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P R O C E E D I N G S

UNKNOWN FEMALE 1: Perry is in the attendees.


MR. PATEL: Hello, everybody.

UNKNOWN MALE 1: Hi, Perry.

UNKNOWN MALE 2: Hi, Perry.

UNKNOWN MALE 3: Hello, Perry.

MR. PATEL: Can you guys hear me okay?

UNKNOWN MALE 2: Yep.

UNKNOWN MALE 3: Yes.

MR. PATEL: Thank you, sir.

(Inaudible) is trying to just get off the other call.

MR. DAVIS: All right. Let's see.

Let's just -- we'll get started and then if -- if Karen or Rafael join us, they can -- they can just hop in.

BETSY HATCH: Okay.

MR. DAVIS: All right?

BETSY HATCH: Sounds good.

MR. DAVIS: So, if you're -- if you're ready, we'll -- we'll call the meeting to order. This
is the New Castle County Historic Review Board Public
Hearing of March 16th, 2021. It is 5:03 by my
computer clock. We'll start with roll call.

BETSY HATCH: All right. Mr. Brook?

MR. BROOK: Present.

BETSY HATCH: Mr. Johns?

MR. JOHNS: Here.

BETSY HATCH: Ms. Silber? Ms. Silber?

Ms. Silber, I can't -- are you on mute?

MR. DAVIS: I don't know if Barb can
hear us.

MR. BROOK: Looks like she's not --
doesn't hear you.

MR. DAVIS: Okay.

MR. BROOK: Technology.

BETSY HATCH: All right. Well, Ms.
Silber's here and I'm -- going to help -- try and help
her get her -- her audio working, here. Mr. Patel?

MR. PATEL: I'm here.

BETSY HATCH: And Mr. Davis?

MR. DAVIS: Present -- yep. Here.

BETSY HATCH: All right. And then,
let me just check the attendees really quick.

MR. BROOK: Mr. Johns.
BETSY HATCH: Mr. Johns?

MR. JOHNS: You -- you already called me.

BETSY HATCH: I've gotten him.

MR. BROOK: Oh, you did?

BETSY HATCH: Yep.

MR. BROOK: Okay.

BETSY HATCH: Yep. All right. So -- and Ms. Anderson and Mr. Zahralddin are absent. So, there are five present and two absent.

MR. DAVIS: Okay. Good. All right. Do we want to move on to the --

MS. SILBER: Okay. I have -- I am in a meeting (cross talk) --

MR. DAVIS: Is -- is that Ms. Silber? Can we -- can --

BETSY HATCH: Yep, we can hear her now.

MR. DAVIS: Okay. Barb, you -- you can hear us now?

MS. SILBER: I think I'm muted for some reason.

MR. BROOK: I don't think she can.

BETSY HATCH: We can hear her now, but she can't hear us.
MR. DAVIS: Okay.

MS. SILBER: There we go.

MR. DAVIS: Okay. I don't know -- I don't know if -- if Ms. Silber can hear us or not, but --

MS. SILBER: I can, indeed. Sorry.

MR. DAVIS: Okay.

BETSY HATCH: You're okay.

MR. DAVIS: Okay. Good.

MS. SILBER: My -- my speaker was off.

MR. DAVIS: Okay. Perfect. All right.

Good.

BETSY HATCH: Okay.

MR. DAVIS: All right. We'll move -- move on to the rules of order, then.

BETSY HATCH: All righty. This is a public hearing conducted by the New Castle County Historic Review Board. The purpose of these hearings is to compile a record of relevant information regarding each application, and how the -- both projects affect the county's historic resources. To make the most efficient use of time at this hearing, the following rules of order are established.

Following the reading of each agenda
item, the applicant and their representatives will make a presentation not to exceed a total of 15 minutes. Board members may ask questions of the applicant at the conclusion of the presentation. The public will then be invited to speak in the following order: one, those who wish to speak in favor, two, those who wish to speak in opposition, and three, those who wish to offer general comments. Speakers are encouraged to be brief and to focus their remarks on historic issues.

So that everyone has had an opportunity to be heard, all speakers are limited to five minutes. Any speaker may ask the board to hold the record open for submittal of written testimony if the time limit is not sufficient for their needs. Speakers are not permitted to debate the applicant but may ask questions that the applicant may choose to answer during his or her rebuttal period at the close of the public comment period.

All testimony is recorded and transcribed, therefore, all speakers must come forward to the table one at a time and state their name, address, and organization affiliation, if any, before offering comments. Random comments from the audience
will not be recognized, and the public is asked to respect the applicant's right to an orderly hearing.

