TOWN OF MIDDLEBURG
HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, November 7, 2024
PENDING APPROVAL

The regular meeting of the Historic District Review Committee was held on Thursday, November 7, 2024, in the Town Hall Council Chambers. Chair Clites called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Town Clerk North called the roll.

PRESENT: Tim Clites, Chair
Punkin Lee, Vice Chair
Virginia Jenkins
Linda Wright
Cindy C. Pearson, Council Representative

STAFF: William M. Moore, Deputy Town Manager
Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

ABSENT: William Anderson (excused)
Margaret Littleton (excused)

Approval of Minutes

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve the October 3, 2024 Regular Meeting Minutes as submitted.

Vote: Yes – Committee Members Lee, Jenkins and Wright, and Councilmember Pearson
No – N/A
Abstain – N/A
Absent – Committee Members Anderson and Littleton
(Chair Clites only votes in the case of a tie.)

Old Business

COA 24-20 Revision: Free-standing Sign – 101 N. Madison Street – Middleburg Community Charter School

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that they approved this application in September; however, the applicant was now proposing to change the interior portion of the sign to one of a similar design. He reported that the proposed location would remain unchanged, the interior portion of the sign would be the same size, and the sign would continue to be a two-sided one. Mr. Moore advised that the applicant was proposing to change the signposts to remove the top crossbar and lower the height of the side legs, as well as to add a backer board. He explained that the sign would sit lower than the previously proposed one, with the backer board connecting to the two posts. Mr. Moore reminded the Committee that the Historic District Guidelines suggested colors be limited to three; however, there could potentially be more for exceptionally designed signs. He noted that the original design consisted of four colors and advised that the revised design added a fifth color – Forest Green - for the backer board. Mr. Moore suggested this was something the Committee should discuss.

John Ralph, of Quail Run Signs, explained that they minimized the structure and opined that this design would not be as "post heavy" and would allow the sign to be the star. In response to an inquiry from the Committee as to why Forest Green was proposed for the backer board, he explained that the applicant did not want to go with a black color and noted that a version of green was their preference. Mr. Ralph opined that if the Committee felt it should be black, this would be a reasonable accommodation. In response to an inquiry from the Committee, he opined that it would be better if the sign did not swing, as kids would walk by it.

The Committee agreed they were fine with the new design. They held some discussion of the backer board color and suggested that Charleston Green be used instead, as it was a much deeper green.

In response to concerns that were expressed about whether a fifth color would meet the guidelines, Deputy Town Manager Moore advised that if the Committee felt the design was exceptional and tastefully executed, it could have more than three colors. He advised that five colors would not be unreasonable if the Committee felt it worked with the design.

Committee Member Jenkins moved, seconded by Committee Member Wright, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 24-20, with five colors and changing the Forest Green color to a Charleston Green as in the photo.

Vote: Yes – Committee Members Lee, Jenkins and Wright, and Councilmember Pearson
No – N/A
Abstain – N/A
Absent – Committee Members Anderson and Littleton
(Chair Clites only votes in the case of a tie.)

COA 24-21: New Door – 2 W. Washington Street – Tom Beckbe

Deputy Town Manager Moore reviewed the history of the application. He reminded the members that one of the items included re-establishing the door on the front elevation on the easternmost side and noted that they conditionally approved it based on the design of the door returning to the Committee. Mr. Moore further reminded the members that they wanted to maximize the height of the door in the opening and conditioned their approval on the door being painted black and the installation of door height shutters. He reported that the applicant worked with a door designer to develop the details of the door, which was proposed to have a transom at the top. Mr. Moore explained that the applicant felt this would help with the frequent use of the door, as this was a retail opening. He reiterated that the proposal was to have a three-light transom at the top of the door. Mr. Moore noted that they would be true divided lights, the height of which would match the lights in the windows. He advised, however, that the width would be slightly narrower and would be ten inches as opposed to the thirteen-inch ones in the windows. Mr. Moore reported that the applicant was proposing to use a muntin that was one and a half inches wide to better support the opening and closing of the door.

Manual Simpson appeared before the Committee representing the application. In response to an inquiry, he advised that the plan was for the new transom to be on the same plane as the transom above the original front door.

