

## New Hope Borough

July 28, 2020

### Council Meeting

#### Minutes

Council President Gering called the meeting to order at 7:04 PM held via teleconference.

Present: Council Members, Connie Gering, Dan Dougherty, Tina Rettig, Laurie McHugh, Ken Maisel, Louise Feder, Peter Meyer. Also present were Mayor Keller, Borough Solicitor Barbara Kirk, Chief Cummings, Borough Engineer Karen McNair, Zoning Officer Tracy Tackett and Borough Manager Peter Gray.

### Mayor's Report

Mayor Keller announced a documentary called Walking while Black and LOVE Learn, Open, Volunteer, Empower, Others, that is scheduled at the school at the school on August 3<sup>rd</sup> at 6pm, and to register, it is a virtual screening, so to register, you have to email [mruggiero@nhsd.org](mailto:mruggiero@nhsd.org). After the documentary is shown, and I did see it and Chief Cummings has seen it. They are hoping, they have about 75 people registered so far. They are hoping for 100. After the screening, they are breaking into 10 groups. We are hoping for 5 officers representing Solebury police department and 5 officer representing New Hope police department to have a smaller group discussion amongst 10 in each group. Not sure what questions some of the adults will have, the residents, whatever they are, the interested people in the community. I am just reaching out to Council and our residents that anybody who wants to register for this just email [mruggiero@nhsd.org](mailto:mruggiero@nhsd.org). It is organized by the Peace Center in Langhorne. Next to just put out there obviously the New Hope Police Department is aware what is going nationally, the issues. I just want to affirm to Residents and Council, the Chief and I are absolutely committed to our mission statement and the values we have on our website. We are going to continue to be engaged and pursue being accredited. Just like Solebury has already had their accreditation. It is a long process and take quite a bit of time, but we are committed to doing that. Lastly, I have had 3 residents call me this past week concerned about masks. I think there is a misconception about masks. They think wearing a face mask is a law but it is not, it is a civil order that has been issued by Dr. Rachel Levine, our Secretary of Health. One facet of it is, law enforcement's role in ensuring compliance should be to encourage and gain compliance thru education and understanding. Not to compel compliance thru punitive criminal process. Our Police Department as much as possible, it is a very difficult situation, with some people not walking down the street not wearing masks, some people wearing masks. We are addressing it as much as we can. It is not a situation that calls for someone getting ticketed for not having a mask on. I just wanted to share that. That's it Connie. Ms. Gering thank you so much. Just an update for the rest of Council, we were supporting the movie being shown at the school district. It was a joint venture between New Hope and Solebury and the School District. Larry, I am so glad you brought that up, thank you.

### Executive Session Announcement

Ms. Gering announced there was an executive session on July 6 before our work session to discuss a personnel issue.

### Consider Resolution for increasing On Street Parking Meter Rates

Ms. Gering announced for consideration for increasing the parking from .25c to .50c for every 20 minutes. Laurie McHugh from the Parking Committee gave a presentation at the February meeting about this issue. The Borough has not raised parking rates since in 18 years. Can I have a motion to pass this resolution. Ms. Rettig I make the motion, Mr. Maisel I second it. Ms. Gering are there any comments from Council? Public Comment? There are no comments. All in favor? ALL aye Ms. Gering Opposed? (none) Motion passes, thank you.

**Consider Amended Final Land Development for 274 South Main Street – Gateway to New Hope, LLC (River House)**

Ms. Gering called for a motion for approval. Mr. Dougherty made the motion, seconded by Mr. Meyer. Ms. Gering Discussion. Is Mr. Murphy here? Mr. Ed Murphy, Council members and staff should have the July 23, 2020 letter that summarizes a handful of the modifications to the plan since 2017 when the amended plan was first approved. A lot were generated by Bucks County Water and Sewer, PennDOT, PECO, DCNR and other agencies to make design changes. There was nothing of great consequences. They are listed and commented by Tracy. We are seeking approval for the changes so the latest plan can be recorded as we move towards the conclusion of the project. I am happy to talk about any one of those and I am sure Tracy and Karen are to. Mr. Maisel are all of these 11 done? Are they completed? Mr. Murphy the parking lot has not been paved. The guard rail fence has not yet been installed. The modification to the Shade Tree Commission's approval of the revised plan, those trees have yet to be planted. Half of the utility things have been done. The non-utility items have not been done, they are to be done. Mr. Maisel has #1 been done? Mr. Murphy I believe it has, but I defer to Karen. Ms. McNair I believe that has been completed. We approved that as a field change since it was a minor change to the plan. Our letter of July 17 has additional items to what the July 23 letter that Mr. Murphy referenced, if you would like me to go thru some of those. Mr. Maisel So what we have dated the 23<sup>rd</sup> is not necessarily what we are addressing now? Ms. McNair So I identified a few additional issues related to the conditions of approval from the prior approvals. Mr. Meyer But the question is whether or not what they proposed on the 23<sup>rd</sup> satisfies what you came up with on the 17<sup>th</sup>, Karen. Ms. McNair it did not. What was issued on the 23<sup>rd</sup> does not address the comments. Mr. Murphy The items Karen listed in her July 17<sup>th</sup> letter, we didn't have her letter when we wrote our letter on the 23<sup>rd</sup>. What Karen wrote is not inaccurate. I would be happy to talk about all of them. The July 23<sup>rd</sup> letter is right, but there are a couple extra Karen has that we should talk about. Mr. Meyer The question is, is there anything in her letter of the 17<sup>th</sup> that presents a problem at this stage of the game to conform to what she is asking about? Mr. Murphy No, and I will pick them one at a time. The first thing is the continental crosswalk. There is a crosswalk on Odette's property that is part of the towpath. The original route of the towpath bisects our property. DCNR asked us, and we agreed to demarcate that original towpath route by using a color. There is a plan the Borough has that shows the color red in the area of the original towpath route. There is one place where the towpath route crosses the south access drive as you go underneath our building. Karen is recommending a white striping of the crosswalk retained and we want it in red. That is what DCNR preferred. We are following the recommendation of DCNR, to highlight the towpath. Karen is that a fair summary? Ms. McNair Yes it is. The reason we are recommending that the crosswalk markings be retained is PennDOT does not recognize colorizing a crosswalk as a marking. To get this, we either do striping that was shown on the improvement and what was recommended by the Planning Commission was continental crosswalk, which is the thicker striping 1 to 2 feet wide and having a break in it. Or visually alerting drivers with striping on the side, is another option. But no striping at all on the continental crosswalk without PennDOT approval. Mr. Murphy I heard what Karen said, but not all of it. We are happy to reach out to DCNR and if they are ok with Karen is recommending with the crosswalk itself, we are happy to comply. Ms. Gering So I need guidance. If we do a conditional approval, Barbara, I need to ask you, can we give them a conditional approval that they meet all the conditions? Ms. Kirk yes. Mr. Maisel Connie, this letter of the 23<sup>rd</sup> I don't know if there are any more things that are different from the 17<sup>th</sup>'s letter that need to be incorporated into the 23<sup>rd</sup>. This is suppose to be the final land development waiver that has everything in it. It sounds like there are other things to be amended. Is that true? Ed? Mr. Murphy well, as I said, our letter of the 23<sup>rd</sup>, we thought was good. Karen highlighted a couple other items that could be included and they are written down. Mr. Maisel ok, that is what we need to do. So we have number 1. How many are there? Mr. Murphy well, the next one, we will take them in the order Karen identified. The next one simply acknowledges we eliminated the fitness room in the hotel and added two new rooms and the parking count goes up by two accordingly. We have reflected the updated parking count on the plans and we need to satisfy the updated parking count. That was in our letter and we did note that, and Karen highlights that, which is correct. The third item is self-evident, Karen and Tracy are right to raise it. You remember when plans were approved in 2017 we agreed to construct or install a gateway treatment at the entrance of New Hope. Back then, I don't think any of us knew what that would be. As it turned out, after the approval, we ended up relocating the Odette's building. Candidly, I don't think anyone would disagree that is a far more significant gateway treatment that may have otherwise would have been contemplated. I think what we would like to do, and Karen and Tracy are right to say it, Borough Council meets Tuesday,