No recommendations or decisions will be made by the Historic Review Board at the hearing today. The board will evaluate the information, testimony, and comments received here at a public business meeting to be held the first Tuesday of next month.

MR. DAVIS: Thank you. The next item is old business: we have none. On to new business.

BETSY HATCH: All right. Our first application this evening is Application 2021-0108-H, 500 McKennans Church Road, Tax Parcel 08-023.00-00 -- 055, located at the northeast corner of the intersection of McKennans Church Road and Mill Creek Road. This is a demolition permit to demolish the historic manse, constructed circa 1871, S Zoning, Council District 3. And then I will promote --

MS. ANDERSON: I would like to note for the record that Karen Anderson is here.

BETSY HATCH: Oh, thanks.

MS. ANDERSON: Thank you.

MR. DAVIS: Hi, Ms. Anderson.

BETSY HATCH: All right. And then I
will promote the applicant here. All right, Mr. Roof (ph), you should be on the line, can you -- are you able to speak? I believe you're muted, currently.

MR. DAVIS: Is the applicant there?

BETSY HATCH: He is -- Mr. Roof, are you able to speak?

MR. ROOF: I'm present. I was expecting Dave Howarth (ph) to speak to the issue, but --

BETSY HATCH: Oh, okay. All right. Let's see -- I see a Marian Howarth, so let me promote her -- or promote him, sorry -- if -- if he's using her name.

MR. HOWARTH: I'm here -- can you hear me?

BETSY HATCH: Yes, we can hear you.

MR. DAVIS: We can hear you. Yep.

MR. HOWARTH: Okay. Good. Betsy, do you have the PowerPoint there?

BETSY HATCH: We do. Yep. It -- it is up on the screen -- or it should be up on -- yeah, it's up on the screen. If you could advance to the next slide, Chris?

MR. HOWARTH: There we go. Okay. We
can go right to the next one. Good evening. Just a brief history of the manse and its uses -- the manse was constructed between 1868 and 1871 -- that's according to Harold Hancock's history of the church. Extensive renovations and improvements were made during the 1920s and '30s, and then the building was remodeled and renovated again in 1958. In 1963, the manse was remodeled into offices. The manse was used as the church office until 2007, when the offices were moved to the new addition to the church.

The building has been vacant since 2007. Planning for the new addition to the church began in the year 2000, and part of that planning were -- committee work on how the manse could be used after the new construction was completed. The same question has been debated periodically over the last 20 years.

In 2019, the church hired Siemanowski Consultants and Cooperson Associates to evaluate the manse. The goal of this analysis and evaluation was to provide a basis for the church to make an informed decision about the disposition of the manse. The architect engineering study addressed two possible uses of the building -- one was to create office space and classrooms, and the other was to restore the
building to a residence for refugees or other needy families. The study estimates the cost to make the building handicap-accessible and meet existing code for offices, classroom space to be between $900,000 and $1,100,000. The estimate to bring the building up to code, just as a residence, is between $300,000 and $350,000.

The final evaluation report was received at the end of May 2019. The report was then presented and discussed at a congregational meeting. The session, which is the board of the Presbyterian church, using the report and information gathered at the congregational meeting, decided that demolition was the only viable alternative.

So far, the asbestos abatement is -- has been completed and the once deteriorating building has gotten worse. Thank you. Any questions?

MR. DAVIS: Thank you. Questions from the board?

MR. JOHNS: (Cross talk) I have a question, and that is -- could the -- the last speaker please introduce himself and let us know, you know, what his connection with the church is?

MR. HOWARTH: I'm sorry -- could you
ask that again?

MR. JOHNS: Who are you?

MR. HOWARTH: Oh, I'm -- I'm Dave Howarth. I am a chairman of the -- what the church calls the home committee -- read that as building committee or facility committee.

MR. JOHNS: Thank you.

MR. DAVIS: We have Mr. Brook, then Ms. Silber.

MR. BROOK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would imagine that the church as -- with as many members and -- that you have at Red Clay that you have more than one minister -- is that correct?

MR. HOWARTH: We do. At the moment, we have an interim pastor and an associate pastor, yes.

MR. BROOK: All right. Now, I know you have built a new manse at some point in this (inaudible). Is it possible that you could have your assistant or associate live in this property in lieu of the payment for housing allowance?

