



MIDDLEBURG TOWN COUNCIL
Regular Monthly Meeting Minutes
Thursday, May 27, 2021



PENDING APPROVAL

PRESENT: Mayor Trowbridge M. Littleton
Vice Mayor Philip M. Miller
Councilmember Chris W. Bernard
Councilmember J. Kevin Daly
Councilmember Morris “Bud” Jacobs
Councilmember Darlene Kirk
Councilmember Peter Leonard-Morgan
Councilmember Cindy C. Pearson

STAFF: Danny Davis, Town Manager
Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk
William M. Moore, Deputy Town Manager
Estee LaClare, Planning & Project Associate
A.J. Panebianco, Chief of Police

The Town Council of the Town of Middleburg, Virginia held their regular monthly meeting, beginning at 6:00 p.m. on Thursday, May 27, 2021. Due to Governor Northam’s executive orders requiring that people social distance, the meeting was held as a hybrid meeting, with some of the Council and staff participating in-person and others participating remotely.

Mayor Littleton explained for the viewing audience that it was the Council’s responsibility to conduct essential public business despite the COVID-19 pandemic; however, it recognized the need to do so safely, not only for its members but also for the Town staff and members of the public. He further explained that to that end, the Council would hold its meetings via remote access until such time as the Governor rescinded his executive orders. Mr. Littleton advised the viewing audience that copies of the agendas were available on the Town’s website. He reviewed the process that would be utilized for the remote meetings.

Mayor Littleton led Council and those attending in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag. The roll was called at 6:00 p.m.

Town Clerk North reviewed the procedures for those individuals who wished to speak during the meeting via Zoom.

Public Comment

Prem Devadas, of Salamander Hotels & Resorts, noted that the Town staff was scheduled to provide the Council with an update on their proffer amendment request. He further noted that he met with the staff and reviewed the public comments that were received during the Planning Commission’s public hearing on this item. Mr. Devadas advised Council that he planned to reach out to the neighbors on Reed and Chestnut Streets, as well as to the individual members of the Council, in an attempt to find common ground and share information.

Liz White, 708 Chestnut Street, noted that her property bordered that of Salamander and the Town’s water treatment plant. She advised that her concerns were about maintaining nature. Ms. White opined that Salamander was proposing to build a lot of houses and noted that Chestnut Street was a small street. She advised that she chose to purchase at this location due to the quaintness of the street. Ms. White noted that trees were important to her. Ms. White advised that she did not want a lot of traffic on her street and noted that Chestnut Street would be used by those living at The Residences at Salamander to access their central mailbox. Ms. White asked that the Council find a way to reduce the number of houses; provide the necessary infrastructure for everything that was being built; not affect the existing houses; and, preserve nature.

Will McCulloch, 207 Chestnut Street and 202 Sycamore Street, advised that he was upset that Salamander was not keeping their word. He further advised that he bought his house on the basis that there would be forty-nine houses and two entrances and opined that Salamander was now changing that. Mr. McCulloch suggested that if Salamander asked for more than forty-nine homes, the Town should renegotiate everything.

Kevin Daly, 112 North Jay Street, reminded the Council and audience of the upcoming Memorial Day holiday. He further reminded them of the purpose of the holiday, which was to remember those who lost their lives and gave all defending our democracy and freedom.

Roxene Hill, 205 Chestnut Street, opined that Chestnut Street was being made to be the “scape goat”. She suggested that just because it was inconvenient, it did not mean it was impossible for Salamander to develop the Reed Street extension. Ms. Hill opined that Chestnut Street was not wide enough to handle the additional traffic, nor was the pavement appropriate for many cars. She questioned whether a proper traffic study had been done so the residents would understand what would happen to their properties and opined that they could lose a portion of them. Ms. Hill noted that the proffers called for four entrances into the subdivision and opined that all the traffic would be on Chestnut Street if this were changed. She further opined that it would be a hindrance to the Town and property owners. Ms. Hill noted that people walked and biked on Chestnut Street. She noted Middleburg’s charming atmosphere and suggested the charm would be lost due to the things the Town wanted to do. Ms. Hill expressed concern that trees could be destroyed and noted that many of them were over one hundred fifty years old. She opined that the location of the centralized mailbox would compound the traffic issues. Ms. Hill asked that the proffers be thrown out entirely and work on them start again.

Public Hearings & Approvals

Zoning Text Amendment 21-01: Ordinance to Amend Section 121 of the Middleburg Zoning Ordinance Pertaining to Building Height in R-2 Single-Family Residential District

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded Council that they directed the Planning Commission to research ways to address concerns that had been raised regarding the infill and redevelopment of the Ridgeview area and to report back with a zoning text amendment. He reported that the Commission studied the matter and unanimously recommended the amendment before the Council, which would reduce the baseline building height in the R-2 District to twenty-five feet and allow it to be increased by a foot for each additional foot of side yard above the minimum, up to a maximum building height of thirty feet. Mr. Moore noted that this would result in a side yard of twelve and a half feet.

No one spoke and the public hearing was closed.

In response to an inquiry from the Council, Deputy Town Manager Moore confirmed the maximum height would be thirty feet regardless of how large the side yard was.

Mayor Littleton thanked the Planning Commission and staff for their hard work. He opined that the proposed solution was reasonable, flexible and would help retain the village/town feel. Mr. Littleton noted that this was a great start to a balanced approach.

In response to an inquiry from the Council, Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that the staff proposed three amendments to the Planning Commission; however, they chose to not proceed with the first recommendation, which was to establish a maximum lot size. He suggested that if the Council wished, it could direct that item be sent back to the Planning Commission; however, they could not add it to this item.

Councilmember Jacobs explained that the Planning Commission felt it made more sense to consider maximum lot coverage limits. He noted that that item was pending.

Mayor Littleton expressed an understanding of the Commission’s position on the maximum lot size amendment; however, he opined that it would be a thoughtful way to address the issue. He noted that the building height amendment would not stop an individual from buying six lots and building a large house. Mr. Littleton reiterated that establishing a maximum lot size, as well as establishing lot coverage ratios, made sense. He questioned whether the Council could pursue those on its own. Deputy Town Manager Moore confirmed the Council could initiate a zoning text amendment.

After some discussion, the Council agreed to ask the Planning Commission to revisit establishing a maximum lot size limit; however, they noted that they did not want to pressure them one way or the other. They asked that the staff report on those discussions as a part of their next staff report.

Councilmember Jacobs moved, seconded by Councilmember Daly, that Council adopt an Ordinance to Amend Section 121 of the Middleburg Zoning Ordinance Pertaining to Building Height in the R -2 Single-Family Residential District.

Vote: Yes – Councilmembers Miller, Bernard, Daly, Jacobs, Leonard-Morgan and Pearson

No – Councilmember Kirk

Abstain: N/A

Absent: N/A

(Mayor Littleton only votes in the case of a tie.) (by roll call vote)

Zoning Map Amendment 21-01: Ordinance to Rezone 0.5153 Acres at 10 West Marshall Street from R-1 Single-Family Residential District to C-2 Town Commercial District and to Rezone 0.59696 Acre Portion of Adjoining Land from MUV Mixed Use Village District with Proffers to C-2 Town Commercial District

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded Council that this was a part of the Town Hall Project and involved the rezoning of two properties behind the existing Town Office to C-2 Commercial to match the zoning of the existing Town Office and that of the surrounding properties on Marshall Street.

No one spoke and the public hearing was closed.

Vice Mayor Miller moved, seconded by Councilmember Kirk, that Council Adopt an Ordinance Approving Zoning Map Amendment 21-01 as depicted on the exhibit titled “Rezoning Exhibit, ZMA 21-01” dated March 17, 2021, as it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and represents good planning practice.

Vote: Yes – Councilmembers Miller, Bernard, Daly, Jacobs, Kirk, Leonard-Morgan and Pearson

No – N/A

Abstain: N/A

Absent: N/A

(Mayor Littleton only votes in the case of a tie.) (by roll call vote)

Zoning Map Amendment 21-02: Ordinance to Amend Proffers Associated with Conditionally Zoned R-1 Single-Family Residential, R-3 Residential and MUV Mixed Use Village District Properties and a Portion of 500 North Pendleton Street

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised Council that this proffer amendment was primarily associated with the Town Hall Project. He reviewed the history of the Salamander proffers, which were adopted in 2007 and subsequently amended twice. Mr. Moore explained that this amendment would eliminate the proffer requirement that Salamander dedicate property for a Town Hall and instead proffer the Village Green location, which Salamander would continue to own. He advised that the other amendments were not substantive and involved things such as removing proffers that had already been fulfilled and updating ownership information. He further advised that this amendment would combine all the proffers and amendments into one document.

No one spoke and the public hearing was closed.

Vice Mayor Miller moved, seconded by Councilmember Kirk, that Council Adopt an Ordinance Approving Zoning Map Amendment 21-02 as contained in the Proffer Statement Titled "Amended and Restated Proffer, Middleburg Residential LLC & Salamander Middleburg MUV LLC" dated February 24, 2021.

Vote: Yes – Councilmembers Miller, Bernard, Daly, Jacobs, Kirk, Leonard-Morgan and Pearson

No – N/A

Abstain: N/A

Absent: N/A

(Mayor Littleton only votes in the case of a tie.) (by roll call vote)

Staff Reports

Town Treasurer's Report

Town Manager Davis reported that the meals tax receipts for the month of April were over \$81,000, which was more than projected and higher on a percentage basis when compared to previous years. He reported that the meals tax revenues were currently down by 6.5% compared to 2019 receipts. Mr. Davis advised that the Town had made up for some of the lost revenues and noted that the staff expected the May meals tax revenues to be good as well. He noted that with the change in the Governor's executive orders, businesses would be able to hold larger events again.

Town Manager Davis reported that the Town had received most of the bank franchise revenues and advised that they were on track. He reminded Council that the business personal property and real estate taxes and vehicle license fees were due soon.

COVID Status Report

Town Manager Davis reported that effective at midnight, the requirement to social distance and the restrictions on businesses would expire. He encouraged the public to continue to take proper precautions. Mr. Davis opined that vaccinations were now easy to find and noted that the Loudoun County Health Department was available to assist individuals in finding a location to get one.

Town Manager Davis advised that he believed Middleburg would receive \$865,000 as the result of the American Rescue Plan Act; however, he was waiting to receive the final number from the State. He noted that he would return with a plan for its use. Mr. Davis reminded Council that the money would be received in two tranches.

It was noted that the Safeway was offering the Johnson & Johnson vaccine on a walk-in basis.

Consent Agenda

A. Council Approval – May 13, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes

Vice Mayor Miller moved, seconded by Councilmember Daly, that Council approve the consent agenda as proposed.

Vote: Yes – Councilmembers Miller, Bernard, Daly, Jacobs, Kirk, Leonard-Morgan and Pearson

No – N/A

Abstain: N/A

Absent: N/A

(Mayor Littleton only votes in the case of a tie.)

Discussion Items

Zoning Text Amendment 21-02: Salamander Proffer Amendments

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised Council that this proffer amendment was separate from the one they previously approved. He explained that the applicant requested substantive amendments, two of which involved the replacement of the layout plan. Mr. Moore advised that the first item would eliminate the requirement to extend Reed Street. He noted that there were a number of issues connected to that extension, including that the right-of-way did not align with the current street and that there were a number of utilities in the right-of-way that would require relocation. Mr. Moore reminded Council that financial considerations should not impact their decision. He advised that the extension would impact the surrounding property owners; would require a design waiver from the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT); and, would require construction easements from the surrounding property owners, which were not guaranteed. Mr. Moore explained that if approved, the vehicular connection would be replaced with a pedestrian connection only. He noted that this change would create additional traffic on Chestnut and Pendleton Streets, with one hundred fifteen trips/day going to Pendleton Street and sixty-five going to Chestnut Street. Mr. Moore reported that Salamander was also asking to revise the street sections on the layout plan to allow for pedestrian facilities on one-side of the street only in the R-3 section, which involved the larger lots. In response to an inquiry from the Council, Mr. Moore confirmed the homes in the R-1 section would have sidewalk on both sides of the street; however, the other sections would not.

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that Salamander was also seeking two amendments to the proffers related to the elimination of the Reed Street extension - the first being the elimination of the four-way stop requirement and the second being the bonding requirement – and noted that these were dependent on the action on the Reed Street extension amendment. He further reported that they were also seeking an amendment to allow construction traffic on North Pendleton Street, in addition to Foxcroft Road, which the staff supported as it would decrease traffic in front of the Middleburg Community Charter School.