yes, we agree the relocated Odette's building satisfies that obligation to provide a gateway treatment. Is that fair summary? Ms. Kirk as an alternative, we can say you are asking for a waiver of the prior condition? Mr. Murphy not at all, we satisfied it twenty fold. We are saying what we did is that gateway treatment that satisfied that condition. We don't need a waiver. We need an acknowledgement to what we did satisfies that condition from an earlier approval. Mr. Meyer what you are saying is the relocation of the Odette's building satisfies that condition? Mr. Murphy yes. Ms. Tackett There is significant language in there regarding road improvements at the Windy Bush Road intersection. It seems difficult to say it is satisfied by the Odette's building when there is specific language in there that differs from the Odette's building. I think either waive it or change it, if Council is ok with that. Mr. Dougherty can I ask a question Tracy, is the work on the Windy Bush intersection, how much specificity is there in the language of the original agreement? Moving the building does not address it. What does it actually say in regard to that language? Ms. Tackett I am reading Karen's letter. At its sole expense, Gateway treatments acceptable to the Borough Engineer and Council on River Road at the Windy Bush Road intersection and the south Borough limit, as well as drainage improvements, measures to restrict on street parking and traffic calming measures. Those are things called out for. I am not sure of the intent of it. My point is, moving the building does not satisfy the specifics of that. Mr. Dougherty Ok Ed, how do you feel about that? You said moving the building satisfies that. Do you think it satisfies the traffic calming and improvements? Mr. Murphy yes I do. I think we have done over and above anything that could have been contemplated to make a statement at the south entrance of New Hope as the Gateway to New Hope. I can't imagine something more appropriate than what we did. I can tell you, as I was there when it was happening. The idea was the cost of doing something was in the \$50,000 range and we spent more than 20 times that to do what we did. I think it was universally applauded as something unique, different and appropriate. I think we went well beyond what anybody thought of to make that statement. Yes, I think we have more than satisfied the obligation. Ms. Gering any other comments from Council? Mr. Meyer I would like to see if we have any comment from the citizens. Ms. Gering any questions from the public? Mr. Gray no hands are raised. Mr. Murphy that last one in Karen's list is the circulation plan associated for Odette's and the Raven. Based on your recent approval for the Raven, we submitted the revised circulation plan that requires all traffic to go up Suga and Windy Bush and not thru the Borough. I think we have done whatever you guys have asked us to establish how the whole consolidated operation will work. Ms. McNair I work like to say, we are asking for information now that we understand there will be valet at the River House as well. During their presentation for the parking lot at the former Raven, I was under the impression and understanding was that all cars were going to be diverted in that lot. Since we have seen their parking procedures, they will be directing people who will be using the hotel and restaurant to the River House site. We still need to see how they will deal with the traffic. We are seeking additional information. Mr. Murphy whatever else you need, tell me, we will do it. Mr. Meyer Ed, I think the question is, we were talking at the Planning Commission dealing primarily the fact that everyone was going to be directed to the Raven. Now we have signage for in and out at the location of the River House itself. Part of the time, part of the residents, were going to be at the River House, they were going to park their rather than the Raven and be relayed. Further explanation of that, is what we may need. Mr. Murphy I think we have done that already, but if you need it in writing, we can do that. We have said, if you are just going to the restaurant for dinner, you are not going to go the Raven. You are going to the River House and have your car valeted. It would only be an exception for disabled people going to an event at the River House, would be permitted to be dropped off at the River House. The driver and occupants of the car where that disabled person would be in, would be directed to the Raven. It is for disabled people to go directly to the River House and be dropped off and diners or those staying at the hotel would be the only people going to the River House directly. All others directed to the Raven for valet services. Mr. Dougherty how many restaurant seats are there, roughly? Restaurants and Bars seats? Mr. Murphy I think 131 seats for the restaurant and 38 required parking spaces for the hotel. At 25% capacity right now, 33 seats in the restaurant and 38 in the hotel, that is 71, until the Governor's orders would change. Mr. Dougherty the 25% occupancy limit could be over in 3 or 4 months. Mr. Murphy it is 131 for restaurant and employees and 38 for the hotel, so 169. Ms. Rettig does that include the membership club on the roof? Mr. Murphy I believe it does include the seating upstairs. Ms. McNair So the plans indicate, the 131 parking spaces required for the restaurant indicate there is 433 seats proposed for the restaurant. That is the rate of 1 parking space for every 5 seats in the restaurant. Mr. Dougherty I think the 400 seats are for banquet seats. The restaurants, hotel rooms, disabled and the club, it sounds like there are 200 people or 100 cars per day, that