MR. HOWARTH: I don't -- I don't know, to answer that question. As the engineering and architect study said, it would cost between $300,000 and $350,000 to make it livable. Yeah, I don't think
it would be worth spending that --

MR. BROOK: Could you detail what would cost that much? I mean, it looks like it's a house in very good condition to me.

MR. HOWARTH: It -- you know, it appears to be. The -- do you have a copy of their engineering -- I don't know if that was sent to you or not, but --

MR. BROOK: No. I don't.

MR. HOWARTH: -- it -- you know, the building is not, you know, livable, I guess, but -- yeah, that's certainly a possible consideration, but since I don't know when -- and maybe Bob Roof could jump in on that -- pastors have tended to not want to live near the church. And -- they --

MR. BROOK: Well, in terms of employment, usually it's at least a two-way street. The -- the other thing I'm wondering is -- is it necessary to spend the $900,000 to $1,100,000 on this property to make it usable as a -- perhaps a shelter for homeless -- or for battered women and children or for families that are temporarily without a place to live?

MR. HOWARTH: To make it --
MR. BROOK: I mean, I know -- I know the church is very much interested in --

MR. HOWARTH: Right.

MR. BROOK: -- mission work and that would certainly be a mission need that needs to be fulfilled in New Castle county.

MR. HOWARTH: Right. And that -- that would be in the $300,000 to $350,000 to make it a -- call it residence -- for people to live in, and would probably have to be handicap-accessible. I don't know if, for that purpose, it would require sprinkler systems and, you know, all the things that it doesn't have now.

MR. BROOK: Yeah. I don't know either. Is there any other organization that could -- either state or private that -- or county -- that could help provide the funds necessary if it were dedicated to that sort of use -- to help you with -- with turning the property into that kind of thing?

MR. HOWARTH: I'm not aware of any, but there may be -- they may be out there.

MR. BROOK: Okay.

MR. ROOF: And I offered some assistance to comment from a -- my name is Bob Roof
and I have been the chairman of the history committee for approximately the last 25 years -- and actually going back to our 275th anniversary in 1997. When we knew about the -- the building modification and expansion in 2000, which was completed in 2007, we began to try to find -- as proponents for historic preservation -- any alternate use.

We reached out to, among others, Easter Seals, a number of organizations that we still work closely with in our mission operation. We came up with one dead end after another reaching out. We're not on a bus route -- that was deemed a -- a real difficult problem. We couldn't get transportation for low-income people -- for people trying to transition out of low-income into the workplace. Even when we sponsored refugee programs, the residence was not appropriate or desirable for whatever number of different -- opportunities that we sought.

So, the expenses have put it out of reach in the absence of any interest by either minister's associates or alternate uses. Very sad, but that's the condition. And then the requirement of asbestos abatement to file for the application has put the building itself in a much poorer condition than
MR. BROOK: But you did remove the asbestos -- is that correct?

MR. ROOF: The asbestos has been removed and we -- Dave can correct me -- I think we have the inspector's report that asbestos has been satisfactorily abated and removed.

MR. HOWARTH: That -- that's correct. That was submitted with the application.

MR. ROOF: Yes.

MR. BROOK: That concludes my questions for now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Brook. Ms. Silber?

MS. SILBER: Hi. Yes, thank you so much for your presentation. Do you have any -- if -- if it were to be demolished, are there any either long-term or short-term plans for that space in -- in regard to the overall property usage of -- of the -- of the church? Are -- are there any, you know, ideas, that you are thinking about that property may -- that piece of property may be used functionally?

MR. HOWARTH: There has been discussion of that. Many people want to commemorate the building
with something. We don't know at this point exactly what -- it might be a garden, some people have proposed a pavilion so that outdoor services could be held under cover, but -- but at this point, we don't know, you know, just what it will be.

MR. ROOF: There has been substantial interest to commemorate the space, but not use it for alternative parking or any degradation of the memory of the -- of the -- of the space.

MS. SILBER: So, the idea of converting this -- this -- this plot of -- you know, plot of the property as a pavilion that perhaps could mimic the outline of the -- the original manse is -- is a feasible possibility, you know, to -- to create sort of a -- I would say, like a shadow kind of structure that sort of commemorates what this piece of property served during its -- its use. Okay. Thank you.

MR. ROOF: Yes.

MR. HOWARTH: I think so.

MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Ms. Silber. Mr. Johns?

MR. JOHNS: Yes. I was wondering if you could provide a -- maybe a brief timeline of the construction of the church and the manse -- which was
built first and which came after and the relationship
of the people who resided in the manse to the church,
you know, historically.

MR. HOWARTH: Bob, can you take that
one?