In response to comments from the Committee, Chair Clites reminded the members that during their last meeting, they expressed a desire that the door and muntins all be black. He suggested that now that they had the design with the transom, they could entertain whether they wanted them to be a different color. Mr. Clites reminded the members that the existing front door was white below the window and that the muntins were white. He noted that the transom also contained white. Mr. Clites advised that the door itself was black. He suggested that if the Committee agreed this door should be all black, it would be

different than the original front door. Mr. Clites reviewed the size of the glass and suggested that if the Committee liked the design, they should ask that the width of the glass be the same. He questioned whether the Committee wished to revisit the question of color. Mr. Clites noted that due to the size of the muntins, if they were painted white, there would be more white in those muntins than in the ones in the windows. He questioned whether the trim around the transom should be white.

Mr. Simpson advised that they were open to any of the colors suggested by the HDRC; however, they would prefer the door be painted black.

After some discussion, the Committee agreed they preferred the door be painted black and that the transom casing be painted white.

Mr. Simpson confirmed a shutter would be installed to match the shutter on the original front door.

The Committee suggested it be square at the top, rather than curved to match the shutter on the original front door, in accordance with their previous approval.

Chair Clites moved, seconded by Councilmember Pearson, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 24-21, a request for a new door and transom as submitted, with the following clarifications: (1) that the width of the three panes of glass will be equal, which is approximately ten inches; (2) that the door and transom be painted black; (3) that the casing will be painted white to match the window casings; and, (4) that the shutters previously approved to be the height of the door or the height of the door and the transom combined and that they're square at the top.

Vote: Yes – Committee Members Lee, Jenkins and Wright, and Councilmember Pearson
No – N/A
Abstain – N/A
Absent – Committee Members Anderson and Littleton
(Chair Clites only votes in the case of a tie.)

COA 24-23 Revision: Fence – 105 Garden Cottage Lane – Baron Buckner/All About Fences

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that the original request was for an eight-foot-tall fence, which would have consisted of a seven-foot board-on-board fence with a foot of lattice on top. He noted that after much discussion and considering that the property line sat below the level of the adjoining parking lot, the Committee conditionally approved a six-foot-tall fence of the same design. Mr. Moore reported that the property owner was returning to request a design that would omit the lattice section, with the fence continuing to be six feet in height. He summarized that it would be a six-foot board-on-board fence that would be painted white after it cured.

Bob and Kim Renniker, the property owners, appeared before the Committee representing the application. Mr. Renniker reminded the Committee that the trees on his property, which served as a natural screen from the adjacent commercial property, were removed. He noted that the contractor took responsibility for removing them and explained that the adjacent commercial property owner had told him the trees were on his property. Mr. Renniker advised that upon returning from a trip, they found all their trees had been removed and noted that it now felt like they were living on a parking lot for a construction company. He expressed an understanding of what the Committee previously approved and asked that they be allowed to construct a six-foot-tall fence that did not contain lattice on top. Mr. Renniker noted that there were many examples of this type of fence in the Historic District and noted that there was even one on his property, but on a different property line. He reminded the Committee that the fence would appear to be shorter from the other side due to the topography of his property. Mr. Renniker noted that the fence on his property that was like this one was falling down and would be replaced with the same kind of fence.

In response to inquiries from the Committee, Mr. Renniker advised that the property line was on their side of the top couple of steps. He explained that the land started to drop off at the landing. Mr. Renniker opined that from the street view, the fence would only appear to be five-and-a-half-feet tall. He noted that the grade dropped off dramatically from there. Mr. Renniker advised that the stone fence/planter was at the bottom of the hill.

Deputy Town Manager Moore reminded the Committee that one of their conditions was that he would have to meet with the contractor to verify the property line before the fence was installed; and recommended this condition remain.

Mr. Renniker advised that he would have the contractor locate the property pins and make sure the fence followed the property line.

The Committee agreed they were fine with the revised fence design. They noted that once painted white and once the vines grew, it would not be noticeable.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Mr. Renniker confirmed there would be a gate, which would match the fence, at the top of the steps; however, it would be slightly lower for aesthetic reasons.