are going to the site, taken to the Raven, anywhere from 1-4 hours later, dinner is over or the next morning, those 100 cars are brought back. Mr. Murphy everybody would be valeted, but only those people would drive there that you indicated. Everybody else would drive to the Raven and shuttled down. Mr. Dougherty everybody else, being the banquet attendees, right? Mr. Murphy correct. Mr. Dougherty how many spots are on site? Mr. Murphy it is 18 and 29. Mr. Dougherty in theory you are going to use some of those spots on a Tuesday night, when it is not crowded. There could be on a Saturday night or Saturday day, there could be 100 cars being valet parked to and from. Is the valet route the same as the one for the vans? Mr. Murphy yes. Mr. Dougherty can we have everything we said in a letter. Can we make it conditional? Mr. Murphy yes, that is entirely fair. Mr. Gering to summarize this, we have a motion on the table, but the motion has conditions attached to it based on Karen McNair's and Tracy's input. Is this correct? Ms. McNair yes, and I have one additional item. There was a waiver from the street tree requirement, that was discussed at the Shade Tree Commission meeting, the removal of the street trees. Mr. Murphy I think we are going to pay for the trees we are not going to plant. You are going to come up with a figure. We are going to plant what we can and what we can't plant, we will plant off site or pay a fee in lieu. However you want to do it. Ms. McHugh the Shade Tree is ok with that, we already talked about it. Mr. Meyer I assume you have where you want to put the trees, Laurie? Ms. McHugh we will handle that. Ms. Gering we have a motion, we have conditions for the motion, that Karen and Tracy are going to add with this. Mr. Dougherty can I ask a question about Windy Bush? Right now, I don't have the diagrams, there may be 20 cars, I do not know, but that number will go up by a factor of 3. There is no light there. This is a question for Tracy and Karen. What happens if that becomes a traffic nightmare for the Borough, who is responsible for the cost if we have to put lights there? Who is responsible? Ms. McNair They did a traffic study about 10 years ago and there was no indication there was a need for a traffic signal. I don't think that is a condition here. The condition is a parking management circulation plan. At this point I don't think they need a signal, if so, the Borough would be responsible for it. Mr. Murphy they are both state roads, Windy Bush and River Road. PennDOT jurisdiction. Mr. Dougherty thank you. Mr. Maisel would it be possible if someone were to drop off somebody at the River House and they are proceeding to the Raven to park their car, can they be given instructions on how to go so they don't work their way thru the Borough? Mr. Murphy correct, we have contemplated that. Mr. Maisel thank you. Ms. Gering anyone else on Council? Let's take a vote. All in favor? ALL aye Ms. Gering opposed? Ok, motion passes. 33.19

### **Consider Certificates of Appropriateness**

#### **1. 274 South Main Street**

##### **a. Signage (Building)**

Mr. Murphy This is the single sign. This is the one Borough Council has seen before. It goes on the front of the building. It was recommended by HARB and I think we are good. Mr. Dougherty I think you showed this to us, Ed. Mr. Murphy we did. We reduced the size, we originally sought relief, Council was not in favor, withdrew the application, the sign conforms, no zoning issues and Barb said fine. Mr. Dougherty wasn't it 4 by 8? Mr. Murphy it is compliant now. There is not issue with size. It is fully compliant. Tracy, this sign is on the side of the building. There is another sign on street level. Are there any zoning aspects to having multiple signs? Ms. Tackett part of the issue was how there were measuring the dimensions of the signs. They measured the components and shrank them down so they would comply. This is the only building sign with the exception of the valet parking directional signs. Those two signs are considered compliant. Mr. Dougherty is there going to be a sign on the street level 6 feet off the ground? Mr. Murphy no Ms. Tackett there will be signs at the driveway signs that say enter and on the other sign that say enter. Mr. Dougherty I am good. Mr. Meyer basically what you are seeing are in and out signs Dan. Ms. Gering this sign is 25.7 square feet according to the paperwork that was filed. Any other discussion from Council? Any questions from the public? All in favor? ALL aye. Ms. Gering motion passes. Mr. Meyer I don't think we made a motion. Ms. McHugh I will make that motion. Mr. Meyer I will second it.

##### **b. Split Railing/path lighting**

Mr. Murphy perhaps Tracy would want to talk about those. Ms. Tackett this is one of the components they are requesting variances for. I believe the lighting is compliant. Mr. Murphy remind everyone, because it is in the front yard, you are to limit it to 3 feet? Ms. Tackett 3 feet. Mr. Murphy we are asking for a 1 foot variance to have the fence depicted. That would be 4 feet instead of 3 feet. Mr. Meyer is that a 4 foot pole or a 4 foot lateral. Mr. Murphy I think you measure the top of the post to the grade. Mr. Meyer that was my impression. Isn't that what DCNR requested of you? Mr. Murphy that is there preferred standard and PennDOT's preferred for fencing. Mr. Meyer I move to approve.

Ms. Gering we need a motion to approve the certificate of appropriateness but it needs a variance from zoning and we would approve it with them getting a variance. Can I have a motion? Ms. McHugh I'll make that motion. Ms. Rettig I second it. Ms. Gering all in favor? ALL aye. Ms. Gering opposed? (none) Motion passes.

c. Guard Rail and Entry Signage

Ms. Gering they will need a variance for this. Can I have a motion? Mr. Dougherty I will make that motion. Ms. McHugh I will second it. Ms. Gering discussion. Ms. Tackett the guardrail is considered a fence. The same rules apply. Mr. Murphy this is a strong request from DCNR. This is their preference. Ms. Tackett the previous plans had a 2 foot guardrail. The larger portion is the name of the business. The small portion is a directional sign. It would be sign normally. This is the part that needs the variance. Mr. Murphy there is one at each entrance. One says entrance, one says exit. Ms. Gering this certificate is based on them getting a variance. All in favor? ALL aye. Ms. Gering anyone opposed? Any questions from the public? Ok, motion passes.

2. 328 South River Road

Mr. Murphy this is for the conduit that services Union Mills. Mr. Maisel what is the material? 2 inch metal pipe, black, ok. Ms. Gering any questions from the public? All in favor? ALL aye. Ms. Gering opposed? Motion passes.