MR. ROOF: I'll take a -- a shot at
that. The -- Red Clay is celebrating its 300th
anniversary -- meaning, it's organization goes back to
the year 1722. Tradition says that there was some
dirt floor structure where the cemetery now exists,
and some of the stones were used to build the first
foundation of the church, which is still in place as
early as 1751, and that cornerstone is in that
building.

The manse -- approximately 20 years
later -- it was during that period of constructions --
1871 and then there was one long-term pastor who has
been very well-celebrated and the subject of some of
the major historical publications that we've put out
that were made available to your committee, John
Blake. And then his successor, I believe, lived
there. But later years, there's very little mention
of the manse and who lived there. We -- we've
documented very well the pastors, but not their
relationship to their housing.

We've had temporary manses -- Highland West, and more recently in Westgate Farms -- the pastorate doesn't seem to want to live right there at the church. I -- I don't know if that's our denomination or if that's something broader, but Dave provided the history in conversion to offices and the -- I don't think any pastor has lived there or there hasn't been any residential use for a very long period of time.

And the office staff really didn't like working in a residential-type structure. So, it's -- it's been a challenge trying to find a proper use and connected use for -- and the last 20 years have been very difficult.

MR. JOHNS: So -- so, the manse was originally built -- I would call it a parsonage -- as a residence for the -- for the -- and it's always been owned by the church and it's been used --

MR. HOWARTH: Yes.

MR. JOHNS: -- as a residence for somebody associated with the church?

MR. ROOF: That is correct. I don't know the last time that a pastor of the church has
actually lived there. That -- that's a question we
could address, but I don't know that answer off the --

MR. JOHNS: (Cross talk) --

MR. ROOF: -- top of my head. It's
been a long time.

MR. DAVIS: Anymore questions for the
applicant? Mr. Brook?

MR. BROOK: Yes, I'll just add one more
thought. I don't -- it seems like the less -- least-
expensive thing you could do with this property is to
turn it back into a single-family-type residence, and
I'm wondering if some kind of arrangements could be
made with your sexton or whoever takes care of your
cemetery to live in this property in lieu of a portion
of their salary.

MR. HOWARTH: I -- I missed the last
part of your sentence there.

MR. BROOK: I said -- I was wondering
if there was a way that this property could be used as
a residence for your sexton --

MR. HOWARTH: Okay.

MR. BROOK: -- or whoever takes care of
the cemetery --

MR. HOWARTH: Okay.
MR. BROOK: -- in lieu of a cash salary -- or cash payments that are made to that person now.

MR. HOWARTH: As far as the cemetery is concerned, the maintenance of mowing the grass is basically the only thing and it's a contractor. There is no, you know --

MR. BROOK: Okay.

MR. HOWARTH: -- person. And the church does not have a sexton at this point. So --

MR. BROOK: A church without a sexton. Okay. Thank you.

MR. ROOF: We basically pay for cleaning services and lawn care, I guess is the way to put it.

MR. HOWARTH: That's correct. We contract -- yes.

MR. BROOK: Okay. All right.

MR. ROOF: Some of us are very active in a home committee activity.

MR. HOWARTH: Correct.

MR. BROOK: All right.

MR. DAVIS: No further questions for the -- for the applicant?

BETSY HATCH: I'm not seeing any hands
raised.

MR. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you. On to -- on to public comment. I'll ask for those in favor of the application, if anyone would like to -- to speak.

BETSY HATCH: For those that are on a phone line -- to raise your hand if you would like to speak, you hit *9, and then to unmute you hit *6. I am not seeing any hands raised from the public.

MR. DAVIS: Okay. We'll make a call for those in opposition of the application.

BETSY HATCH: I am not seeing any hands raised.

MR. DAVIS: Thank you. One last call for general comment from the public.

BETSY HATCH: Okay. I am not seeing any hands raised.

MR. DAVIS: Okay. Very good. Thank you, Betsy.

BETSY HATCH: Uh-huh. So, switching gears here -- all right. So, the last application on the agenda this evening is 2021-0109-H, 201 Reybold Road -- Reybold Road, Tax Parcel 11-014.40-11 -- -144, north side of Reybold Road, 2,500 feet east of the intersection with Sunset Lake Road, Pencader Hundred.
This is a demolition permit to demolish historic
outbuildings as part of the Reybold Agricultural
Complex with -- with an associated minor subdivision
plan -- and the minor subdivision plan Application
Number is 2020-0051-S, ST Zoning, Council District 11.
I will promote Chris Duke, who is the engineer for the
project. And, Chris, whenever you're ready, you
should be able to share your screen.