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proffer amendment request, with almost all the speakers speaking in opposition to the elimination of the Reed Street extension. He further reported that the Planning Commission voted to recommend denial of all the amendments, except for the one to allow construction traffic on North Pendleton Street, which they supported. Mr. Moore reminded Council that the applicant could revise the proposed proffer amendments up to the time of the public hearing.

In response to an inquiry from the Council, Deputy Town Manager Moore confirmed there would not be an entrance into the subdivision from Middleburg Downs. He advised that traffic was currently proposed to access the subdivision through Chestnut Street, Reed Street and North Pendleton Street.

Councilmember Kirk advised that she was not in favor of eliminating the Reed Street extension. Councilmember Leonard-Morgan advised that unless it would create a major utility issue, he believed there should be three entrances into the subdivision.

Councilmember Jacobs advised Council that the Planning Commission was impressed by the residents' views on not eliminating the Reed Street extension, which were that the decision should not affect their safety and quality of life. He noted that the Commission's vote was unanimous; although, one member did not support denying the sidewalk amendment. Mr. Jacobs explained that the reason the Commission recommended denial of that was because the Comprehensive Plan encouraged pedestrian facilities and they were concerned about setting a precedent. He advised that as to the construction traffic, he suggested the Council and staff think about how it will be monitored to assure it used North Pendleton Street and Foxcroft Road.

Councilmember Kirk noted that the original reason for having multiple entrances was so the traffic would not be horrible for the residents on one street. She agreed with the need to assure construction traffic used the authorized entrances.

Councilmember Pearson noted the need to control the dirt and dust associated with the development. She suggested the need for four-way stops at the entrances.

Deputy Town Manager Moore noted that the proffers already required four-way stops at the intersections, subject to VDOT's approval. He reminded Council that the Town tried on multiple occasions to change the intersection of Marshall/Pendleton Streets to a four-way stop; however, VDOT denied the requests. Mr. Moore explained that absent accidents, VDOT looked at traffic volumes in determining the warrant for a four-way stop; however, they were averse to making motorists stop on a street with a high volume of traffic. He opined that they would not approve it unless political pressure was applied to them.

In response to inquiries from the Council regarding the sidewalks, Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded Council that the lots in the R-3 section would back up to those on Stonewall Avenue. He advised that constructing sidewalks on the south side of the street would require a steep grade on the front lawns of the houses. Mr. Moore noted that the R-3 section was heavily wooded and explained that Salamander was concerned that if they constructed sidewalk on the west side of the development, it would require more grading and more tree removal. Mr. Moore advised that the applicant amended their request to put sidewalk back on both sides of the street in the R-1 section; however, they were being sensitive to retaining trees wherever possible and asked to not have them on both sides of the street in the R-3 section.

Mayor Littleton noted that Salamander amended the proffers in 2015 to include the Reed Street extension. He further noted that the utilities existed at that time and the geometry of the right-of-way was the same. Mr. Littleton questioned what changed to cause Salamander to request the proffer amendment.

Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that based on his meeting with Mr. Devadas, it appeared the biggest concern was the ability to acquire construction easements from the adjacent property owners. He opined that if the Council denied the request for a proffer amendment and Salamander could not secure the necessary construction easements, the project would be "blown up". Mr. Moore advised that several months ago, he suggested to Salamander's partner and engineers that they should reach out to the two property owners; however, that had not yet happened. He noted that he did provide contact information to Mr. Devadas earlier in the day and advised that his intention was to meet with the adjoining property owners.

Town Manager Davis noted that the other changes that had occurred since 2015 was Salamander's development partner and engineers, as well as that the development plans were further along than they had been in the past.

In response to inquiries from the Council, Deputy Town Manager Moore confirmed that Salamander's development costs would be reduced if the proffer amendments were approved. He further confirmed that sidewalk would be required on both sides of the street if they were denied. Mr. Moore advised that Salamander could not return to the original proffer requirement to construct an entrance on the Middleburg Community Center's property, as they did not have the legal right to do so. He reported that the proffer amendments were scheduled for a public hearing during Council's June 10th meeting.

Mayor Littleton suggested a proposed motion be available following the public hearing in the event the Council wished to make one; however, he noted that they could also table action to the following meeting if desired.

Post-Pandemic Continued Use of Zoom by Public During Council Meetings

Mayor Littleton noted that after June 30th, the Council would no longer be able to attend meetings remotely; however, there was nothing to prevent the public from doing so if the Council wished to allow it. After some discussion, they agreed they did not as they felt they could better engage with individuals when they were in-person. It was noted that individuals could always continue to submit written comments before the Council meetings.

Council agreed that although they could continue to meet remotely through June 30th, they wished to resume meeting in-person immediately. It was noted that under the State Code, individual Councilmembers could participate remotely twice a year for personal reasons or an unlimited number of times for medical reasons or due to a disability, as long as a quorum was seated in the room.

It was further noted that the same rules applied to the Town's boards and commissions regarding the in-person meetings effective June 30th.

Information Items

Councilmember Pearson reminded Council of the Employee Picnic scheduled for June 14th.

Town Manager Davis reminded Council of the ribbon cutting ceremony for the PLAYroom on May 28th.

Mayor Littleton reported that he recently attended the Loudoun County School Board meeting to ask that they reconsider allowing a one-hundred-eighty-five-foot cell tower at Mercer Park. He noted that the standard sized tower was one-hundred-ten-feet. Mr. Littleton acknowledged that a tower would be located there; however, he asked the School Board to consider either moving it further north or reducing the height by fifteen feet so it would not be visible from the road. He reported that the School Board tabled action on the request. Mr. Littleton suggested the members of Council email the School Board members to express their concerns. He noted that the Route 50 viewshed only had one telecommunications facility – that being a one-hundred-foot monopole. Mr. Littleton reiterated that the tower would be built; however, he suggested its effects could be lessened.

Mayor Littleton reported that he was working with the PEC to meet with the members of the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors on the cluster development ordinance amendment, to stress the need to protect the open space and limit clustering on buildable soil. He suggested the Council also email them regarding it. Mr. Littleton noted that developers were also meeting with the Supervisors and suggested the community needed to as well.

In response to an inquiry regarding a letter the Council received regarding sidewalk issues at the intersection of Madison and Federal Streets, Town Manager Davis advised Council that the staff would bring this matter to them; however, he noted the need to first make sure the sidewalk was in the public right-of-way.

In response to an inquiry from the Council, Mayor Littleton advised that he did not know the status of the efforts related to the preservation of property in St. Louis. He advised that he would check on it and report back to the Council. Mr. Littleton noted that the last he heard, the land trade deal was dead. He advised that the Board of Supervisors were accepting proposals for the acquisition of their Aldie property, with proposals being due by May 26th.

Town Manager Davis reported that the Board of Supervisors was scheduled to receive public input on land use planning in the village of St. Louis during a special meeting on June 7th. He further reported that there was a public hearing that same evening on the conveyance of the Aldie Assemblage. Mr. Davis advised that three proposals were received; however, no recommendation was included in the County staff's report.

Public Comments

Liz White advised that Mr. Devadas told her the Town wanted the extensions of Reed and Chestnut Streets. She questioned who asked for the extensions.

Mayor Littleton opined that this occurred in 2006 when the entire development was put together. He suggested Ms. White speak with the staff about the history of the project.

Councilmember Kirk explained that the right-of-way already existed for both roads.

Closed Session

Vice Mayor Miller moved, seconded by Councilmember Kirk, that Council go into closed session as authorized under Section 2.2-3711 of the Code of Virginia, for the discussion or consideration of (1) appointments to a public body related to the Middleburg Arts Council and Go Green as allowed under Subsection (A)(1); (2) the disposition of publicly held property related to the Asbury Church as allowed under Subsection (A)(3); and, (3) briefings by staff members pertaining to actual or probable litigation, where such consultation in open meeting would adversely affect the negotiating or litigating posture of the public body related to a requested boundary line adjustment as allowed under Subsection (A)(7). Vice Mayor Miller further moved, seconded by Councilmember Kirk, that the Council thereafter reconvene in open session for action as appropriate.

Vote: Yes – Councilmembers Miller, Bernard, Daly, Jacobs, Kirk, Leonard-Morgan and Pearson
No – N/A
Abstain: N/A
Absent: N/A
(Mayor Littleton only votes in the case of a tie.) (by roll call vote)

Mayor Littleton asked that Council certify that to the best of each member's knowledge (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and (ii) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the closed meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered in the closed meeting, which each member so did. He reminded those present for the closed session that any discussion that occurred within it should be treated as confidential.

Appointments to Middleburg Arts Council

Councilmember Pearson moved, seconded by Councilmember Kirk, that Council reappoint Punkin Lee, Susan Pollard and Jennifer Long to the Middleburg Arts Council for two-year terms, said terms to expire June 14, 2023.

Vote: Yes – Councilmembers Miller, Bernard, Daly, Jacobs, Kirk, Leonard-Morgan and Pearson
No – N/A
Abstain: N/A
Absent: N/A
(Mayor Littleton only votes in the case of a tie.)

Appointment to Go Green

Councilmember Leonard-Morgan moved, seconded by Councilmember Kirk, that Council appoint Alfred Pollard to Go Green to fill an unexpired term, said term to expire May 12, 2022.

Vote: Yes – Councilmembers Miller, Bernard, Daly, Jacobs, Kirk, Leonard-Morgan and Pearson

No – N/A

Abstain: N/A

Absent: N/A

(Mayor Littleton only votes in the case of a tie.)

There being no further business, Mayor Littleton declared the meeting adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

APPROVED:

Trowbridge M. Littleton, MAYOR

ATTEST:

Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

May 27, 2021 Middleburg Town Council Meeting

(Note: This is a transcript prepared by a Town contractor based on the video of the meeting. It may not be entirely accurate. For greater accuracy, we encourage you to review the video of the meeting that is on the Town's website – www.middleburgva.gov)

Bridge Littleton: All right, six o'clock, all right, I will call the May 27th meeting to order. First item is Pledge of Allegiance. [Pledge of Allegiance] All right. Next item is roll call Darlene. [off mic]

Darlene Kirk: Darlene Kirk.

Philip Miller: Philip Miller.

Bridge Littleton: Bridge Littleton.

Cindy Pearson: Cindy Pearson,

Kevin Daly: John Kevin Daly,

Chris Bernard: Chris Bernard.

Bridge Littleton: Peter.

Peter Leonard-Morgan: Peter Leonard-Morgan.

Bridge Littleton: Bud.

Bud Jacobs: Bud Jacobs

Rhonda North: Rhonda North, Town Clerk.

Danny Davis: Danny Davis, town manager.

Bridge Littleton: Ok, let me do the remote meeting announcement here. If I can get to it, OK. It is the Middleburg Town Council's responsibility to conduct essential public business matters. Despite covid-19 pandemic, however, recognizes the need to do so safely, not only for its membership, but also for the town staff or members of the public. To that end, the council is conducting its meetings remotely. We anticipate resuming normal in-person meetings when the governor's covid pandemic emergency order expires on June 30th. Until such time, anyone wishing to participate during the meeting, during the public comment periods or public hearings may do so in person or by calling in at the number provided. All right, next item here is public comment, so we will open the public comment session. If anybody would like to address the town council on any matter. Well, actually, before you open the public comment session, Rhonda, do you want to remind folks who potentially are online of the rules for online.

Rhonda North: Sure. Well, it's more how you how you'd like to if you'd like to speak, how you do so through Zoom. So when you come in, you are automatically muted and you only have listen or view capabilities. If you would like to speak, if you will, please let me know if you're on your computer or a device by raising your hand or sending me a message via chat. If you're on your phone, you can press star nine. Once you're granted the opportunity to speak, then if you're on your computer, you would simply unmute your microphone if you're on your telephone. Press star six.

Bridge Littleton: Ok, so we've got several public hearings tonight, we've also got the public comment session, we will still be holding two public comment sessions, one at the beginning of the council meeting and one at the end. So we will

now open the public comment session. If anybody would like to address council on any matter, please identify yourself now. Prem. Absolutely. Come over here. All right. Or yeah. There you go. Wherever.