3. 111 New Street

Ms. Gering this is part of St. Martin's church. It is going by the cemetery. Is anyone online representing them? Mr. Gray there is an individual with a hand raised. Ms. Gering if they can explain this please? Mr. George Chrencik I am George Chrencik, I am an Eagle Scout, and this is my project. I am here on behalf of Father Kindon who had mass tonight and was unable to attend. As you can see on the screen, it was originally put on the schoolyard and now we are putting it on the cemetery parking lot to prevent cars from rolling down the ravine. Any questions? Ms. Gering Where is the gravel parking lot? Is it inside the cemetery? Mr. Chrencik yes it is. Mr. Dougherty I have a question. I am in favor of this but is it visible from the public right of way? Mr. Chrencik no, it is inside. Mr. Dougherty why does this need a HARB approval? Mr. Chrencik my understanding is it is a historical area. Mr. Dougherty thank you and thank you for your service. Ms. Rettig how will this be maintained? Mr. Chrencik the wood is pressure treated. The groundskeeper will make sure it is safe. Ms. Gering it is in a private cemetery, they are putting a fence there and they are coming because it is in the historic district. Any questions from Council? The public? All in favor? ALL aye. Ms. Gering opposed? Thank you so much.

4. 10 West Ferry Street

Mr. Meyer Connie, I need to recuse myself, I own property across the street. Ms. Gering is there anyone here? Mr. Gray yes, there is a gentleman by the name of Mark Baker with his hand raised and Ralph Fey. Mr. Baker Ralph Fey and Jennifer Sophia are here as well. Ms. Gering hi there. I read the summary by Mr. Wise. You started working before the HARB approval. His recommendation was that you blend the color in to meet with the historic building. Can you talk about that? Mr. Baker sure, in the course of building the building, constructing the levels of the floor, the addition floor was built lower to maintain the level of the entire inn so there are not a lot of ramps in it. The parking lot is higher than the new floor was constructed, therefore there needed to be steps and a ramp down. The steps and ramps are not built yet. The canopy was built and extended 3 feet to cover the future ramp and steps. The canopy is 3 feet larger now as it sits in anticipation of covering the ramp and steps. I think the canopy being built is what triggered the building inspection to say this needs to be HARB approved. Ms. Gering also the recommendation was to build vegetation there to hide the structure from the canal. Did you address this? Mr. Baker if you go to the site plan, you can see the concrete ramp with bushes in front of it. The bushes were always planned. The curb was always the curb line according to the development plans. I think Mr. Wise wanted to ensure there would be planting there. The ramp actually slopes down from the parking lot, so it is not a raised ramp, so you are not seeing a concrete ramp, the steps go down into the ground and you are not seeing them. We wanted to make sure it matched the building and it was not a blaring white new concrete so we agreed to stamp the concrete a greyish color to mute it and subdue it and to maintain the plants in front of the ramp. Ms. Gering he also recommended them to be by the canal. Is that where the ramp is? Mr. Baker no, that is in regard to the transformer that is PECO's. PECO had to move the transformer to service the building. They moved it back to the canal. There is a blast wall around the transformer and bollards around the transformer. These are PECO specified and required. Mr. Wise's recommendation was, where we can, put vegetation to shield the site of the blast wall. Mr. Maisel do you know the requirement of how much freedom you need between the blast walls and pylons to allow for vegetation to be planted? Mr. Baker if there is ground there you can plant vegetation there. Mr. Maisel it is

not prohibitive from the requirements from PECO. Mr. Baker between the wall and the transformer there won't be anything planted in there. The planting will be planted on the outside of the wall, close to the canal and the neighboring property. Between the bollards and transformer, you can put bushes there. I think it is a 3 foot clearance. They do it all the time. Mr. Maisel ok, thank you. Ms. Gering any other questions from Council? So I am going to assume that is one of the conditions that when you get this approval you will put the shrubbery there? Mr. Baker yes, we agreed to that in the certificate of appropriateness. Ms. Gering ok. Anymore questions from Council? Public? All in favor? ALL aye. Ms. Gering opposed? Ok, motion passes. Good luck guys, motion passes.

5. 61 West Ferry Street

Ms. Gering is anyone here? Mr. Gray yes, there is a gentleman here. Mr. David Broad this is a picture of my house. That is my current slate roof. We are proposing replacing it with simulated slate. I am at 61 and it is the same simulated slate in the same color as the one's at 63, 65, 67 and 69. I gave a copy of the slate to JoAnn Connell yesterday. They requested a color to make sure it matches. The same grey that is there now. Ms. Gering according to my notes it was recommended to be black or grey. Mr. Broad yes, it is grey. It is going to be a grey color. Ms. Gering any questions from Council? Mr. Dougherty I think we need to make a motion? Mr. Gering do I have a motion? Ms. McHugh I will make that motion. Mr. Dougherty second. Ms. Gering any other discussion from Council? Public? All in favor? ALL aye. Ms. Gering opposed? (none) Good luck.

6. 8-10 South Main Street

Ms. Gering this was taken off the agenda.

7. 19 West Bridge Street

Mr. Gray there is a representative here named James Shields. Ms. Gering hello, how are you. I read the notes. I have a problem with the barber sign in the front. I know you are not going to light it but we have no idea what will happen in the future, but I am opposed to the sign. Mr. Dougherty is this barber pole sign, a motorized barber pole? Is that true? Mr. Shields I spoke with Tracy early on in the process and she advised me if I have outside to adhere to historic district recommendations and guidelines, I should not have it oscillate or illuminate. I explained to her, that would not be a problem. I will 100% comply. I have no plan to wire it, I will mount it to the wall out front to the right of the front door. Mr. Dougherty what I have been told, we have another barber shop in town, and that person was specifically told they were not permitted to hang the barber pole on the exterior of the building without a variance. They have that barber pole in the store. I don't have that strong of a preference. I want consistency. If we told one barber they cannot put a barber pole outside without a variance, lit, unlit, oscillating or not oscillating. Are you familiar with this Tracy? Ms. Tackett I am not familiar with advising someone they cannot have a barber pole outside. Mr. Dougherty they were told they can't have it outside without a variance. Ms. Tackett I don't believe I told them that. It was a situation when I read the ordinance, it could not be lit and it could not be oscillating. They were the two requirements. I could go back to the other barber shop and see what the situation was there. I don't remember, it could have been before me. Mr. Dougherty It could have been a year or two ago. I am just looking for consistency. I don't have a strong preference with lit or not lit or oscillating or not oscillating. Mr. Maisel also, you're not certain if the condition was, he wanted it oscillating or lit as well. Mr. Shields correct. I searched thru the New Hope Borough code and that is what it says. It may not oscillate or illuminate. Mr. Maisel I am talking to my associate. The request from the other barber could have been to have been lit and or oscillating. Mr. Dougherty basically what I am hearing, I am satisfied. Would the COA state under no circumstances it would not be lit or motorized? Ms. Rettig it says that. No spinning mechanism in barber pole. Electric barber pole on front door no light in the barber pole or on the top. Ms. Tackett that will also be a condition of his sign permit. Ms. Gering any questions from Council? Public? All in favor? ALL aye. Ms. Gering good luck with it.