MR. DUKE: Very good. Can everyone
hear me okay?

MR. DAVIS: Yes, welcome.

MR. DUKE: Thank you. I am going to
attempt to share my screen -- bear with me for just a
sec. All right. Can everyone see the map in front of
them with my PowerPoint presentation, hopefully?

MR. DAVIS: Yes.

MR. DUKE: All right. Very good --
thank you. Good evening. My name is Christopher Duke
with Becker Morgan Group. We are the civil engineer
of this application and representative of the owner,
Reybold Cap (ph), LLC. We are here tonight regarding
the proposed demolition of five existing structures
located on the current lands of 201 Reybold Road, an
approximately six-acre property located along Reybold,
east of Sunset Lake Road, and west of Salem Church
Road, southeast of the incorporated limits of the city
of Newark. The property zone ST, per rezoning that
occurred in 2008.

Just a little background -- this parcel
was created as lot 210 as part of the previous major
land development plan known as Whitewood Village.
Whitewood Village is a 209-lot townhouse subdivision
recorded in 2014, and is currently under construction.
The subject parcel was created as a residual lot
during that subdivision process.

The property has been identified as
being part of the Reybold Agricultural Complex. It
was before the HRB in March 2007 in coordination with
the major land development plan that you see on your
screen now, and it is our understanding that the
previous review did not result in any development
restrictions on the subject property.

Before you now is a smaller-scale
depiction of the residual six-acre property that is
proposed for the minor subdivision as part of our
application. Highlighted in blue and green are the
two parcels that would be created from the singular
parent parcel. The green parcel is proposed as being
approximately two acres in size and would contain the
existing primary and accessory dwelling unit on site
with access from Reybold Road. The blue parcel would
be created as residual land and include the five
structures proposed for demolition as part of our
application tonight.

In terms of providing full disclosure
to the board, previous land development application
proposing townhome development on this parcel was
previously submitted to the county and it was based on
the demolition of these structures. That plan has
since been withdrawn to facilitate the minor
subdivision shown tonight. And while the current
application proposes only to subdivide the parcel, the
ultimate intention is to develop the blue property.
So, I just wanted to be candid about that intention.

MR. BROOK: Could you go back over that
again -- say that again for me?

MR. DUKE: Yes, sir. So, the six-acre
parcel that you see -- probably about a little over a
year ago, maybe a little bit more, we had submitted a
land development plan for the entire six-acre parcel.
Since --

MR. BROOK: Okay.
MR. DUKE: -- then, the intention has - has changed a little bit -- first to carve out what I'll call the green, two-acre parcel, as a minor subdivision, but still with the intent to develop the remaining four acres.

MR. BROOK: Okay. All right. Thank you.

MR. DUKE: The five structures highlighted here are the ones proposed for demolition. They include structures identified as two barns, two sheds, and one workshop. While they have been identified as being part of the Reybold Agricultural Complex, the buildings are in a general state of disrepair and there is little if any meaningful historical character in the buildings or their uses, which are generally for storage at this point.

Earlier this month, our structural engineers and architects performed a review of the structures current state of repair and historical relevance in coordination with the Newark History Museum and the Pencader Heritage Museum. Both the interior and the exterior of the buildings were surveyed and this information was compiled in a report that was provided to the department of the boards --
per the board's review earlier this month.

This is a picture of what we call Barn 1. It is a two-story post-framed building with a lean-to that was added with modern construction. Approximately 25 percent of the existing structure is not of the original construction. Observations revealed inadequate foundation, substantial deflection in the flooring and termite damage, extensive damage to exterior and interior walls, and significant deterioration in the roof framing.

Architectural observations concluded that the lean-to addition was not in keeping with the style of the framing and sheathing of the original building's period, and that elements of original construction would require considerable repair or replacement in its entirety to maintain the historic character and provide for the health and safety, and welfare, of the building occupants.

Barn 2 is a two-story post-frame building with a lean-to that was added after the original construction of the structure. Approximately 40 percent of the structure is not of the original construction of the building. Structural observations revealed insufficient foundations at column locations,
considerable damage to interior and exterior walls, and considerable structural damage to the roof. Architectural observations concluded that the lean-to construction is not of historical significance, and other parts of the building that have been replaced were done using more recent construction methods and materials not in keeping with the original character of the building or historical significance of the structure.