Prem Devadas: Ok, great. Thank you. Prem Devadas, Salamander Hotels and Resorts. And good evening, everyone. Good to see you. I understand that staff will be providing you with an update on our proposed amendments following last week's Planning Commission meeting. So I just wanted to let you know that I had the opportunity to meet with staff. I was not at the Planning Commission hearing, but I've had a chance to review some of the some of the session. And my intent over the next week, including this weekend, is to reach out to some of our neighbors and neighbors on Reed Street who would be impacted by Reed Street being accessed, neighbors on Chestnut, including those who have spoken out with concerns about our proposal and also Council Members. I plan to reach out to individually because I'm interested in hearing all points of view. I'm interested in hearing concerns in the next few days to the extent there is the ability to find, you know, common ground on any concerns, I always want to do that, but also to have the opportunity to share information that people may not know and to make sure that we surface all the facts. So that's all I wanted to let you know, is that you may be getting a call from me and you can. And I actually already have a meeting set up for this Sunday morning with one of our neighbors who has vocalized some concerns. So that process will be ongoing this week. Any questions? [off mic] OK.

Bridge Littleton: Prem, thank you very much.

Prem Devadas: All right. Thank you.

Bridge Littleton: Ok. Would anybody else. Oh, yes, ma'am. And if you just want to give your name and address,

Liz White: Sure, my name is Liz White and I'm brand new here. I live at 708 Chestnut Street, which actually borders not only Chestnut, but on 708 Middleburg sorry, Stonewall OK, still getting used to that. So and I would be mostly the largest impacted person as I see it, as this development would go forward on Chestnut. Now I've been looking for a year for a house in this vicinity, so it's been a while. So I finally found that house because of the peacefulness of it. One of the things I liked about Middleburg is that there is an element of joining, of connecting of people, respecting of people, respecting of nature and a natural master naturalist and well as a master gardener. So those things have been a lifelong part of my life. So as you know, my property sits and really borders not only the just the small section of what's owned by your property and then, of course, the sewage plant. But my largest concern is maintaining the naturalness of nature within the community. And I've been working for so many years with other projects about open space, about maintaining the virtualness of that, and that when you enter the amount of houses that are going to be proposed for that, that's a it's a small street. It's not one that has sidewalks, even though the proposal does have sidewalks. But we're I picked it because of its quaintness. And I certainly don't want to impact any of the nature things. And I have about one hundred and fifty year old oak tree. And if you look under the statutes in Virginia about the rankings of trees, I'm sure it's under preserve. Those are things that are important to me. The total amount of units being built, the houses being built matters to me. I think that there are alternative ways to address that. I certainly don't want a lot of traffic coming because they have to all go to their mailboxes. If that's the plan to be centrally located, they would be coming down Chestnut Street. Most of these houses have at least two or three cars. So we're talking about a great number of traffic that that Chestnut would have to bear and Stonewall would have to bear, which is really not consistent to what I understand what I know about the town. So bear with me. But I think there are some more plans that should be take place to preserve the what you've already set in motion. You're a bird city. You're a tree city. You've done a lot. And you have two great organizations that do horticulture support. And I came from Lewes, Delaware, where those are big things in saving open space and saving all those things are critical. And so and if there are things to be addressed in added into the town that obviously I know about the infrastructure from being with Red Cross for 17 years, there have to be ways to get to those houses pretty quickly. But can we find a way to reduce the number of houses proposed? Can we find ways that we can have the infrastructure for all the stuff that's being built, not impact a lot of those of the existing houses. And the other thing is, can we preserve the natural nature of what we want. And I think that's critical. People come here because of the look. this is a unique town. And again, you know, as you know, you've been here for years. I've been here for two weeks. But it's been a long, year long journey to find a place that does that kind of preservation. And Virginia is good about their loss and preservation. They're good about their laws on open space. And it's really similar to southern Delaware, where I lived for a number of years. And so part of that is important to me. And if you allow too much building with with interrupting the natural peace and

quiet of the town, I think you are doing a disservice to too many people. And whether I lived here or not, I still think that the preservation of what you have brings people here. So if you have any questions, you're welcome to ask me.

Bridge Littleton: [off mic] public comment, it's there's. We're not allowed to do a back and forth, but we really appreciate you coming by and expressing your giving us your thoughts. Yes, ma'am. Thank you. Will.

Will McCulloch: Look at that, I showed up. OK, name and address. William McCulloch. 207 Chestnut Street tomorrow morning, 202 Sycamore Street. So my public comment is, I mean, I think everybody heard my comment last time about the nature of the land that we come from and keeping your word and how your word really runs deep back here. So I'm upset that nobody decided to just go ahead and keep their word and take their money and just do what was said and that were at this table again, because I bought on the perspective that everything was just going to be as is there was going to be 49 homes. There was going to be two driveways, there was going to be no fuss, no bus, nothing, because it was set in stone. There was nothing I could do about it. There was nothing anybody else could do about it. But the fact of the matter is, when you come to the table a decade later and change what's on the perspective and say, hey, I want to renegotiate, then I want to sit here and I want to renegotiate the whole thing from the ground up. So I say it's a great thing that we want to start this conversation and have it. But I think it's going to be much longer than anybody wanted. And unless there's a public apology and a straight and direct, concise way to get to 49 homes in as proposed, that it's just going to be more difficult and stressful for everybody involved. And that's all I have to say.

Bridge Littleton: Thank you. Rhonda, is there anybody online? [off mic] would anybody else like to, anybody else here to address council? Oh, you want to speak? Absolutely. Go ahead.

Kevin Daly: I just want to put a thought in everyone's mind part. Oh, John Kevin Daly, 112 North J Street. Just want to put a thought in everyone's mind in the rush of going out to the beaches, doing a barbecue, enjoying the sun, and in some cases the start of this weekend, the rain to remember the too many, much, much too many men, women of every race, color and creed, some of them not even naturalized citizens, but Americans, all who gave their all in defense for our democracy and our freedom. And that's what Memorial Day is all about, is to remember those who gave up all of their tomorrows for our today.

Bridge Littleton: Thank you. Yes. Hello. Ma'am, are you here to speak for the public comment session?

Roxene Hill: Oh, I was waiting. I thought you were going to. I'm not ready yet. Sorry.

Bridge Littleton: Well, the public comment sessions open right now. So how much?

Roxene Hill: Well, I guess I can start. I just had left some papers in my car, so.

Bridge Littleton: I mean, if you'd like to wait, we do have another public comment session at the end of the council meeting. And so that'll probably be in an hour, an hour and a half. But so if you're ready to speak now, that's great. If you want to wait till then, it's totally up to you.

Roxene Hill: Ok, now I can go ahead now.

Bridge Littleton: Ok. All right. You can just state your name and address.

Roxene Hill: Sure. Roxene Hill. I'm 205 Chestnut Street. I'm well aware certainly of the development having been a developer myself. I think what I'm concerned about now is I feel like we have become the Chestnut Street has become the scapegoat because it's not convenient for everyone to follow through on any other possibilities for entrances. And just because it's inconvenient, it doesn't mean that it's not possible and it doesn't mean that you shouldn't be, you know, trying to settle those issues. And maybe there's some other ways that can be affected for to have a development which we believe will be more which will be better for the town. As it is now, Chestnut Street is not a very wide street, and nor is the is the pavement appropriate for the amount of cars that could be going through it. The I don't know how many of you make a right turn off of onto Chestnut off of Route 50, but when you make that turn, at least myself having done it now for the

last 20 years, I don't care if I'm going 10 miles an hour or I'm going 30 miles an hour. Inevitably, I wind up in the left lane. So if I'm making that right turn, I'm over in the left lane. And I can tell you that I've had some close calls on many an occasion. So to me, I think that there's there's got to be other issues. Has the town has there been a detailed traffic study done by an appropriate professional? I mean, can anyone answer this for me?

Bridge Littleton: So during public comment session, it's, we can't speak back.

Roxene Hill: Ok. All right, that's OK. All as I know what the rules are. So I feel that if a proper study was done, the landowners, the people who own property on Chestnut would have a better idea of exactly beyond the scope of what traffic is going up and down the street they would also have an idea of what's going to happen to their property. It could be with right away and the DOT, assuming that that they're going to go to VDOT standards, VDOT standards, people could lose their property. And now what what's happened is you don't have their exits now, Reed Street has been eliminated or at the moment and originally the proffers had four entrances into the property they had Foxcroft. You have to pull it out here, Foxcroft by the community center, Chestnut Street and Pendleton, and now what you've said or what you're trying to do now is to lay everything on to Chestnut Street, which while the developers certainly has a right to build their property and I'm definitely encouraging property rights, it also is a hindrance to the town and people who have lived there for many years. And I can tell you that the streets now are used for not just getting out of your driveway and going somewhere, but people walking, people riding their bikes, people the lady over on the corner of Chestnut Street is an invalid. She's 90, some years old, and she walks with a walker up and down the street. Now, that's not going to happen if you put the kind of traffic that you're talking about. And I feel almost as though it's a class thing right now. I mean, you've got houses that I understand are going to be over a million dollars, maybe over two million dollars in the new development. And then you've got the town's houses, the town, the houses in town, which are of varied kinds. They're small ones, larger ones. But it is the charm of Middleburg. And I think people who live there enjoy that atmosphere. But I feel that that's going to be eliminated with some of the other things that the town is is looking to do, such as limit height of houses to to I think it's 20, 20 some feet or one story. One story. Anyway, it is it's of great concern to me then I also I'm looking at the trees that are on Chestnut or and or the beginning property to the Salamander property and a lot of these trees will be destroyed. And they are specimen trees, some of them, I'm certain, are over 150 years old. so sorry that I don't have this better prepared, but I was working really hard today in my own business anyway. I'm very concerned. I would hope that the developer who is, you know, has produced a lovely venue here in Middleburg would be maybe more cognizant of the town people and work with the town people to come up with a better solution than just putting all of the traffic down Chestnut Street. And certainly the idea of putting the mailbox where they've got it right now is really compounds the traffic type that they're talking about. I mean, I've read through the original proffers that were made, and obviously there have been a lot of changes since then, but it would seem to me that given the changes that have been made, which are many, many to accommodate this development, that maybe we should throw these proffers out and we should start over again. And I'm wondering, you know, if the if certain that it would that that would have to happen. I don't think anyone wants to.

Bridge Littleton: [off mic]

Roxene Hill: I'm sorry.

Bridge Littleton: That's ok [off mic]

Roxene Hill: No, I think I think I've said pretty much everything. I just really would like the town and the developer to work with the people of Chestnut Street to come up with a better solution. I don't feel that just because it's inconvenient. I understand what's going on on Reed Street, you've got some big houses and that's going to cost a lot of money to to alleviate that situation. But you've got streets, but it doesn't mean that Chestnut should be the fall guy. Anyway, I think I'm done, but.

Bridge Littleton: Ok, thank you so much. We appreciate it. [off mic]

Rhonda North: So maybe just let them know that if they would like to speak during the public comment, if you please raise your hand so that we know that we can recognize you.

Bridge Littleton: Are they visually on or are they.

Rhonda North: They are on as an attendee.

Bridge Littleton: No. Can you see them? Some people don't know what that raise your hand means.

Rhonda North: So you can either send me a chat message or raise your hand on Zoom. Your on the telephone. If you will press star nine. [off mic]

Bridge Littleton: Oh, OK, perfect. All right. Is there anybody else out there Will? And Rhonda, there's no one else on phone, on the phone. OK, we will close the public comment session. And thank you all so much for coming in and providing your input. We really do appreciate it. We will now go to the public hearing. The first item is zoning text amendment 21-O1, an ordinance to amend Section 121 of the Middleburg zoning ordinance. Mr. Moore, I believe you're on deck.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, and members of the council on this zoning text amendment was introduced to you two weeks ago, May 13th reading just a quick recap for the benefit of the public. In January, council directed staff and the Planning Commission to do some research into the character of some concerns around the character of fairly recent infill and redevelopment that is, tear down and rebuild in various sections of the Ridgeview subdivision and to report back to council with some possible ordinance amendments to address some of those concerns. So over the following several months, the Planning Commission studied those concerns diligently, ultimately initiated a text amendment, which is before you now. And the proposal is to reduce the baseline height that is allowed to be built to in the R-2 zoning district from 30 feet as it is currently to 25 feet. However, the ability still to build up to 30 feet in height with the provision of additional side yards. So the idea is that you wouldn't have multiple 30 foot tall homes built in a row with only 15 feet. That is seven and a half side yard on one, seven 1/2 on another. So in order again to build up to 30 feet in height, you would have to provide 12 and a half foot side yards. So that's the proposal that is before you for your consideration. Again, this was forwarded with a unanimous recommendation for approval by the Planning Commission.