8. 10 West Randolph Street

Ms. Feder what we are looking to do and it doesn't specify the details we have in the HARB application. We are proposing a 3 foot fence in the front and side. We have 2 - 6 foot tall privacy panels at the rear of the fence on the side. The circle must indicate in the HARB we were happy to do a trellis top per Robert Wise's suggestion and HARB seemed to be on board as well. The main reason we want to do the fence, as all you know we have a four year old and that is an exceptionally busy street. Especially with the pandemic extending, we are hoping for a safer place for him to be outside, but also aesthetically for the house, a picket fence along the front and the majority of the side seemed to go along with the character of the house. We went with the spaced spindle picket fence primarily because it gives more visibility thru

the spindles but also it is done pretty often in the historic district. It is a cedar fence, including privacy panels all painted to match the trim of the house. Worth noting, the privacy panels we put them in line with the zoning measurements per Tracy, I believe it is 25 feet back. Where they are, I don't believe it would be a visual impairment because of the size of the hedges of our neighbor, the white house on the corner of North Main and West Randolph. They don't block a window. They will block our air conditioning units from view of the private driveway that is shared with four other houses. I am happy to share the information that was in the HARB packet or share my screen if that is helpful or answer any questions. Ms. Gering I think what was deceiving is the fencing that was going to go along the side of your house. Ms. Feder I don't have a picture of the side. I can show you what the side of the house looks like, if you want me to share my screen. But except for the two privacy panels in the back, it is same white picket fence. Mr. Dougherty so there would be 12 foot of 6 foot tall lattice, or 16 foot, 2 eight foot sections? I think they are 8 feet, then they will drop down to picket. Ms. Feder spindle is the type of picket. It is not the flat gothic picket. Mr. Dougherty is it square with the peak at the top? Ms. Feder yes. Mr. Dougherty ok, I got it. Ms. Gering is it going in the front of the house or enclose just the sides and back? Ms. Feder it is going in the front of your house or is it going to enclose just the sides and back. Ms. Feder yes. Do you want me to share my plan it may be in the supplemental material? Mr. Maisei I think I add some clarification. It looks like it is the entire front and 25 feet on the side before it begins the 6 feet. Is that correct, Louise? Mr. Meyer what I don't understand, I had kids by a federal highway. I understand the problem. In the neighborhood, are their other kinds of privacy fences along the front? Ms. Feder yes. We do not have a privacy fence along the front. Our neighbors have a 6 foot tall privacy fence that is right next to us. There are other neighbors, not West Randolph but on the next street over that also have a flat top privacy fence. We didn't want to do it on the front, we didn't want it to be visible from the street beyond a possible sliver and that is why it is so far set back. Primarily you would be looking at a white picket fence. Mr. Dougherty I think the larger taller sections are far away from the road. Other than a passing glare at them, the people who will primarily see them will be the three or four houses who use the alley driveway to park their cars. It is going to be down the road. I don't think the mass of it is going to be a problem. To me, I think the 6 foot is going to be fine. 5 would be better. Will it go behind the house, Louise? Ms. Feder no. Mr. Dougherty It is just along the side then down along the side to the trellis, right? Ms. Feder yes. On the street you would only see white picket fence. Mr. Dougherty the only concern is, we would be approving the look and the materials, that is what the COA does, is that correct Connie? Ms. Gering correct. Mr. Dougherty Tracy, as far as the dimensions and how close it can get to the macadam and how much sidewalk there might be available to create canal access. How far it comes away from the house, is that a zoning issue or fence permit? Ms. Tackett the fence cannot be in the existing right of way. I think there is a dash line on the plan that shows the right of way. It needs to be out of the right of way. Like Louise said, I think they proposed the 6 foot portion to be closer to Randolph Street but because of the setback requirement, it has to be 3 feet and 25 feet back from the right of way. They revised it to meet that. Ms. Feder the initial plan did not propose that. When we applied for zoning, we went in and made sure the zoning setbacks per Tracy's requirements are on the plan. Mr. Maisei I see that. Mr. Meyer what we are looking at here on the screen is not accurate. Ms. Feder What do you mean? Mr. Meyer The fence location is going to be further back. Ms. Feder it is further back. The setback per Tracy, per the code, is on the plan. You can see a property line and a setback that is appropriate for the dimensions from Tracy is also indicated there. The fence is well back. It is following the code. Mr. Meyer how many feet back is that, Tracy? Ms. Tackett I can't read the site plan online here. We had measured the right of way width, based on the County GIS and it looks like they are showing it on the left side of the plot line. It says to the left, front of lot line 16 and ½ feet from center of road. That's representing the right of way of Randolph. It is a 33 foot right of way. They measured 16 ½ feet from the center of the road towards their property. I said the fence cannot be in that space. Mr. Meyer what I am reading, 1 feet, 8 inches, looking at a number above the word "new work". There is a number there that seems to show an indent Tracy. Ms. Tackett correct. I am not sure what that is representing. That could be a site plan showing their property line. What I did, what go to the County GIS, measured what the right away was, split that in half and told them the fence could not be in their half of the right of way. Ms. Feder for what it is worth, we have a neighbor who has a 3 foot fence that is on the other side, the same white house, and our setback is even further back in than theirs. I know it is not the application here. Mr. Meyer my only concern is there is no sidewalk there now. Ms. Feder there is not. Mr. Meyer should the Borough should decide it would like to pursue a sidewalk, is it possible to set that fence front or back from the right of way to give us room for a sidewalk, should we wish to put one in at a future date, rather than getting in conflict with the fence. That is what I am trying to deal with. Ms. Feder I can't speak to that. I do think what we were doing with the fence was trying to go by what the code says what we could do about putting up a fence. It is an interesting question. I don't know if I can speak to the potential of a sidewalk on that street. Apologies for that. All we did for the fence was try to go by the zoning setback for the fence. We tried to do the same thing for