Councilmember Pearson moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 24-23, a revision request of Baron Buckner/All About Fences for a fence at 105 Garden Cottage Lane, with the same condition from the last meeting that Mr. Moore visit the site prior to the installation.

Vote: Yes – Committee Members Lee, Jenkins and Wright, and Councilmember Pearson
No – N/A
Abstain – N/A
Absent – Committee Members Anderson and Littleton
(Chair Clites only votes in the case of a tie.)

New Business

COA 24-24 (S 24-09): Replacement Projecting Sign – 2 East Washington Street – The Red Fox

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that The Red Fox would like to replace their existing sign with a new sign that would be the exact dimensions and in the same location as their current projecting sign. He noted that the sign was larger than what was allowed today under the zoning regulations; however, because it was a legally nonconforming sign, it could be replaced with one of the same size, as long as it was not higher or greater. Mr. Moore noted that the guidelines suggested signs should be mounted perpendicular to the building; however, in this case, the bracket has existed for a long time and was unique to this historic property. He suggested the continued use of the bracket made perfect sense to this application.

The Committee agreed the proposed sign was beautiful.

Matilda Reuter, the applicant, advised that she was excited to replace this sign thirty years after its installation.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, John Ralph, of Quail Run Signs, opined that there was enough contrast in the sign. He acknowledged that the muted gold would not have as much pop as the gold leaf did.

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Ms. Reuter advised that the old sign would be displayed in her shop on her farm.

The Committee agreed the bracket should remain given the history of the building and opined that it should stand alone in the privilege of being installed at an angle.

Vice Chair Lee moved, seconded by Committee Member Wright, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA 24-24 (S 24-09), a request of Matilda Reuter for a replacement projecting sign at 2 East Washington Street – The Red Fox.

Vote: Yes – Committee Members Lee, Jenkins and Wright, and Councilmember Pearson
No – N/A
Abstain – N/A
Absent – Committee Members Anderson and Littleton
(Chair Clites only votes in the case of a tie.)

COA-RS 24-05: New Single-Family Dwelling – 600 Martingale Ridge Drive – Gretchen Yahn

Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that the proposed new home would be the twelfth one in The Vineyards section of the subdivision. He displayed the color map that showed it in relation to the other homes. Mr. Moore advised that this one would be clad in lap siding.

Gretchen Yahn, the applicant, reported that this home would be painted Revere Pewter, with black shutters, which would contrast with the adjoining homes that were Kendall Charcoal and Bruton White. She advised that it would have a view out of the right elevation and noted that the only change was that the owner requested the rear elevation contain a window in the gable on the second floor, as opposed to a barn door. She confirmed it would have a barn door on the front elevation. Ms. Yahn advised that the garage was similar to the one on other homes in The Vineyard in that it would bump out in the rear.

Councilmember Pearson moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lee, that the Historic District Review Committee approve COA-RS 24-05, a request of Gretchen Yahn for a new single-family dwelling at 600 Martingale Ridge Drive – Middleburg Residences Lot 9.

Vote: Yes – Committee Members Lee, Jenkins and Wright, and Councilmember Pearson
No – N/A
Abstain – N/A
Absent – Committee Members Anderson and Littleton
(Chair Clites only votes in the case of a tie.)

Discussion Items

Planning & Project Associate Position

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that he was continuing to work on the hiring of a Planning/Project Associate.

House Numbers – Residences at Salamander

In response to an inquiry from the Committee, Deputy Town Manager Moore reported that it was his understanding that the lights that backlit the house number signs were disabled and a small pin light that would shine down from above was installed in each of the signs. He advised that he would confirm this to be the case.

November Meeting Quorum

Those members who were present indicated they would be present for the December 5th meeting. Chair Clites asked that if a member found they had a conflict, they please let Town Clerk North know so she could keep track of it.

Volunteer Appreciation Reception

Vice Chair Lee thanked Town Clerk North for organizing a nice Volunteer Appreciation Reception for the Town's committees.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:23 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____ _____

Rhonda S. North, MMC, Town Clerk

(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)

Rhonda North: Mr. Chair, you are live.