Bridge Littleton: All right, before you open the public or actually, I guess we'll go ahead and open the public hearing for this right now, and then we can have comment afterward or I should say council discussion. So we will open the public hearing. Anybody who wishes to address the council on this public hearing matter. They may do so now, Rhonda. Is anybody online wishing to discuss or wishing to provide input.

Rhonda North: So I'm not seeing hand or a chat, so I'm going to say no.

Bridge Littleton: Ok, well, you know, this is a public hearing, so we'll give everybody one last chance to either comment in the chat or electronically raise your hand in Zoom if not familiar with it, there's a button that says raise hand that will notify Rhonda that you're that you would want to comment. No. OK, we will close the public hearing and move on to council discussion, so. Any discussion?

Kevin Daly: Question for clarification, even if they have 12, more than 12 and a half, let's say 24 feet going out 30 feet is the maximum height for any building?

Will Moore: Correct. Yes, sir.

Bridge Littleton: Actually, that's a great point, I'm getting at 600 feet that way. Go 92 stories. Yeah, I don't think so. Only comment I would make is that and I said this earlier before we started the hearing. I know this is all tough stuff. And the Planning Commission, Will you and staff working really, really hard over the last six months, as was a priority from council. Really appreciate the work you guys did in coming up with good solutions that can address this in a reasonable, measured way and is designed to achieve the goal of, you know, allowing people flexibility to do what they'd like to do, but within the confines that we can retain the village town feel, you know, throughout the community. And I think this

and the other stuff you guys have come up, come up with are just a great start to working in a framework that can, you know, has it's a very balanced approach. So I really appreciate it. Bud or Peter, did you guys have anything?

Peter Leonard-Morgan: Just one comment, really. Peter here. I noticed that item two and three really [inaudible] and not [inaudible], does it make sense to try and do all 3? [inaudible] And do we need to do two and three now. Can we not wait do all three together oh does that not make sense.

Will Moore: So for those who don't necessarily have the memo open in front of you, staff proposed a number of items for the commission to consider and addressing some of these concerns of one of those proposals that was given to the commission to consider, which Peter is referring to as number one, was the establishment of a maximum lot size in the R-2 district. The commission did study that a good bit and they chose to not proceed with including that in the text amendment. So they initiated a text amendment that did not include that. So we could not add that in at this point. If council wanted further consideration of of that possibility, we would have to restart a process that would simply address the maximum lot size. But but what has been brought forward to you does not include that. And there would be no possibility to add it in at this point. Staff suggestion it

Peter Leonard-Morgan: Thank you Will. [inaudible] it was really more of a comment. And I was going to thank you for that.

Rhonda North: Yes, sir.

Bridge Littleton: Bud go ahead.

Bud Jacobs: Peter, item one was rejected by the planning commission and is not forwarding it to the council for any consideration. I think Will's intent was to with that memo is just to give you the flavor of the discussion that the planning commission had and what we found that might be helpful and what we discarded, I don't remember if Will said that in the memo, but several members of the Planning Commission felt that it might make more sense instead of dealing with a maximum lot size, it might make more sense to consider maximum coverage of buildings on the lot. And that, of course, is pending for action. We haven't really dug into that very much, but Will correct me if I'm wrong, that's still an active item on our agenda.

Will Moore: Yes, sir. That is something the commission was very interested in studying. We felt that that would take more time to study, to get it just right. So we wanted to proceed with what is before you this evening as a first step, understanding that there is more work to do.

Peter Leonard-Morgan: Thank you very much, gentlemen for that.

Bridge Littleton: Yeah, so Will it's a good question. So quite honestly, I mean, you know, and I mean, maybe we should we should have the vote on the on the height and then we can talk about the other stuff that's on this memo. But since we're here, I mean, I understand the Planning Commission's view of not wanting to send it forward. Personally, I disagree. I think that is actually a very thoughtful approach to addressing this as well, I mean, you know, one thing that's not been short of in town right now is people coming in with a lot of money and paying unbelievable prices for things and cobbling them together and tearing down and rebuilding and whatever. I mean, you know, there's the one great example right now, but it's the start. And so, you know, what does that potentially look like over time? So like this height limitation, if somebody bought three six thousand foot lots and put them all together, this height limitation wouldn't mean anything because they'd be so far, I mean, you know, they're not going well. Maybe they would be able to build a 20000 square foot house. But the lot, you know, size would be so long that the 30 feet would never would never entertain it. I think you guys are hitting on two really important things. A maximum lot size, I think does make a lot of sense. And number two, on that maximum coverage ratio of the lot size makes a lot of sense. So I think both those things are really important. So my question to you would be from a process perspective, even though the Planning Commission decided not to forward it, is it something that council in the future could consider on its own?

Will Moore: So, yes, from a process standpoint of an amendment to your zoning regulations can be initiated by the planning commission. It can also be initiated by the council. So yes.

Bridge Littleton: Ok, so I get. Yeah, Bud go ahead.

Bud Jacobs: Ok, I think Mr. Mayor, if you wanted to, you could direct, or council rather to direct planning commission to take another look at the maximum lot size issue.

Peter Leonard-Morgan: I did read one sentence there that the commission also expressed interest in moving forward with a study of the topic of lot coverage. So it seems to be an open item.

Bridge Littleton: Yeah. So, yeah. I mean, I guess that's the question. So so but I think it's a great point. You know, we've got a great planning commission. Is everybody comfortable to asking them? I mean, yeah, I totally agree. The one that they haven't looked at it and you're studying right now, which is the maximum coverage. Clearly, I think you're going to take that to them anyway when it's ready. Correct. OK, great. I think everybody here is supportive of that. I don't want to put words in anybody's mouth, but asking them to go back and relook at the maximum lot size and give it further consideration, I mean, I would be on board with that. But this is a council decision. So what's everybody think?

Kevin Daly: I'm good for that.

Chris Bernard: Ask them to go back and look at it with the message along with it. We're asking you to do it because that's what we want to do, is take another look but don't feel pressured to push it.

Bridge Littleton: Oh, sure. I mean, they're going to vote there. Yeah, totally. You know, do what you feel is right. [off mic] No, no, I totally agree. But I think if we all feel it's a good idea, them having that input is OK, maybe we should give a deeper look or another look or whatever that I think. [off mic] Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah, I agree kind of with what Chris said, they looked at it, but we're going to ask them to revisit it. And come back with any other suggestions they may have.

Philip Miller: So. Yeah, I agree they should relook at the maximum lot size when they look at what Will has is currently preparing for the coverage of the lot. I think that that makes a lot of sense. Maybe there's some kind of hybrid option if they can figure something out.

Bridge Littleton: Darlene?

Darlene Kirk: I think it makes sense to have a look at that, and I think they need to come back. In a timely manner, I mean. It needs to come back within, you know, at the most a month, because if we're going to look at one thing we need to look at it as a package.

Bridge Littleton: It might be two months because they don't meet for another.

Darlene Kirk: How long do we wait for this initially anyway?

Bridge Littleton: It was the first time? So, I mean, yeah.

Will Moore: So so the difficult and I definitely hear with Council Member Kirk is saying, but we have to understand that the process takes time by design so we can't report back in a month because, you know, they have to do diligent study first and then they have to go through the process of initiating an amendment, holding a hearing. It is it is designed by state code to ensure that it is a deliberate process and that essentially localities can't do a quick change.

Darlene Kirk: But I mean, I don't say that they have to come back with the code and everything all made out formally. But tell us this is what we're thinking for a lot coverage size. This is what we're leaning towards on this. So at least we know how to look at the whole thing, the whole package.

Bridge Littleton: Ok, so I think Bud and Will can do that is they come to the next council meeting with Bud's. So Will just make sure you're capturing that on your staff report.

Will Moore: Yes, sir.

Bridge Littleton: Ok, perfect. Bud or Peter, any objections.

Peter Leonard-Morgan: No, I'm all for it.

Bridge Littleton: Thank you. OK, Will, is that helpful?

Will Moore: Yeah, that's perfect. We don't need a vote or anything. We can just deliver that message like we we did with your previous direction back in January to study

Bridge Littleton: Great. So any other comments on this? The height zoning amendment. So would anyone like to make a motion. All right, go ahead Bud.

Bud Jacobs: Wait a minute. OK. I move that council adopt an ordinance to amend Section 121 of the Middleburg zoning ordinance pertaining to building height in the R-2 to single family residential district?

Kevin Daly: Second.

Bridge Littleton: Any further discussion? OK, we'll have to do a roll call vote, Rhonda, you want to call the roll the roll?

Rhonda North: Vice Mayor Miller.

Philip Miller: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Bernard.

Chris Bernard: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Daly.

Kevin Daly: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Jacobs.

Bud Jacobs: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Kirk.

Darlene Kirk: Nay.

Rhonda North: Council Member Leonard-Morgan.

Peter Leonard-Morgan: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Aye.

Bridge Littleton: Roll call, right, roll call, so it's just yey or nays. OK, good. The amendment to the ordinance has been adopted. Thank you guys very much. All right. Next item is the zoning map amendments an ordinance to rezone 0.1535 Acre portion of 10 West Marshall Street. I wonder what this is for. Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you again. So zoning map Amendment 21-01 essentially relates to the town hall project, so it seeks to rezone portions of two different properties. Of one of those is a little more than a half-acre portion of our existing property here, and that is the property to the rear of the existing office building that we previously acquired from Nattie Kaye. We brought that into our own property via boundary line adjustment. However, that portion that we acquired still remains zoned R-1. So we are seeking to rezone it to C-2. And then additionally the property a little further to the north, a little less than six tenths of an acre that we are in the process of acquiring from Salamander Middleburg MUV, LLC, and that's essentially the parking lot portion of the of the planned town office. We would seek to rezone it from its existing mixed use village designation with proffers also to see to C-2 so it would match. We would have one property, eventually matching zoning and matching the zoning of the surrounding properties along West Marshall Street.

Bridge Littleton: Perfect. Thank you. We will now open the public hearing for the zoning map amendment. Anybody wishes to address the town council on the zoning map amendment. Please make yourself known. Rhonda, anybody online?

Rhonda North: I'm not seeing anyone raising their hands or sending a chat.

Bridge Littleton: Ok, we will close the public hearing any discussion on this item. Pretty easy one who would like to make a motion?

Philip Miller: I'll do it. I move that council adopt an ordinance approving zoning map Amendment 21-01, as depicted on the exhibit titled Rezoning Exhibit, ZMA 21-01 dated March 17th, 2021, as it is consistent with the comprehensive plan and represents good planning practice.

Darlene Kirk: Second. [off mic]

Bridge Littleton: It's a competition, I love it. Whoever wins the most gets a Snickers. OK, any other. All right so Rhonda if you can do the roll call.

Rhonda North: Vice Mayor Miller.

Philip Miller: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Bernard.

Chris Bernard: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Daly.

Kevin Daly: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Jacobs.

Bud Jacobs: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Kirk.

Darlene Kirk: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Leonard-Morgan.

Peter Leonard-Morgan: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Aye.

Bridge Littleton: All right the amendment passes. Last public hearing zoning map Amendment 21-02 an ordinance to amend the proffers associated with conditionally rezoned R1 single family residence and the rest of that there.

Rhonda North: Will. [laughter]

Bridge Littleton: Why are you laughing Will?

Will Moore: The best abbreviated title reading I've heard in some time. So. [laughter]

Bridge Littleton: Hey, Will, the funny thing was the first part was on one page and I'm going, oh, this is going to be short. And I go to the next page. I'm like, no, it's not. [laughter]

Will Moore: So thank you again. Again, related primarily to the town hall project, this is amending proffers associated with the original Salamander hospitality proffers that were approved in 2007. There were two subsequent proffer amendments. So the substantive portion of this is to eliminate the proffer that requires dedication of space for a town hall on the property. And that's as a result of our negotiations with the Salamander entity to acquire land instead for parking lot and for village green. We would in turn be building the town hall on property we already own. So it would remove existing proffer 11 that would require the dedication of that land for the municipal building and replace it that proffer 11 instead with a a new location and a proffered location for the village green. And of course the access to that village green, which will remain under the ownership of the Salamander entity. But the the ability to use it in the manner in which it can be used for the public is subject to the separate purchase and sale agreement that we are executing to acquire the parking lot. There are quite a number of other elements if you look at the red line in this proffer statement that are being changed. But I would qualify all those as non-substantive. They're really addressing one of two things, updating information that has been superseded. So subsequent subdivision of the land since the original proffers has resulted in different property identification numbers. So those are currently outdated. This would update those. It updates the ownership entities. It also removes a couple of proffers that have since been fulfilled and as such are no longer required. So it's accomplishing a good cleaning up for people who want to understand what's proffered. Right now they have to look at an original proffer statement and to piecemealed amendments. This would clean it up, put it into one. So those are really the elements that we're looking at here sir.