the privacy fence. At the end of the day, it is a pretty standard white cedar picket fence for the house. Ms. Tackett is there parking along your frontage? Ms. Feder not in front of the house. Ms. Tackett so if there is no parking on the street, there is probably enough room. Ms. Gering there is parking, but no parking in front of her house. Mr. Meyer we are talking about a picket fence, and I am looking at something circled and it is not a picket fence. Ms. Feder as I have explained those are the two sections of privacy fence that are 25 feet back along the side. The vast majority of the fence is a white picket fence. Mr. Meyer across the front? Ms. Feder across the front and 25 feet along the side. They are literally 2 segments of privacy fence in the back. Ms. Gering any other questions from Council? Mr. Dougherty the diagram says there is a gate, Louise? Ms. Feder yes. Mr. Dougherty did you provide HARB with a gate design in their package to them? Ms. Feder We did provide to HARB with samples of space spindled picket fences in the historic district and what those gates looked like. We will have built to fit that dimension. The gate design will continue the spindle picket fence gate design. It was a front page application. Mr. Dougherty in the past HARB has asked to provide the type of hinges and shutter tie backs. A gate is more substantial. This is not to do with you, per se. We are going to have to get better at being more consistent on what they ask for, less or more. They have to be more consistent. Your fence was not specifically out to them, what you are calling a picket, it will replicate that same look. It may be a one two door swing or door swing, but it's a gate, right? Ms. Feder yes, it is a space spindle swinging a picket fence inward. Mr. Meyer Dan is raising an important point. I want to emphasize, we need a degree of consistency as to how we apply this stuff. What worries me, we don't know what the gate looks like. At some other stage, we see someone else with a gate and we don't ask a question and we get something horrendous. I don't expect of you, Louise. Ms. Feder I have the rendering, would you like to take a look? It is exactly the same as what HARB took a look at. It is a space spindled continued across, double gate and swings in. Mr. Meyer Dan, would that help? Mr. Dougherty I am ok, I think going forward, we need to standardize the level of detail HARB is permitted to opine about, or pontificate about or dictate to our applicants. I am certain that this picket fence that is being described to us that is 36 inches, has a gate and Louise is saying it is going to replicate the rest of the pickets. I am ok with that. Ms. Feder I think for future packets, we should probably have the complete HARB applications in the Borough packets. Mr. Dougherty thank you. Ms. Feder all the information was in that packet. What we are talking about are visuals which I have made and HARB has seen. I know it is hard for you guys to visualize when you are seeing snippets of it. Mr. Dougherty the other problem and it is not your doing, is the COA, the piece of paper where Connie and Pete have to sign it, does not mention any of that stuff. It doesn't say, by the way, attached is this, and this is the material, it is cedar...it may mention a couple of things, but there is a great deal of specificity that one would have to go and get minutes from a HARB meeting and demonstrate. This is something we have to do a better job at, going forward. I think the fence is fine, I am talking about the process more. Ms. Feder as the applicant, I don't write what was on the COA, I don't know why what was written in the COA is what was written there. If you look at the application we made to HARB, it is written on the form, and the letter and the samples and the rendering. Mr. Meyer that is exactly the problem as I see it, Louise. Ms. Gering we need to redo the process of how we get this information from HARB so we can make an intelligent decision. Any other questions from Council? Mr. Meyer I am concerned about this whole thing Dan raised. I want to make sure we have, the problem we have right now and I don't know how to deal with this. Ms. Gering Peter, this is the application, not the process right now. We are going to talk about that later. We are only dealing with her application. Mr. Meyer what worries me, is somebody uses this as precedent, saying we did something in favor of one of our fellow Council members and I don't want that to be used to hang us. Ms. Feder I don't think it is a favor. We just approved 3 different fences before this. This is one more fence. Mr. Dougherty The six people who are going to vote on this, haven't seen it. That, I guess, is Peter's point. We are aggregating our responsibility to actually adjudicate the reasonableness. We would be rubber stamping the recommendation without the material. I think that is what Peter is saying. I understand Peter and I understand this is not a problem of your making, Louise. Ms. Feder I would push back on that. If I was any other applicant coming here and you said I don't see it, I would say it was in the application, would you like to see the application? The answer would have been, yes. I can still certainly screen share the application. We are at a point where the process has been, you apply to HARB, you apply to zoning, you go to HARB and get the permissions, done. I have no hand in making up the Borough packet. I am sorry what you are seeing is not the full slate of the application. That is absolutely no fault of the applicant. It is no fault of Council. It is just a fact of record keeping. If we meeting in person, certainly I can show you the paper version of it. Mr. Maisel excuse me Louise, I am not sure Peter, what the issue is that you are having, the difficulty you are having, other than the specificity of the trim of the walking gate. Perhaps their trim has not been established. What exactly are you concerned about that you feel some kind of preferential treatment is potentially being bestowed on the applicant here. I am not sure what it is. Ms. Feder putting aside HARB. Mr. Maisel that is besides the point. Mr. Meyer I understand fully. What I am dealing with is my concern that someone else at a future