Shed 1 is a one-story post-frame building composed of modern lumber that our structural engineers classified as being in significantly better condition than the other structure on site, but architecturally holds little historic significance to the history or character of the site.

Shed 2 is a one-story post-frame building. Approximately 15 percent of the structure is not the original construction of the building. Structural observations reveal no foundations along the rear façade of the building, substantial damage to exterior walls, significant structural deterioration to the roof framing along the rear façade as well. Architecturally, they concluded that
the roofing elements appear to be more of a recent replacement, and the original elements that remain would require considerable restoration or replacement to assume the historic character of the period of construction.

Lastly, the workshop is a two-story post-frame building with a lean-to that was added with moderate construction after the original construction of the building. Approximately 20 percent of the structure is not of the original construction, and the roof has been replaced with asphalt shingles. Structural observations revealed significant deterioration to parts of the building foundation, damage to the exterior and interior walls, and water damage to the roof framing. Architectural observations revealed materials of a historic character in some areas of the original framing. However, most of the building, including the roof rafters, purlins, and sheathing had been replaced with modern construction and methods. Much of the detailing in the windows and the architectural elements would require substantial restoration or replacement to function as originally intended and with respect to the historic character and remains of
the building.

In summary, after performing a detailed structural engineering and architectural survey of the buildings proposed for demolition, it was included that four of the five structure on site are in various stages of disrepair and would impose undue financial hardship to preserve and rehabilitate the structures to a useful state while maintaining the historical elements. And furthermore, the demolitions of the buildings would not represent a threat to the historic character of the site and surrounding location.

Alternatives to demolition were considered, including the possibility of using transfer of development rights to other properties as well as seeking to avoid the structures with conceptual land plans for future land development. However, these were ultimately considered to be not feasible. As such, we respectfully request approval from the board to proceed with demolition of the buildings at the appropriate time. And, with that, I'm happy to answer any questions that you may have.

MR. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Brook?

MR. BROOK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
So, I understand that you're going to remove five buildings from the four-acre portion of the -- what you've proposed to set aside for new construction, and to maintain the two-acre site with the house and apparently some other buildings and -- and not tear those down. What -- if that's correct, what guarantee would this board have that you would retain and maintain the historic house structure?

MR. DUKE: That -- that is the intent. As far as a guarantee, I would ask the board what -- what -- what they would ask for, be it a D restriction or a similar -- I don't -- I don't think that's out of the question. I think it's something that our client would certainly entertain. It -- it is the -- certainly the intention to -- to maintain on the two-acre parcel -- the existing dwelling and the accessory dwelling unit.

MR. BROOK: So, you would be open to suggestions that the Historic Review Board might make to ensure the long-term preservation of this structure --

MR. DUKE: Yes, sir.

MR. BROOK: -- the house structure?

All right. Thank you.
MR. DAVIS: Anymore questions for the applicant?

BETSY HATCH: I'm not seeing any hands raised.

MR. DAVIS: Okay. Shall we move on to public comment, then?

BETSY HATCH: Sure. All right. Let me switch gears here. All right.

MR. DAVIS: Yep, and -- and we'll -- and we'll make a call for, you know, public comment in favor of the application first.

BETSY HATCH: For anyone on phone lines, in order to raise your hand to speak on the application, please press *9 to raise your hand and then *6 will -- will unmute, just, again. I am not seeing any hands raised.

MR. DAVIS: Thank you. We'll make a call for comments in opposition to the application.

BETSY HATCH: I am not seeing any hands raised.

MR. DAVIS: Any general comments from the public?

BETSY HATCH: I am not seeing any hands raised.
MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Betsy.

BETSY HATCH: All right. So, under the report of the presentation planner, I don't have a report for the board tonight other than the items that were discussed at tonight's hearing will be deliberated on on April 6th at 5:00 p.m. via Zoom at the public business meeting. That's all I have for you tonight.

MR. DAVIS: Great. One last call for public comment?

BETSY HATCH: I am not seeing any hands raised.

MR. DAVIS: All right. We have a motion to adjourn?

MR. PATEL: I make a motion to adjourn. This was one of the short meeting.

MR. JOHNS: Second.

MS. SILBER: (Cross talk) the motion.

MR. DAVIS: All in favor?

MR. BROOK: Aye.

MS. SILBER: Aye.

MS. ANDERSON: Aye.

MR. JOHNS: Aye.

MR. DAVIS: Aye. Thank you, everyone.

MR. BROOK: Bye.

MS. SILBER: Bye.

MR. JOHNS: Bye.

(Whereupon, this hearing concluded.)
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