Bridge Littleton: Ok, thanks, Will. We will open the public hearing for the proffer amendment. Rhonda, anybody online?

Rhonda North: Not seeing anyone raise their hand or send a chat, so no.

Bridge Littleton: Ok, I don't think there's anybody here. So we will close the public hearing. Any comments or concerns? Questions for Will. It's pretty straightforward, we've known it's been coming, so, all right, Rhonda you want to do the roll call vote?

Rhonda North: We need someone to make the motion.

Bridge Littleton: Well, so moved. [laughter] [multiple speakers] Chris wants to get back to the store. I'm trying to move it along as fast as possible. [off mic] Yes.

Chris Bernard: I don't [off mic] there's too much work to be done.

Rhonda North: Still. [multiple speakers]

Bridge Littleton: Well, Chris, if you'd like me to drag this out, I can. [off mic]

Chris Bernard: Right in the middle.

Bridge Littleton: Careful what you wish for.

Danny Davis: Until I get to the Covid update.

Philip Miller: I move that council, adopt an ordinance approving zoning map Amendment 21-02 as contained in the proffer statement titled Amended and Restated Proffer Middleburg Residential LLC and Salamander Middleburg MUV LLC dated February 24th 2021.

Darlene Kirk: Second. [multiple speakers] [off mic]

Bridge Littleton: That's too good. Rhonda can you do the roll call vote?

Rhonda North: Yes sir. Vice Mayor Miller.

Philip Miller: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Bernard.

Chris Bernard: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Daly.

Kevin Daly: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Jacobs.

Bud Jacobs: Aye.

Rhonda North: Vice Mayor Council Member Kirk. [laughter]

Darlene Kirk: Aye.

Rhonda North: Old Habits.

Darlene Kirk: Yeah.

Rhonda North: Council Member Leonard-Morgan.

Peter Leonard-Morgan: Aye.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Aye.

Bridge Littleton: Ok, the amendment passes. Next item. Town Treasurer Report Revenue Update.

Danny Davis: Mr. Mayor and Council just wanted to give a brief update since meals tax revenues and receipts were received on or close to May 20th. As noted in here, we received over eighty one thousand dollars in meals taxes, which is higher than projected, and also higher on a percentage basis than the rest of the year compared to prior years. So we saw about a six and a half percent reduction compared to 2019, which is better than what we've been generally seeing for the year. So that's a positive sign. And again, remember, this is for April Sales. May.

Chris Bernard: What was the gap in March?

Danny Davis: It was around 2021 I believe 19 or.

Bridge Littleton: Yeah I think it was 18 percent.

Danny Davis: I can go find it but we definitely have made up ground which is good. We also know we've had a very positive May or just weather wise I think has been very good. So we're expecting that May receipts will also be good. Also know that with the opening of meeting in social gathering capacity limits and gathering limits, that that has been helpful and some of our places being able to hold small events or medium sized events and then, of course, starting tomorrow, unlimited caps on that. So we are excited or happy to see where we stand with that. I did not mention this here, but we have received most of our bank franchise taxes, I believe, which have come in pretty much on track with our budgeted line items. And then, as noted here, a few deadlines for business, personal property, vehicle license fees and real property taxes. As a reminder for yourselves individually, if you do pay those, but also showing when we will receive those revenues. Happy to answer any questions we have. We'll have a more formal and complete end of the month report at your next meeting.

Bridge Littleton: Any questions for Danny on the finance update? Bud or Peter? No. OK, Danny, thank you very much. Next item, [off mic] Covid update. Hang on.

Danny Davis: So we obviously are at a pretty big turning point in the current pandemic and operating status' as of 11:59:59 this evening. All of those expire in terms of any kind of social distancing requirements, gathering, social gathering limits, business restrictions and anything else of that nature. And that is a big step in the right direction. We do obviously continue to encourage taking proper precautions as per normal [multiple speakers] as we've seen a lot of other sicknesses not showing up in the past year because people have been extra cautious with handwashing and staying home when you're sick. Obviously, for anyone who is looking for a vaccine, that should be relatively easy to find now. And if you have troubles, please reach out to the Loudoun County Health Department. They are there and ready to assist. Even now, they're discussing scaling back their hours at their big pod at the Dulles Town Center Mall just because the demand is strong, but is going to be scaling down as they continue to vaccinate everyone 12 years and older. We've talked about the mask mandate. Happy to answer questions that may arise there. Probably the big positive news is, as listed here in the ARP funds, the American Rescue Plan, we are 95 percent certain this is the proper allocation amount and we don't know what that might end up being. Or I should say we have to wait and get that from the state. However, we do believe that number is just over eight hundred and sixty five thousand dollars, which is actually more than the original number that we first got from Congress. So I know.

Bridge Littleton: [off mic] The second number we got. First number was 151 and.

Danny Davis: Yes, yes. So there are still some quirks to be worked out by the state there somehow or other. But I will let them deal with that. It's irrelevant for us right now. So as mentioned, we will bring back an item to you about planning the use of those funds. It does come in two separate tranches. How it fits in fiscal year we'll figure it out, whether it's current year and a budget amendment or whether it's next year. But we'll work those details out.

Bridge Littleton: Any questions for Danny? Yeah.

Cindy Pearson: I don't have a question, but the Safeway does have on their prescription line when you call that, you can walk in and get a Covid shot now.

Danny Davis: That's fantastic.

Bridge Littleton: So great.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah.

Danny Davis: And as far as I understand, it's the Johnson and Johnson, so it's a one and done kind of.

Bridge Littleton: Ok, any other questions for Danny on Covid? All right. Next item here is the consent agenda. Would anybody like the one item removed? [off mic] All right Philip.

Philip Miller: I move we adopt the consent agenda as proposed.

Kevin Daly: Second.

Bridge Littleton: Too slow Darlene.

Darlene Kirk: I know.

Bridge Littleton: All right, so here's how we'll do voting now. We won't go person by person since we're all in person here, but we'll do, you know, yay's and nay's in the room. And then I will call on the people. I'll call on Bud and Peter individually. So you guys don't say yay or nay. I'll call you for your vote specifically, OK? All those in favor of adopting the consent agenda say Aye. Opposed. Bud.

Bud Jacobs: Aye.

Bridge Littleton: Peter.

Peter Leonard-Morgan: Aye.

Bridge Littleton: OK, it is adopted. Next discussion item, zoning map, amendment 21-03. An ordinance to amend the proffers associated with conditionally zoned R1 single family residential R3 and MUV mixed use village, I believe. Will, this is you, right?

Will Moore: Yes, sir.

Bridge Littleton: All right.

Will Moore: So this is the is a separate proffer amendment from the one that was just approved. And this is one that is being proposed by the developer, the one that was subject of some of the public comment earlier in the session. So let me give you kind of the the 30,000 foot view. It's basically proposing three what I would say are substantive elements for your consideration. Two of those fall under the guise of replacing the proffered preliminary layout plan that is currently standing. And the two substantive elements under that are that first, they are proposing to eliminate the Reed Street extension into the development. So currently the residential component could be accessed from Pendleton Street. It could be accessed from a planned extension of Reed Street and also from a planned extension of Chestnut Street. So the first element is that they are proposing to eliminate the extension of Reed Street and to the development. There are a number of items that are of concern for the developer in trying to execute that extension of Reed Street. And a number of items just for you to consider. It is a difficult geometry that is that the proposed extension and that is through an existing right of way on Stonewall Avenue, does not align perfectly with the current terminus of Reed Street at Stonewall. So slightly offset not to the point where VDOT would nix the extension of Reed Street. But if it were being built today, the full Reed Street, it would not be allowed to be constructed with that offset. So that is an item of concern. There are a number of existing utilities within that right of way as it extends north of Stonewall Avenue that will require relocation if the if it is

constructed. In general, we wouldn't give any consideration to the financial impact of that because that comes along with development. But the narrowness, it's a 50 foot right of way in order to relocate those utilities, it could impact the surrounding properties on Stonewall Avenue. That's 410 Stonewall Avenue, Mr. Boyle's property, 500 Stonewall, which is Mrs. Jackson's property. So some difficulties in achieving that. But again, it can be done. The actual construction of the Reed Street extension does require a waiver, a design waiver from VDOT, simply because it doesn't have the full width to accommodate everything that they would typically require in terms of buffer strips between the back of the curb and sidewalk, things like that. But that design waiver has been granted. So it is achievable in that manner. It would also require construction easements to be granted from the surrounding property owners, and that's not guaranteed. So that's one of the reasons why the developer is asking for consideration of not proceeding with that extension of the street. I do understand, Mr. Devadas spoke to earlier and said he would be speaking with some residents on Reed Street as well as neighbors on Chestnut Street just regarding the proposal. He's also planning to speak directly with the two adjoining property owners on Stonewall Avenue through which that street would be constructed. So those are some of the reasons why the developer is proposing to eliminate the Reed Street vehicular connection. Their plan that they proposed to you is to replace that with a pedestrian only connection so they would do an eight foot wide trail through the property. They would connect with a crosswalk to the existing sidewalk on the south side of Stonewall that terminates at Reed Street. And then they would just heavily landscape the rest of the right of way through there. That's what they would propose for your consideration. There would be it's absolutely correct that that would create additional loading both on Pendleton and Chestnut Street. So as of now, the projected volume on the Reed Street extension would be 180 vehicles per day and if it were to go away, it's anticipated that it would create an additional 65 trips per day on the extension of Chestnut Street, and an additional 115 trips per day on Pendleton Street. So that's probably how that traffic would be dispersed if the Reed Street extension were to go away. The next item that falls under that replacement of the preliminary layout plan has to do with proposing to revise the typical street sections. And what that means is it shows you a section view of the street and shows you where curb and gutter would be located, where sidewalks would be located or not located. So as currently proffered, there would be a pedestrian network on both sides of the street throughout the development on all the public streets that would be placed throughout the development. When the proffer amendment request first came in for the Planning Commission's consideration in April, the developer was requesting to eliminate sidewalk from one side of the street throughout the development and only have it on one side of the street. There was a lot of discussion amongst the Planning Commission about that at their April meeting in between the April meeting and the May action earlier this week, the developer revised those proffers to address some of the concerns that they heard from the commission. So what the commission saw and what's being forwarded to you at this point would have sidewalk or trail on one side of the street throughout the R3 section. So those are the the smaller lots that are just north of Stonewall Avenue. So there are 28 lots. So for those 28 lots, there would be a sidewalk or trail fronting on all of those. There would be sidewalk or trail on both sides of the full extension of Chestnut Street. But when you got further to the west into the larger lot section for the 21 homes that are further to the west, there would only be pedestrian facilities on one side. So that's how the proffers were revised in between the April and May commission meetings, I guess.

Bridge Littleton: Let me ask you one quick question. [off mic] So if I understand this right in the R-1, there would be some homes that would have a sidewalk on their front, but some homes would not?

Will Moore: That is correct. Yes.

Bridge Littleton: [off mic] Yeah, just want to make sure to get it right.