point, can point to the fact that as Louise has accurately pointed out, we do not have a full picture of what we are voting on. Ms. Feder but you do have full picture of what you are voting on. You have the plan and the application was provided to the Borough. Mr. Meyer ok, I am dealing with what I have in front of me on my computer. Mr. Dougherty I guess if there is an administrative snafu where Council was not provided with sufficient information, Louise, we do not have, we the people on this phone call, do not have your application, we do not have the backup. We were not provided that. That is a mistake by Borough government. We are being asked to vote on something. The next applicant that comes along, if we don't have that material in front of us, some of us might say, no we are not going to vote on that. We can't vote on that. In this case, it is a fence. How do we say to the next person, no, we are not going to vote on it because we don't have the material, if, I think Peter is saying, but we voted on this one. I am not saying the Borough does not have the material, the Borough does have the material. It is people sitting on this call, who have to vote on it. We are basically rubber stamping it, which is a bad precedent to do for a Council person. That, I think that is what Peter is saying. Peter? Ms. Feder We have had this Borough packet for many days at this point. If there was something in the packet that you did not feel was sufficient, the answer would be to first go the Borough and see what other documents we have. If the applicant has gone thru the process of meetings and forms and doing all the renderings and paperwork, to go to the applicant and say we don't have the paperwork and that is actually our fault, so you can't move forward in this process, seems like a real mix-up of what rubberstamping is being done here. Mr. Dougherty Louise, when we got the packet which was Friday I think, that is exactly what I did. I went thru it. I said, what are we being asked to approve? What is Connie being asked to sign here? I sent a series of emails to the Borough Manager over the weekend and Ken Maisel throughout the weekend and we still, the six of us, still don't have the material. Ok, Louise, we didn't want to drag you into it. That is exactly what we did do and we still did not get it. Mr. Maisel what material is missing at this point, between the supplemental information, the explanation of the applicant has made that is making anybody who is opposed to this thing, concerned, at this point? Maybe it's been peeled apart, like an onion? But what part of the application, as we understand it right now, with the supplemental information sent out today, I think it was sent today, that creates the pause? Mr. Dougherty I saw the supplemental material. I didn't see any pictures in the material of any picket fence, Ken. Ms. Feder but that is not the supplemental material that I provided. It's not. There are pictures of picket fences in my supplemental material. There are pictures of samples of similar picket fences in the Borough. There is a rendering of what that picket fence would like in front of my house and there is a plan and a color sample and a letter detailing the extent of the project. Mr. Dougherty and shame on us that we did not get any of that stuff, Louise. I tried to say it 5 times. This is a problem with what has happened in this particular situation. Mr. Meyer I am looking at the document that says, Certificate of Appropriateness. It talks about a fence installation, accepted as presented with changes noted below. It has a fence choice recommended, as Exhibit A, page 1. The thing assembled, it is not a white picket fence. Ms. Feder again, Peter, that is not what I provided. If you like for the purpose of this meeting, I can Mr. Meyer all I can do, Louise is what is before us, is the documentation that I am looking at. I have nothing else I can deal with at this stage of the game. Ms. Feder I am ready to remedy that problem for you. Since the lapse has been in Borough records in what was provided to Council, I can share my screen, I can show you the samples of the fences, the samples in town, the renderings. Mr. Meyer I am looking at a recommendation. It does not recommend a picket fence. I cannot vote for a recommendation that does not recommend a picket fence. Ms. Gering Peter, Tracy is going to share some information. Ms. Tackett I believe Pete can share Louise's screen. Is that right, Pete? Louise, maybe you can share. I apologize, I think JoAnn may have misunderstood what she needed to put in here. I can certainly talk to her after tonight. If Louise can share her screen, maybe that will resolve it. Peter, I understand your issue is the description that JoAnn put on the certificate of appropriateness is not detailed enough. Maybe you could amend the language and she could fix that, after tonight? Ms. Feder would you like me to share my screen? Ms. Gering if you have it, share it. Ms. Feder can you see this? This is a duplication. It is pretty clear, removed old unpainted picket fence, install new white spindle picket fence, painted with Sherwin Williams Classic White to match the trim with gate. The fence would then wrap around the side yard, replacing the existing fence. This is the letter. If you want me to read the letter, I can certainly do that. The relevant point is, again, the last paragraph of the plan is a square spindle picket fence, a wooden picket fence, with a gate to match on the front walkway leading to the red door on the right. It would gradually go up to the privacy fence again which we have discussed at length. Here is the color sample. Here are two samples of what the square spindle picket fence looks like as I noted to be painted in the color sample attached. Here are two of our neighbors who have square spindle picket fences. They are both wood and they are both cedar, so are ours. This was before we got the note about the lattice top. We are happy to do a lattice top. This is an example of a flat top privacy fence. This is an example of a flat top privacy fence in the historic district. This is an example what the fence post cap will look like again painted in the color sample provided. This is front of our house. This is the side of our

house. This is the front of the house with what the gate would look like noted. It is an approximation of size obviously not to scale. There you can see the continuation of the white square spindle picket fence painted in the same color to match. Then there is the plan. It was updated per Tracy's dimensions. There were details. Again, I don't what else we could have presented to HARB beyond this. If there are questions beyond what we provided to HARB, I would be happy to answer them. I don't think that the applicant should be penalized by not having the materials in the Borough Council's supplemental packet. Mr. Meyer Louise, I think that your presentation... Can I complement Louise on her presentation? I think understand it perfectly. I am also looking at page 88 of the materials we received for this meeting. I do not know how we as a Borough Council go about modifying the certificate of appropriateness that we have on page 88. I would like the modify the certificate of appropriateness so that it does not say the fence choice is the thing that is recommended by Exhibit A, page 1 for the front of the building. That is all I am trying to get done. Mr. Dougherty that is one part. The other part on the very same certificate of appropriateness, that we are being asked to vote on and have Ms. Gering and Mr. Gray sign, literally says natural color. It doesn't say it is going to be painted in the color you mentioned. It says natural color. Is this our job as Council to sit here and try to figure out? It is not obviously. That is where the rubber stamp part comes in. We are approving something, or we would have, that says natural color. You are going to paint it white, which is great. You have even given the Sherwin Williams, and they all talked about it. That COA piece of paper says natural color on it. It doesn't mention a three foot fence or six foot going down to three foot. It doesn't have an attachments spelling out all the wonderful things you have agreed to do and make it beautiful. That is the point, I think. Mr. Meyer for some strange reason, I find myself agreeing with Dan. Mr. Dougherty I think our approval to you was worthless, because frankly, if we approved what we approved there, you would have had to keep it as a natural fence. Ms. Feder are you up for amending the language and voting to approve with the amended language? Ms. Gering if the fence is going to be white, then the certificate of appropriateness needs to be amended to reflect the language. Mr. Meyer do we do that or do we send back to HARB. I don't know how to do this. Ms. Gering stop right there, we have legal counsel. Barbara, when we amend the certificate, can it just be amended at the office because this is the recommendation of Council? Ms. Kirk well, if I may, I am looking at a May 26, 2020 letter that was included in the amended documentation that clearly states what the request is for the application. Why don't you just X out where it says natural color and just put color as set forth in the May 26, 2020 letter issued by Mr. Wise. Mr. Dougherty there is no specificity to the height going from six to three feet in the front. Is that in the COA we are being asked to approve? And there is no attachment to the COA except what Louise has so graciously put on her screen for us to stare at, of which there is no formal record of for this process. Ms. Gering the certificate does not tell you the height or anything we are approving. Ms. Feder can you say, see attached with the plan provided by the applicant as it notes clearly what the heights are? Mr. Dougherty in this case, I would be ok with that. Ms. Kirk I am trying to figure out how to do this. Color as set forth in May 26, 2020 letter from Mr. Wise. I am sorry Ms. Feder, tell me again what it was? Ms. Feder the height was 3 feet in the front and the two panels go up six feet. Do you want the color? Mr. Meyer excuse me, the letter make reference to the existing fence being approximately 3 feet high. I think what we may be able to do is make reference to the fact it replicates the three foot. Would this satisfy you, Louise? Ms. Feder it does not, the fence existing on the property is only part. What the issue is.... Mr. Meyer no, no I am talking about the front Louise. Ms. Feder there is no fence currently in the front of our house. The fence we are putting in is a new fence. You can certainly say the height will be the same of the existing fence on the side of the house because it will be, because that fence is also three feet. Ms. Kirk so if I may interrupt, when you said something about the application that you presented, what was the language you were indicating. Ms. Feder you can refer to the application for sure. It says the color in the application, the height, it would wrap around to the side yard replacing the old fence and then it says, where the color would be, see attached for dimensions per the plan, exactly where that would start. You can certainly reference that when you do the application. Ms. Kirk would it be acceptable to Council for the fence installation COA to read accepted as presented with changes noted below, removal of picket fence, color as set forth in the May 26, 2020 letter issued by Mr. Wise. Using fence choice recommended by HARB exhibit A page 1. Fence to be installed in front and right side of property leading up to the sun room. Height of fence not to exceed as set forth in the application. Mr. Meyer no because that doesn't give us the white picket fence in the front that Louise wants. Ms. Feder it is the same dimensions that Barb is referencing. If you want to specifically notate it is a white picket fence. Mr. Dougherty we are making a motion Barbara to amend the draft of the COA? Correct? I would be ok with that. Ms. Gering so we are going to have a new motion for the Certificate of Appropriateness for 10 Randolph Street, there are stipulations attached, that our Solicitor has put together. Mr. Dougherty I'll make that motion. Ms. Gering can I have a second? Mr. Meyer I will second that motion but, Mr. Dougherty when you second a motion you can't put modifiers on it. You either second on