Tim Clites: Thank you. [off mic] Yes. This is everybody. Well, welcome. This is the Middleburg Historic District Review Committee's meeting for Thursday, November the 7th, 2024. The first item of business is a roll call.

Rhonda North: Chair Clites.

Tim Clites: Present.

Rhonda North: Vice Chair Lee.

Punkin Lee: Present.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Anderson is absent. Committee Member Jenkins.

Virginia Jenkins: Here.

Rhonda North: Committee Member Littleton is absent. Committee Member Wright.

Linda Wright: Here.

Rhonda North: Council Member Pearson.

Cindy Pearson: Here.

Tim Clites: Thank you. The next order of business is public comments. If you're here for something on our docket, we'll get to you in the order on the agenda. Any public comments outside of the agenda? You're on the agenda. I'm just kidding. [laughter] All right. Thank you. Our next item is approval of minutes from our October the 3rd, 2024 regular meeting. Are there any adjustments to or comments on the meeting minutes?

Punkin Lee: Excuse me?

Tim Clites: I won't count the sneeze. All right, I'll move that we approve as submitted.

Punkin Lee: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All Committee Members: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain? Thank you. Next is action item Old Business COA 24-20 revision to the request of the Middleburg Community Charter School for a freestanding sign at 101 North Madison Street. The applicant is welcome to come to the podium, and I'll let Mr. Moore give us an update.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On screen here you see the design that you previously approved in September. You may recall from your October meeting agenda, there was a revision application put on for that one, but the owner that is the charter school pulled that design. So, what they are proposing now is somewhat similar in design, the internal portion of the sign. And sorry, this gives you the approximate location that it would be placed that is unchanged from your previous approval. So the internal portion of the sign that consists of the charter school's logo, that remains exactly the same as you had previously approved in dimensions, you had previously conditioned it to be a two sided sign. This would remain two sided. What they have done, they have removed the top crossbar from the previously approved design and the supports from which the sign face would have hung. And instead, they've lowered the side legs and added this backer board instead. So, it would sit a little lower than was previously proposed, and then would have this backer board which would connect to the two side posts. As noted in the memo, there was some conversation at the September meeting when you previously approved the sign. There's a guideline in your signs that suggests that colors should generally be limited to three, but exceptionally designed signs that, you know, could potentially have more. So, the original portion, the logo, which is the school's brand consists of four colors the white, yellow, and green, plus the black outlines and logos and the text. And you had previously found that that was appropriate to have the four colors. This design with the backer board in the forest green now adds a fifth color to the sign. So that may be worth discussing. But otherwise again, this is would be positioned similarly on the site. Again, it sits a little bit lower, and it would remain two sided as you had previously conditioned.

Tim Clites: Thank you, Mr. Moore. Any additional comments from the applicant? If there's anyone here to represent.

John Ralph: Hey there, John from Quail Run Signs. We just sort of minimize the structure, tuned it down a little bit. There's a lot of moving parts at that organization and a lot of different opinions. So, it's been through about 20 revisions. I don't know how many Will has seen, but I think we finally come up with a good one that's not so post heavy and sort of lets the sign be the star.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: Hi, John. So why that color? Is it trying to lose that board that you don't really see it?

John Ralph: We suggested it in black and they really, really, really didn't want black.

Cindy Pearson: What does white do to it? Too much, too bright? It just gets dirty. All the above.

John Ralph: We've tried a lot of options, and they really wanted a Hunter or Essex or Forest Green. So that's what we're presenting.

Cindy Pearson: Just that other green doesn't bounce off that green to my eyes.

John Ralph: I mean, I think if the Committee felt that it should be black, I think that would be a reasonable accommodation.

Cindy Pearson: And the other thing with the other proposal and the way it hung, you could see, is it more do you think it will be more stable with this way that it won't. Was there?

John Ralph: I mean it's nice in that it doesn't swing. Because kids walk by it all day long. So.

Cindy Pearson: Understood that. Yeah, I got that. Okay. I don't have any further questions right now.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm not completely opposed to the extra color even though it's not in the bylaws. But honestly, I think the black would look better and it would pop off that a little better.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: Yeah, I actually prefer this design to the last.

John Ralph: As do I.