Will Moore: Right. So those are the two elements that kind of fall under the guise of the revised preliminary layout plan. There's also a proposal to eliminate two proffers that are related to the extension of Reed Street. So one proffers that if VDOT would approve it, they would provide a four way stop condition at Reed and Stonewall. And there's also another proffer that has to do with the bonding of Reed Street and the placement of it into service. So they are also proposing to eliminate those two proffers. Pretty much my guidance to the commission and would carry on to council is that if the Reed Street extension were to be approved, to be eliminated, it'd make sense for those two proffers to go away. But if the Reed Street extension was not approved to be eliminated, those properties would need to remain in place. The last substantive element is a request as currently proffered, all construction traffic associated with development on any of the property has to access from Foxcroft Road. So that's the service entrance to the resort. They were requesting to have the option to also access from North Pendleton Street. This is the one element that staff was outright in support of. I did

discuss this with Chief. Currently, we understand that the vast, vast majority of construction traffic that comes to the site is going to come either from the east or west on Route 50. They're going to come to the center of town to access Madison Street to head out Foxcroft Road. So really, we're talking about the traffic traveling one block further or one block less if they're coming from the west and using Pendleton Street as an option as well. Revising that to give Pendleton Street as an option could reduce the amount of construction traffic that passes in front of the community charter school, which we think is a good thing, particularly because construction traffic and school traffic often arrive at a similar time frame in the morning. So that's the last kind of element that is being requested here. So the commission did hold its public hearing on Monday of this week on the item had numerous residents, both in person and through the online ability to to comment spoke, I would characterize nearly all being all who spoke at the hearing to be in opposition of specifically the request to eliminate the Reed Street extension, didn't really talk about sidewalks, didn't really talk about construction traffic, but that was really the topic of the comments in the hearing. Subsequent to the hearing, the commission deliberated. They forwarded the request to you as currently proffered, recommending denial, and then they went on to further enumerate those different elements. They were opposed to the elimination of the Reed Street extension into the development. They were opposed to the revision of essentially where a sidewalk would be and where it wouldn't be. In other words, they would still insist it be on both sides throughout the development. And they were opposed, again, to those two proffers related to the extension of Reed Street because they should really remain in place if that remains. They are supportive of the request to open up the ability to use North Pendleton Street for construction traffic. So by parsing those different elements, it gives the applicant the opportunity to consider revising the proffers again before the public hearing. And they are free to do that. A proffer statement by code can be amended at any point up to your public hearing. So it would give them the ability to consider doing that. So again, that's what has come forward from the Planning Commission. There are a number of exhibits in the packet kind of showing what the sidewalk layout would look like those kinds of things. I would be happy to, if it's helpful, meet with you individually prior to the hearing, if you have any questions about that. But again, as currently proffered with the proffer statement dated April 29th, it has been forwarded to you from the commission recommending disapproval.

Bridge Littleton: Will what was the vote on; the items?

Will Moore: The vote on the items. [multiple speakers]

Bridge Littleton: So was it unanimous? [multiple speakers]

Will Moore: It was so it was unanimous of all those present and voting yes. Correct.

Bridge Littleton: Okay.

Will Moore: We had a couple of members absent, but it was a unanimous recommendation. Yes.

Bridge Littleton: Any questions for Will? Yeah Darlene.

Darlene Kirk: Ok. The house is on the back property. There's no entrance from Middleburg Downs or anything to that, correct?

Will Moore: That is correct. There is none.

Rhonda North: So everybody's going to be basically entering by Chestnut.

Will Moore: Chestnut, Reed or Pendleton, but it makes sense that if they're trying to access the westernmost portion, I think it makes perfect sense. Yes, ma'am.

Darlene Kirk: Okay but they don't want Reed anymore as [off mic]?

Will Moore: That is correct. [off mic]

Kevin Daly: And correct me if I'm wrong, did I not hear that the committee denied closing off Reed?

Will Moore: So they're recommending disapproval they don't have the ability to deny the proffer statement, but they are recommending to you that closing off Reed Street should be disapproved.

Kevin Daly: Okay.

Will Moore: Yes sir.

Bridge Littleton: They're recommending that the developer be required to build the Reed Street extension as originally proposed. Bud, Peter, any thoughts or inputs? Peter.

Peter Leonard-Morgan: Yes, thank you very much. Will, first of all, thanks for a very, very detailed summary. I appreciate that very much. And I read through this a lot, and I seen the proposed drawings for a while about eliminating Reed Street which was really confusing to me because I'm no expert on this at all. But it would seem to me that you're going to get a lot more traffic in Chestnut and Pendleton. And also, you know, I understand the angle going from Reed Street into, I guess, the new street into Salamander. Yeah, there's a slight offset, a bit like [inaudible] you know, St. Louis Road, but not as bad as that and certainly much smaller. So unless there's a major, major issue in utilities, I mean, I cannot imagine not having that third entrance, but thank you.

Bridge Littleton: Bud.

Bud Jacobs: Will did a terrific job of explicating what was a pretty complex discussion. We were I think, pretty impressed with the views of the several residents on Chestnut Street who would be affected by not following through with the extension on Reed Street. I imagine we'll hear from them again in the public hearing. And I have to say that the arguments that were put forward by the residents on Chestnut, to me at least, were pretty compelling. I have to say that with the exception of perhaps one speaker, all of the chestnut residents who spoke in opposition to approving the Reed Street proffer amendment, each and every one of those speakers seemed to be quite supportive of Salamander itself. This is not a case of community angst directed at the resort at all. It is a case of people concerned about how decisions that we take are going to affect their safety and their quality of life. You asked the question, Mr. Mayor, about the vote and Will is accurate. Among the planning commissioners present for the meeting, both votes or the vote on both the Reed Street extension and the sidewalks were unanimous. However, there were statements made by at least one commissioner that he was not really supportive of denying the proffer amendments on sidewalks. The reason I think the planning commission voted to deny the proffer on sidewalks, really, of the two reasons, one, of course, is that the comprehensive plan encourages the provision of pedestrian facilities throughout the town and related to that. Secondly, we were concerned about creating a precedent that future developers might use to avoid providing adequate pedestrian facilities and anything that might be built down the road. This is going to be a tough one, I think, for council to grapple with. And I look forward to the public hearing so that you can get the flavor of what the folks on Chestnut Street think about all this. I'm delighted that Prem is going to reach out to the community and to apparently to members of the council. There was a representative of Salamander listening in to the conversation and discussion at the Planning Commission, but he chose not to speak. So we really haven't heard from the resort on on some of these questions from their perspective. I'm very interested to hear what they have to say. And finally, one thing that this has really brought forward in my internal agenda is the question of construction traffic. And I'd like to suggest I don't want to go on and on about it, but I'd like to suggest that staff and the town council at least begin thinking about what is going to be a very difficult and contentious issue as construction ramps up not only for the resort, but also for our town hall. We're going to hear a lot about how construction traffic is affecting quality of life in the town as a whole. And human nature being what it is. I'm quite certain that there will be a lot of dump trucks and delivery trucks who don't necessarily follow the guidelines for where construction traffic is permitted to get into the resort. I think we're going to have to figure out how we monitor that. We're going to have to work with the resort to ensure maximum compliance with the guidelines that we've set forth, and even with maximum compliance, it's going to be bloody awful and we need to be thinking about that. And I don't know whether Danny and the mayor might consider down the road forming some kind of a working group with the police chief representatives of Salamander. If they know who some of their contractors are, we'd like to have them involved in these discussions. But I think we need to start

thinking about this in a serious manner, not to suggest we haven't been, but I at least haven't given it a lot of thought and I'm starting to do so. So that's it for me. Thanks.

Bridge Littleton: Darlene.

Darlene Kirk: What I wanted to say is when we initially worked on this and you know this as well, that's one of the reasons we did not want to have just one entrance on either, Chestnut or Reed. We wanted both of them so that it would not be horrible on the residents [off mic]. Because even when they were doing the construction on the resort, we got a ton of trucks up through there, and that's not something you're going to be able to stop. But it'd be a nice thing if we could. But when they were building the resorts, the trucks were everywhere. They were cutting any way they could to not deal with the light, not deal with extra traffic. So it's just something we've had to deal with before and we're going to have to deal with again. I think that really we need both Reed and Walnut, and if there's a possible, not Walnut, Chestnut, that nut and. If there's a possibility for another and I don't know if there is through Middleburg Downs to get to the back side where the other houses are there's not. [off mic] OK, so we can't put a road through there. All right. Well, I think we need to. The roads just aren't good enough to handle otherwise. All of it.

Bridge Littleton: Yeah, well, it's all going to be about logistics, you know. So I mean, to your point, when the resort was built, you know, that's probably bigger construction equipment and stuff than the houses. And that was done. Remember, that was twice it was started then stopped for a couple of years and then started up again. [multiple speakers]

Darlene Kirk: And it came everywhere. I mean it [off mic] Sycamore Street where I live in. It's like what are you doing down here, you missed the resort.

Bridge Littleton: Cindy do you have a question or input?

Cindy Pearson: Yeah, also with what Bud said to add the control of the dirt and the dust clouds. I know that's usually somewhere that water has to be used to control that. But you know how it gets a dry, dusty day and it's just everywhere. [multiple speakers] Yeah, but sometimes that doesn't happen. And on the sidewalks, Will, just a general question, is the road still going to remain the same width regardless of if they have it on one side or a walking trail or? Yeah.

Will Moore: Yes.

Cindy Pearson: Yes. OK, and the other thing was for Reed Street to have a four way stop sign, is there any way we can get the four way stop sign at Pendleton and Chestnut?

Bridge Littleton: You mean Pendleton and Marshall.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah Pendleton and Marshall also Chestnut and Stonewall.

Will Moore: So the proffers as they stand would require the applicant to provide a four way stop at all three of those access points, Pendleton, Reed and Chestnut. But that's subject to it being approved by VDOT. We've tried on a couple of occasions to get it approved at Pendleton Street and it's been denied.

Bridge Littleton: The most recent time was when [off mic] got it.

Will Moore: Yeah, there has been [multiple speakers].

Chris Bernard: [off mic] additional traffic load bring that up into the parameters that they need.

Will Moore: Their parameters have changed, but [multiple speakers]

Bridge Littleton: How many people die? That's the parameter.

Cindy Pearson: Seriously.

Bridge Littleton: [multiple speakers]. It's not just that, I mean, [multiple speakers] it's a number of accidents, not a number of trips.

Will Moore: So they have what they call warrants. So you have to meet certain warrants in order to get it approved. So absent accidents, you have to look at traffic volume on both streets that would be affected by stop signs. And generally the aversion, the basis for the aversion to all way stops. Well, it's a few things. One, people think it slows people down, which it's actually been shown not to do that. So it's not a good speed control device to have all way stops. But the real aversion from VDOT from traffic engineers is if you have disparate loading on streets, one street gets 100 trips, the other street gets 20 trips. It doesn't make sense to make the 100 people stop. This is their reasoning, not mine. But so it's only when those volumes are close to matching. And you wouldn't necessarily be impacting, you know, the higher volume one separate. That's how they kind of make that decision. I don't think we're going to get them approved. The other warrant, it's not warrant the other way sometimes that they get approved, though, outside of warrants is political pressure. So and sometimes that that weight does carry.

Chris Bernard: We can make that happen.

Will Moore: Right.

Bridge Littleton: Anybody else have any other questions? So, Will, I've got a couple of quick questions.

Will Moore: Yes sir.

Bridge Littleton: The sidewalks, why do they not want to build them?

Will Moore: Yes. So there are.

Bridge Littleton: And it's not aesthetics, it's not any of that.

Will Moore: Well, what they pitched to the commission at the April meeting before they came back and revised, there are two areas of concern. So in the R3 section 14 lots north of the new street that will east west 14 lots on the south side. And those are the 14 that back up to the existing homes on Stonewall. To get a sidewalk or trail on the south side it's going to make them grade the front lawns of those 14 lots more steeply than they would otherwise, because you have to get down to a landing point and then come straight out with the sidewalk. A sidewalk can't be at a certain slope. So it's going to make those front yards steeper than they would like them to happen. They can still do it. In fact, when they revised in between the April and the May meeting, they put that back in. In the R1 section that's the area that's more heavily wooded now. So the section to the west and there is a legitimate concern, again, that they have to do in order to get the sidewalk on what would be the west side of a north south street. They'll have to do again, more grading to get a flat level sidewalk that meets the slope requirements. And it's going to require more removal of existing specimen trees. So that was kind of the argument in the, R1 section. And again, subsequent to the April discussion with the Planning Commission, they came back and they didn't say it. But by putting the sidewalk back in the R3 section, they essentially said, we will live with the more steep front lawns on those lots, but we still want to not provide it over here where we're going to have to do more heavy tree removal in the western section.

Bridge Littleton: I get the tree part. OK, so but I mean, I guess my question is ultimately that's still not the why. I have to grade. Well, what's the big deal about grading just grade it. [off mic]

Will Moore: Well, [multiple speakers] you know, to play Devil's advocate. You know, they have been throughout the development process, from my perspective, dating back to the last proffer revision, which was approved in 2015. All of the plans that they have put together have been from a typical development perspective, much more sensitive to retaining existing trees than developers usually are. Developers don't like to work around trees. They like to clear a lot and then come in and plant [multiple speakers].

