nursing home facility; however, that use was not included in the approved proffers. She provided a photograph of the existing facility in Fredericksburg along with proposed elevations noting changes made to meet staff's recommendations; including the addition of a water table. She stated being that this is a referral for the rezoning case, the more relevant information will pertain to siting and massing as opposed to architectural detail. She stated staff has raised questions regarding the proposed windows and while that will be part of the future Board approval process, any feedback the Board would like to provide would be helpful.

Ms. Gleckner outlined the proposed landscaping plan noting that staff had requested landscaped medians; however, the applicant is proposing a narrower drive and other locations within the development do not have the landscaped medians. She stated revisions were made to the location of sidewalks and landscaping at service entrances on site to address comments made by staff. She stated a light fixture example was submitted which features a 20ft tall gooseneck design.

Mr. Meyer asked staff to explain their concern with the proposed windows.

Mr. Scofield noted a double-hung sash paired configuration would be more appropriate.

Mr. Meyer stated it appears that configuration is what is shown in the photograph.

Ms. Gleckner stated the windows do not open as the adult residents in this facility typically have mental challenges.

Mr. Meyer stated the faux windows in the dormers could be corrected with more effort to create depth.

Mr. Koochagian stated it appears there are a variety of dormers which need to come together from a massing standpoint. He stated the legs for the entry canopy also appear to be spindle like and could be addressed.

Mr. Malloy asked if there will be a wandering area/garden provided for the residents and whether it will be enclosed with an opaque fence.

Ms. Gleckner stated she is not certain but the fence can be opaque if that is desired by the Board.

Mr. Malloy asked if the main entrance will also be used by EMT professionals responding to calls.

Ms. Gleckner stated there is also an emergency entrance in the rear so either can be used.

Mr. Malloy expressed concern with the potentially high number of EMT visits and the impact it may have on the Townhome residents.

Mr. Williams stated the main entrance, where most emergency visits will come, faces the lake.

Mr. Malloy asked the proposed land use for the parcel in front of this property.

Ms. Gleckner stated MUC1 is an open space parcel for the development while MUC2 is planned for commercial use.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 10:01 pm.

Edward Kiley, Chair

Deborah Parry, Planning & Zoning Assistant