it or let someone else. Ms. Gering no more questions, all in favor? ALL aye Ms. Gering opposed? (none) Motion passes, good luck with your fence.

**Consider ZHB application 274 South Main Street – entry signage, guardrail and split rail fence**

Ms. Gering is anyone here for that? We oppose it or stay neutral. That is part of gateway. Everyone neutral? Anyone opposed? (none) Ok, the motion is going to be neutral.

**Consider Escrow Release #2 for River's Edge, 46 North Main Street**

Ms. Gering can I have a motion to approve the escrow release? Ms. McHugh I will make that motion. Ms. Rettig I will second. Mr. Maisel I abstain. Ms. Gering all in favor ALL aye. Ms. Gering opposed? (none) Motion passes.

**Consideration to approve the minutes from the June 16, 2020 and July 6, 2020 Council meetings.**

Ms. Gering can I have a motion? Mr. Maisel I will make that motion. Ms. Gering second? Ms. Rettig second. Ms. Gering any discussion from Council? All in favor? ALL aye.

**Approval of Accounts Payables: June accounts payable in the amount of \$ 181,660.70 and June 29, 2020, July 2, 2020 and July 17, 2020 payrolls in the amounts of \$ 72,435.13, \$ 69,370.48 and \$ 72,043.11.**

Ms. Gering can I have a motion for approval? Ms. Feder I will make that motion. Ms. Gering second? Ms. Rettig I will second it. Ms. Gering questions? All in favor? ALL aye.

**Council Member Reports on Committees**

**Parks and Recreation Board**

Ms. Gering Parks and Rec, do you have a report? Ms. Feder our meeting this month was cancelled. It is worth mentioning that the Park and Rec committee is working on soliciting volunteers for every Monday in August. We are looking for people to come and help with weeding. We also had the Parks and Rec Chair and myself and two other Parks and Rec committee members meet with Pete Gray to talk about strategies for best watering the plants in the planters and hanging pots in July and August. Ms. Gering thank you.

**Shade Tree Commission**

Ms. Gering, Shade Tree? Ms. McHugh, we have nothing to report. Ms. Gering thank you.

**Finance Committee**

Ms. Gering, Dan, Finance Committee? Mr. Dougherty no report.

**HARB**

Ms. Gering, Ken do you have anything? Mr. Maisel, no report, but we have work to do. Ms. Gering thank you.

**Planning Commission**

Ms. Gering Planning Commission, Peter? Mr. Meyer the only thing we have is River Walk which is a development on Main involving two properties being merged together. We had a meeting on that first Monday in July. We had a large number of citizens show up opposed to it. It has been scaled back from 8 units to 6 units. They have come up with a design that is more appropriate. It is considered appropriate by the Planning Commission.

**Zoning**

Ms. Gering has a meeting for 49 West Mechanic Street. That is continued for August 13. They have not made a decision on it.

**Manager Report**

Ms. Gering, do we have a Manager's report? Mr. Gray, not at this time.

### **Solicitor Reports**

Ms. Gering, do we have a Solicitor's report? Ms. Kirk no. nothing.

### **Public Comment**

Ms. Gering, do we have any public comment? Mr. Gray, one hand raised, Mr. Duffy. Ms. Gering Mr. Duffy, how are you? Unmute yourself Ed. Mr. Duffy How is everyone doing? I have watched this whole thing with 10 West Randolph. I think it was a decorum thing because you let a Council person present her own project to Council that was going to approve it. Do you really think that was an appropriate thing to do? She could take her project to the Council, but does it make sense for that person to present the project which might look like favoritism for approval? Because she spent a lot of time doing it. Mr. Meyer may I suggest that I would request humbly that you tell us Ed, what else you would prefer by way of protocol. Are you suggesting that because a member of Council, is a member of Council, that he or she needs to get counsel in order to be able to present proposal before this Council? Mr. Duffy com down Peter. All I am saying is she should not present her project. It looks like it could be undue pass thru for this project. Mr. Meyer who should present for her? Mr. Duffy anyone else. She has other friends like her husband, right? Or a lawyer or architect? Like everybody else does. Ms. Feder Ed, I am going to humbly say, I am going to speak for my husband and myself in this situation? Ms. Gering any other comments. Mr. Gray no other hands are raised at this time.

### **Announcements**

Ms. Gering any announcements?

### **Adjournment**

Ms. Gering, can I have a motion to adjourn? Mr. Meyer I so move. Ms. Feder, second. favor? ALL, aye. Ms. Gering, goodnight everybody, thank you so much. Stay safe out there. Meeting ended at 8:51 pm.