Bridge Littleton: I get that in the R1.

Will Moore: Yes.

Bridge Littleton: But that's not an issue in the R3.

Will Moore: It's not as big of an issue in the R3, no sir.

Bridge Littleton: Ok, my second question. On the Reed Street.

Will Moore: Yes.

Bridge Littleton: So when this was all put in place and they agreed to put this street in back in 2005, six, whatever it was.

Will Moore: 2000 sorry, 2015. So the original proffers did not have a Reed Street extension it had it through the community center lot.

Bridge Littleton: Oh, that's right. That's right. OK, right. So when this was put in in 2015, did all the utilities that would be impacted exist at that time?

Will Moore: They did.

Bridge Littleton: OK, so the utility argument is. I mean, I'm going to this is not a question, this is a statement. I don't understand how concern about having to move utilities is now an issue when it was the exact same issue six years ago when they wanted to do it. So I don't see how you can complain about an issue you were fine with six years ago and today aren't. So that's concern Number One. So that reason to me, this is me speaking, that's illegitimate because you already knew that and that wasn't a problem when you originally proposed it. Second question I've got about the Reed Street extension. Ultimately, at the end of the day, there was to be four entrances. And I get it, we moved the one from the community center to Reed Street. Totally understand. But it's about having four. So and just doing my little dirty math. And I'm not good at math, you know, at the traffic study that they commissioned would have a 30 percent increase in traffic on Chestnut, give or take. So you know, and I get it, you guys have looked at it and said that seems reasonable. So to me, you know, I always find that when somebody commissions their own studies for their our own needs, it sort of gives you the best case. Yeah. And what would the worst case kind of look like? Maybe it's 50 percent. So I think ultimately, you know, whether it's Reed Street or back to the community center or whatever. To me is not really so much about Reed Street as it is about a fourth entrance, because to me it comes down to safety. Right, and so the crooked angle of Reed Street, well, why did you suggest Reed Street six years ago? The angle is exactly the same. Why did you do either? You know what they proposed six years ago there's been no material change in the conditions of putting that in today. So to now say, oh, it's crooked, it's tough. Oh, we have these utilities. Well, six years ago, those issues were totally fine, so I go back to the first question, really, what's the why that they don't want to do this. And if you don't know.

Will Moore: I can't answer.

Bridge Littleton: I got it, I mean, besides those two, right? There's got to be another Why. Because it can't be fine in 2015 and not fine. Something. What has materially changed?

Will Moore: So I will say and town manager and I sat down with Prem earlier today to discuss some things. I think one of the biggest concerns setting the utilities aside is, is the uncertainty of the ability to acquire necessary construction easements from the two surrounding [multiple speakers] Yeah. So I think that's a big concern because if the elimination of Reed Street is denied as recommended by the commission and they were unable to get those easements, the project is blown up at that point. So [multiple speakers] I mean, it's a concern.

Bridge Littleton: So here's the thing then that is so then the utility problem and the crooked street problem is the wrong approach to this issue. The approach, if the concern is, well, I don't know if I'll get the construction easements from the neighbors, I totally get that. That's actually something not in their control. So why aren't they coming to the town and partnering with us to work with those landowners to get these easements to do the construction? I mean.

Will Moore: So and good question. As I told.

Bridge Littleton: You don't just abandon it.

Will Moore: As I told Mr. Devadas earlier today, I made the suggestion months and months ago to not to Prem but to their development partner and to their engineering firm during a meeting that those two property owners, in particular should be reached out to much sooner than later. And to this point, it's not happened. So we did help with some contact information for those neighbors with Prem earlier today. And his intent is to in addition to talking to folks on Reed Street, talking to folks on Chestnut Street, talking to individual Council Members, he intends to speak directly with them now.

Bridge Littleton: But is he going to speak to the two owners on Reed Street? [inaudible]

Danny Davis: Yes, they're Stonewall addresses.

Will Moore: Correct.

Bridge Littleton: No, you know what I'm talking about. [multiple speakers] The Reed Street, the people who have to do the construction easements.

Will Moore: Yes, exactly. That's who I'm referring to right now.

Bridge Littleton: OK. [multiple speakers]

Will Moore: Yeah.

Bridge Littleton: OK.

Danny Davis: And I think the other just to add to what Will has said, the other change is the fact that they actually have a development partner and these plans have gotten further along in review and process than they have today. Right. I'm not saying that rationalizes the change in what is before you.

Bridge Littleton: That's their problem.

Danny Davis: But it is a change in terms of bringing someone in to actually put pen to paper to say how does this connection actually work.

Bridge Littleton: Well, I mean, I get that, but I can't believe that in 2015 we did all this work to approve it the first time that this engineering wasn't looked at to a sufficiency level to go, yes, it's doable or no, it's not. I mean, again, none of this is on their property. So this is all like nothing's moved, nothing's changed. This isn't even affecting their development.

Will Moore: I will say. And again, I'm clearly not taking a position on that.

Bridge Littleton: Yeah yeah I got ya.

Will Moore: There is a different engineer that came on within the last year or two for them then they were engaging with in 2015. So were they adequately, you know, was this issue adequately studied?

Bud Jacobs: Will could you speak up I'm having a hard time hearing you.

Will Moore: Sorry. So what I was saying is that they have brought on a new engineering firm in the last year or so. So whether or not the owners were adequately briefed or adequately told what some of these potential impacts would be by the engineering firm that was previously on board, we don't know. That's a possibility. Just wanted to put that out there.

Bridge Littleton: Ok, no I appreciate it. OK, Peter.

Peter Leonard-Morgan: Thank you very much. Just a quick question. Would I be correct to assume that one effect of [inaudible] think it would be a reduction in development costs presumably?

Will Moore: Yes, [inaudible] without question. [multiple speakers]

Peter Leonard-Morgan: OK, thank you. And the other thing I just want to ask you, Will, if you wouldn't mind just clarifying it. In the drawing of the sidewalk plan it shows quite a lot of purple and blue sidewalks. So does that mean to know, there is on both sides, but it's just not the [off mic].

Will Moore: That is correct, yes, sir.

Peter Leonard-Morgan: Ok, thank you.

Bridge Littleton: Ok, Philip.

Philip Miller: Does Prem intend to go back and look at the original plan to go through the community center?

Will Moore: No. So that was something that was intriguing with the amendment that was approved in 2015, there was never a right to go through that property and the community center never agreed to grant that in [inaudible]. So that's one of the things that spurred the 2015 amendment, was to relocate that particular entrance, not to get rid of it, but to relocate it to this existing right of way at Reed Street.

Philip Miller: Thank you.

Bridge Littleton: Any other input, I mean, Will you don't any action from us tonight this is just giving us the heads up, right?

Will Moore: Correct. So your public hearing is scheduled for your June 10th meeting on this.

Bridge Littleton: Great.

Will Moore: You are not required necessarily to take action the same evening as your public hearing. We purposely worked with Prem because they're trying to move ahead quickly. We proactively scheduled the hearing, but I don't want you to think that we're trying to force your hand in taking action that evening.

Bridge Littleton: No, I understand that. I would say this. [off mic] You know, we're going to have the public hearing. Let's plan on having the motion. But if we don't, if there's a lot of discussion and other stuff comes up we can always table it to the following meeting. But let's plan on doing it.

Will Moore: Yes, sir.

Bridge Littleton: So just be ready with the motions and all that stuff.

Will Moore: Absolutely.

Bridge Littleton: OK, any other last feedback or questions for Will on this item? OK, great, Will thank you.

Will Moore: Thank you.

Bridge Littleton: It's been the Will Moore night. [multiple speakers] I trust Will. [laughter] [multiple speakers] Although I will say Will didn't see many bullet points. [off mic]

Chris Bernard: Will, you nailed it.

Will Moore: Yeah sometimes items are just a little too complex to put into bullets.

Bridge Littleton: Ok, next item is post pandemic continued use of Zoom for public during council meetings. [off mic] What's that.

Chris Bernard: I hate Zoom. I'm over it.

Bridge Littleton: Yeah. I'm totally in agreement.

Cindy Pearson: Peter would probably differ on that.

Bridge Littleton: Peter no more beach for you. [multiple speakers]

Peter Leonard-Morgan: I was waiting to see who would say that. [laughter]

Cindy Pearson: It would be me because I'm jealous.

Bridge Littleton: Bud.

Bud Jacobs: I do have a quick question with the Zoom attendance I've been pretty much wearing my pajamas. [laughter] [multiple speakers]

Bridge Littleton: There's no official dress code here.

Darlene Kirk: Too much information. [laughter]

Philip Miller: See Bud I always thought that was a filter. [multiple speakers]

Bridge Littleton: Well, Peter, I won't even mention what Kevin was saying earlier about your swimming attire. [laughter] [multiple speakers] Yes. Your Euros, that's a good way of saying it. [off mic] So the question on this overall is for Zoom meetings. So, I mean, I have no doubt that council is going to be back in, you know, full. I mean, you know, once everything lifts on June 30th, there is no more, you know, elected bodies zooming in. The question is going to be, do we want to allow public comment through Zoom. I'm with Chris. I'm over it.

Darlene Kirk: Me too.

Bridge Littleton: You know, public comment is actually it's engaging when you're in person and it makes all the difference in the world. But anybody else. I mean.

Peter Leonard-Morgan: I concur. I think when folks want to make comment I think it's great when they come in you know body language is really just as important.

Bridge Littleton: Yeah, well, anybody can send in written comments beforehand. Doesn't stop anybody doing that or calling any one of us.

Chris Bernard: I was going to say if it's important enough to come talk to us. Come talk to us.

Bridge Littleton: Exactly. OK.

Danny Davis: Yeah. And I would just note for the record, technically, you all could meet altogether in person the next two meetings as well.

Darlene Kirk: Yay.

Danny Davis: So the governor's declaration of emergency goes through the end of June. But the social distancing, which is why we had done this hybrid format, is over tonight. So you're not forced to come in. Someone can still remote in for the next two meetings.

Philip Miller: We'll give Peter the next two meetings. [laughter]

Peter Leonard-Morgan: I'm done with it. [laughter]

Bridge Littleton: He's selling the house. [inaudible] [laughter] Yes, so I mean, unless there's some.

Cindy Pearson: We miss you Peter [inaudible]. [multiple speakers]

Bridge Littleton: I know Peter. Unless there's some reason that you can't be here, let's all plan on being in person.

Darlene Kirk: Yeah, [off mic] can always call in us here [off mic] participating.

Bridge Littleton: No. I mean, you're either here or you're not in.

Chris Bernard: You're allowed to not be here.

Bridge Littleton: Exactly you can miss a meeting.

Danny Davis: And as a reminder, too, there are other state code provisions that allow you to participate remotely.

Bridge Littleton: You just can't vote and stuff like that.

Danny Davis: Well you actually can [multiple speakers]

Chris Bernard: We've had call ins before. [multiple speakers] was on like a.

Bridge Littleton: Oh that's right. Yeah yeah.

Danny Davis: You can have up to two per year for personal reasons. So that would typically be something like travel or you're just away. You can actually currently have under the new state code, an unlimited number due to your own medical condition or disability or caring for someone else's medical condition or disability that is to accommodate. And I think that's appropriate. But I think, again, it's intended. There are a few extra steps that have to be taken under those guidelines versus our current emergency ordinance. And so [multiple speakers] encourage people as much as possible.

Rhonda North: And we must still have a quorum in the room. Yes.

Bridge Littleton: Yeah, so I got it. So, I mean, if anybody wants to know what those rules are, contact Rhonda or Danny. I mean, I think also we owe the public to be here in person so if they're in person. We should be in person. You know, you've got to accommodate for life and stuff like that, too, so. Okay yeah.

Philip Miller: How does this affect boards, commissions, etc.?

Bridge Littleton: The same thing I guess.

Danny Davis: We've indicated specifically to the Planning Commission that they can hold their next meeting, the end of June meeting remotely if they prefer. They also can come in. And then subsequent to July 1st, everyone will need to be able to meet in person. No, no more of the just calling in remoting in. And so it's a little bit of a mindset shift and just making sure people were called to make the plans to be here in person.

Bridge Littleton: Got it. Okay.

Danny Davis: Ok, and we will also intend to take the plexiglass down.

Bridge Littleton: Thank God.

Darlene Kirk: So we'll be in our actual seats next week.

Bridge Littleton: You'll be in your actual seat. Keep your hands to yourself. [multiple speakers]

Cindy Pearson: There you go. [off mic]

Bridge Littleton: All right. So any information, items from anybody?

Bridge Littleton: Darlene.

Darlene Kirk: There was one.

Bridge Littleton: It looks like it.

Cindy Pearson: While she's thinking, yeah, don't forget our picnic on the 14th and what you signed up for. And if you forget let me know. The employee.

Bridge Littleton: And remember, it's Christmas in June.

Darlene Kirk: Dress appropriately.

Bridge Littleton: So dress appropriate. Wear your ugly sweater.

Cindy Pearson: Rhonda knows how much I hated that when they would start that in July because she's a Christmas gal so.

Bridge Littleton: Any other information items?

Danny Davis: I think we may have said at the beginning, but ribbon cutting tomorrow, two o'clock at what [multiple speakers]. Playroom 108 West Washington.

Cindy Pearson: New Business.

Bridge Littleton: Yeah I've been there.

Chris Bernard: New businesses are very exciting everyone needs toys.

Bridge Littleton: [inaudible] It's nothing to laugh about actually it's a pretty cool store. They've got this one thing.

Chris Bernard: Just one.

Bridge Littleton: What's that thing? The tree with the marble.

Chris Bernard: The marble tree. [multiple speakers] [laughter]

Bridge Littleton: It's addictive. It's literally addictive. [laughter]

Chris Bernard: You should buy two.

All right. Can I get a friends and family discount of free.

Cindy Pearson: Okay we should all chip in.

Bridge Littleton: All right. The only thing I wanted to mention to folks was there was a school board meeting two nights ago about this 185 foot tower going in at Mercer and I don't know if you guys saw that or not. So I wrote a letter to them asking them to reconsider it. A couple of things. It's kind of I mean, they're going to put a tower there. So the question is, is where and how tall? 185 feet. So a standard cell phone tower is about 110, 120 feet. This thing is tall. I mean, it is tall, I think. Danny, what's our water tower? 70 feet.

Danny Davis: No, no, [inaudible] 110 maybe.

Bridge Littleton: Yeah. So add another 40 percent to that. [off mic] What's that?

Bridge Littleton: [off mic] [multiple speakers] Well, it's 185 feet so it'd be just below the requirement you'd have to put a light on top. Anyway, it's a monopole.

Darlene Kirk: No.

Bridge Littleton: It's really tall. [off mic] What's that.

Chris Bernard: Why do they want to build it so high because it's [off mic].

Bridge Littleton: No, no. The higher you go the more coverage you get. [multiple speakers] Yeah. So I sent a letter to and it's not the board of Supervisors it's the school board because they own the property asking them there's about another 400 feet away from Route 50, they could go to get it out of visual line of sight. And I had a telecom engineer actually look at it and said that, you know, if you took it down 15 feet, it would not appreciably change the coverage area at all. So I spoke at the public hearing on whatever day it was. I sent him a letter. They tabled the vote. It was the vote was supposed to be they're going to vote on it next week. So I'm going to follow this weekend with some more photos. But if you all want to email the members of the school board, I will e-mail you their email addresses, because I've gotten I've met with a bunch of people over at Mercer over the weekend, and [inaudible] and a bunch of other folks have called and just, you know, we don't want this. We've been very lucky that the only cell phone tower between here and the dual lane is that one right there at, you know, Jeff Evans' gas station. It's a monopole. And by the way, that monopole is only a hundred feet. So take that sucker and double it is what we're talking about. You know, we have not littered our views driving in on Route 50 with telecom.

Darlene Kirk: Right.

Bridge Littleton: So if you're interested, let me know. I'll send you everybody's email address. If you want to email them to say, you know, please reconsider citing it further north. Please consider bring it down at least another ten or twenty feet. I mean, it's going to be built. So let's try to just lessen the impact. Yeah, Bud.

Bud Jacobs: Put me on the list. I'd like to send something.

Bridge Littleton: OK.

Philip Miller: Send it out to everybody.

Bridge Littleton: Yeah I'll send it to everybody. Then the last thing is I've been working with PEC to go meet with all the members of the Board of Supervisors about the zoning ordinance, Amendment for cluster zoning. Well, really, it's not about cluster zoning. It's about prime Ag soil protection, which means protecting open space and limiting how you can cluster on buildable soil. We've met with a couple of supervisors so far and we're going to go see the rest over the next two or three weeks. That one also, if you want to email the supervisors, talking about the importance of it, I can give you some of the details. I'll give you the briefing that we're giving to them. But just hearing from more of the local community, you know, I will tell you, the developers have been in there meeting with them. I mean, non-stop. And the thing that really bugs me is they've got some of these, you know, hardworking farmers going and telling them, oh, if you do this, your lands going to be worth so much less and you can't. It's going to be valueless. You won't be able to leave anything to your kids.

Darlene Kirk: Oh my God.

Bridge Littleton: So, you know, they're really sort of, you know, making it, tough. [off mic] So [off mic] yeah. Yeah, yeah. Anyway, so I'll send that to you guys as well. OK, let us have.

Darlene Kirk: I did remember what I was going to say. We got an email late this evening about some [off mic] issues is that being looked into?

Danny Davis: We just received that as well. And so we are going to discuss that about some opportunities. We can bring that forward to you. We want to make sure that we're not looking at any projects that maybe they're outside of the right away or do anything that could cause any residual issues. So we are looking into it is regarding South Madison Street.

Bridge Littleton: Ok. Bud yeah.

Bud Jacobs: Bridge, anything. Any new developments on Middleburg Preserve in St. Louis?

Bridge Littleton: Oh, I don't know what the latest is, Bud. The last and I'll call the county tomorrow and ask I'll call Laura the last I remember. They were trying to figure out some type of deal, but the original deal that had that and Aldie all tied together, that's totally dead. Totally dead. Danny did you see what happened last night with the board vote on Aldie? [off mic]

Danny Davis: We're they taking up.

Bridge Littleton: They were taking the Aldie the Aldie thing? Oh, no, no. Any competing proposals were due in by May 26th. That's what it was. That's what it was. [inaudible] OK. And on the Aldie thing where the firehouse is and all that, that one guy put the proposal in that the county considered a good, valid offer, but they kept the window open for anybody who had wanted to put in a, you know, another proposal that gave them until May 26th. So hopefully, you know, mid, late next month, we'll see something for the board on where they are in terms of they're going to sell to that one guy who's basically going to, you know, keep it the way it should be.

Danny Davis: I just noticed they have a special board meeting on Wednesday, June 9th. OK, and the only item on the agenda is public input on land use planning in the village of St. Louis.

Bridge Littleton: That is great to know. June 9th. Well, what time is it at?

Bud Jacobs: [off mic] That's the meeting that Phyllis Randall was talking about when she spoke at Banneker several weeks ago.

Bridge Littleton: That's right Bud. That's exactly right. She wanted more public input. Yup.

Danny Davis: 5:00

Bridge Littleton: 5:00 p.m.. Okay.

Danny Davis: And then there is a public hearing item that same evening, public hearing starts at six and it's on Conveyance of the Aldie Assemblage.

Bridge Littleton: Any details?

Danny Davis: I'm about to pull it up right now. To Guy?

Bridge Littleton: Yeah, Guy. Guy Gerachis. That's great. That's the local guy who put the 600,000 bid in.

Danny Davis: So the recommendation by staff is to for them to negotiate a purchase and sale agreement.

Bridge Littleton: That's awesome. If you guys remember that was the one I showed you the proposal he had sent. Oh, that's great. OK, cool. All right. June 9th, 5:00 p.m.. OK, anything else from anybody. All right. We will open the second public comment session. Anybody who wishes to address the council may do so.

Danny Davis: Yeah, I'm sorry. I apologize. They received three proposals, so they're actually three. I can send you the document.

Bridge Littleton: Yeah. Yeah. Do that. Just email it to me. But they're recommending Guys being accepted?

Danny Davis: I take that back it wasn't a specific recommendation for his. It was just that the board directs staff to negotiate with one or more offers.

Bridge Littleton: Ok. So we'll open the public comment session. Rhonda is there anybody online?

Rhonda North: No one that [off mic].

Bridge Littleton: Ok, I don't think you can speak again, I think you only get once per meeting.

Liz White: I just have a question.

Bridge Littleton: OK, what's your question?

Liz White: Prem said that he really wanted the proposal for all the traffic to go off [off mic] and it was your idea to do Chestnut and Reed Street and so I'm confused about who made what decision. So that's what he just told us in the back, while you continued on with your meeting. So I was like, oh, OK. Well, I'm trying to figure out how the decision Reed Street and obviously the community center and Chestnut Street got picked and he said you picked them. He was more than glad to just do it for all the traffic going out on the roads they would develop.

Bridge Littleton: OK, well, that may have been back in 2006.

Darlene Kirk: That was even true then.

Bridge Littleton: Yeah, that could have been back in 2006 when the entire development was put together.

Liz White: So you're not ordering.

Bridge Littleton: So ma'am, I appreciate. No I just.

Liz White: Yeah I was trying to get it clarified [multiple speakers].

Bridge Littleton: Yeah. Yeah, yeah. I think the thing to do is come back and talk to Will. Because Will would be able to have all that history together.

Darlene Kirk: And both of those roads are right of ways.

Bridge Littleton: Yeah, yeah, we have the right of ways there. They are Town right of ways. OK, no, I appreciate it. Like I said, Will can probably look up that history and know exactly what the back and forth was either in 2006 or 2007 when they were originally doing it, or back in 2015, what was being updated. But thank you all for coming in. [off mic] I don't know yeah. We'll, now close the public comment session and move on to the closed session. Who wants to read it?

Darlene Kirk: Philip does. [multiple speakers]

Philip Miller: I move that council go into closed session as authorized under Section 2.2-311 of the Code of Virginia for the discussion or consideration of one appointments to a public body related to the Middleburg Arts Council and Go Green as allowed under subsection A one two the disposition of publicly held property related to the Asbury Church as allowed under subsection A three and three briefings by staff members pertaining to actual probable litigation, where such consultation in an open meeting would adversely affect the negotiating or litigating posture of the public body related to a requested boundary line adjustment as allowed under subsection A seven. I further move that council thereafter reconvene in open session for action as appropriate.

Darlene Kirk: Second.

Bridge Littleton: All those in favor say aye.

Everyone: Aye.

Bridge Littleton: Bud. You're on mute.

Bud Jacobs: Sorry Aye.

Bridge Littleton: Peter.

Peter Leonard-Morgan: Aye.

Bridge Littleton: Great, we are in closed session. OK. I ask that council certify to the best of each member's knowledge, one only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act. And until only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the closed meeting was can be were heard, discussed or considered in the closed meeting. I would like to remind those present for the closed session that any discussion that occurred within it should be treated as confidential. Darlene.

Darlene Kirk: Aye.

Bridge Littleton: Peter or Philip.

Philip Miller: Aye.

Bridge Littleton: Aye.

Cindy Pearson: Aye.

Kevin Daly: Aye.

Bridge Littleton: Chris.

Chris Bernard: Aye.

Bridge Littleton: Bud.

Bud Jacobs: Aye.

Bridge Littleton: Peter.

Peter Leonard-Morgan: Aye.

Bridge Littleton: All right, anything else. [multiple speakers] Yeah. Oh, that's right. [multiple speakers] Got two motions.

Cindy Pearson: I'll do Art Council. I move that council reappoint Punkin Lee, Valerie Peacock, Susan Pollard, and Jennifer Long to the Middleburg Arts Council for two year terms, said terms to expire June 14th, 2023.

Darlene Kirk: Second.

Bridge Littleton: Any discussion, all's in favor say Aye. Aye. Bud.

Bud Jacobs: Aye.

Bridge Littleton: Peter.

Peter Leonard-Morgan: Aye.

Bridge Littleton: All right. Second motion.

Peter Leonard-Morgan: May I do the motion?

Bridge Littleton: Yes sir.

Peter Leonard-Morgan: I move that council appoint Alfred Pollard to Go Green to fill the next five terms. Said term to expire May 12th 2022.

Darlene Kirk: Second.

Bridge Littleton: Any Discussion? All's in favor say Aye. Aye. Bud.

Bud Jacobs: Aye. [off mic]

Bridge Littleton: Bud you were muted.

Bud Jacobs: Aye.

Bridge Littleton: Peter.

Peter Leonard-Morgan: Aye.

Bridge Littleton: All right. And with that meeting adjourned.