Linda Wright: I just think it's going to ground and sit better where it's going to be. I'm not opposed to the five colors. I think it reads pretty well, actually. And I mean, if they decided to go to a black background, I would not be opposed to that. But I don't mind that Hunter Green is almost black. It's got enough black in it that I actually prefer the way it looks now.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I like the smaller size of the whole thing. The new post look, I think, nicer. It looks a whole lot more stable. And I think if the green is dark enough that it has enough black in it, that the green would be fine. If it's too green, then I think it's too many colors and that the dark green or black would be fine.

John Ralph: That's why we did Forest, because it is very dark. Yeah. Essex is the one you see everywhere, and it really is still green. But Forest Green is pretty dark.

Punkin Lee: Yeah. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. My comments have already been covered, which is. Yeah. The only thing I would have perhaps thought about was whether we wanted this extra color, but I didn't find it offensive. For myself, I actually much prefer the design of this. The scale of it, the design of it it's just quieter. I think it'll really look nice. So, with that, are there any additional follow up comments from anyone in the committee?

Cindy Pearson: I would just say that I think the black, even though all of you noted that you are okay with the green because green is going to be green when you put it on there. It's just going to depend on the, you know, the tint that you get, who mixes the paint, blah, blah. I think the black would bring it back down. I would suggest that to keep it at the colors that we approved before.

Virginia Jenkins: Can I add one thing or ask one thing? I think Benjamin Moore has a good Charleston Green, which is a really black.

John Ralph: It is [multiple speakers]

Virginia Jenkins: How about that as opposed to the Forest?

John Ralph: I think they would be happier with that than with black. I know that they were.

Virginia Jenkins: Charleston Green.

John Ralph: Yeah, they were pretty adamant or someone on the committee was very adamant that they did not want it to be black, so.

Virginia Jenkins: That would be my opinion if you're going to have that many colors, I would go with the Charleston Green.

Punkin Lee: I agree with Virginia. I mean, we know that one's really dark.

John Ralph: It is.

Cindy Pearson: I agree, and Virginia does have a good eye for color. But my only other problem is, is this not going by the bylaws, the guidelines not bylaws. guidelines.

Will Moore: Yeah. Well and just to clarify the guidelines.

Tim Clites: I think that's a recommendation.

Will Moore: Yeah. [multiple speakers]

Tim Clites: You do allow for some flexibility.

Will Moore: Let me read.

Cindy Pearson: It says use colors that complement the materials and color scheme of the building, including accent and trim colors. A limit of three colors is recommended for signs, although more colors may be appropriate in exceptional and tasteful executed designs. Tasteful.

Will Moore: So, the question is, is this an exceptional and tastefully executed design? And if so, more than three colors is okay. It doesn't give any upper end to what that might be. But five is not necessary. I would suggest not necessarily unreasonable if you think it works with the design, and that's where your judgment has to come in. You know, if it were neon green and neon pink and, you know, added up to five, that might not be okay. Just so.

Tim Clites: Well, I don't get the vote unless you four decide to split down the middle, but I do, and that I like the slightly darker, blacker green. There's something about that color, at least on the screen, that's a little off. It's a little evergreen, kind of. It's got just a little too much green in it. So, if that was a I think that's a good compromise. I can understand maybe why they don't want it to be all black, that that might feel a little heavy visually. So, we're really splitting hairs, but it sounds to me like a nice, appropriate solution to recommend if someone wants to make a motion. [off mic]

Virginia Jenkins: I'd like to make a motion to approve COA 24-20 with the five colors and changing the Forest Green [inaudible] to a Charleston Green as the photo.

Linda Wright: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor.

All Committee Members: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain? Motion passes. Thank you. Oh, I just did it. Next is item COA 24-21 request of Radcliff Menge for a new door at 2 West Washington Street. Welcome. Give us just a second to let Mr. Moore walk us through it. Nope. Come on up. And walk us through the details, and then we'll give you an opportunity to say hello as well. Thank you.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, you've obviously seen this package a couple of times. The original package, which included painting along the Madison Street elevation. The reopening of some doorways. One of the items in that original application included reestablishing a door in this particular opening. So, it's on the front elevation, the easternmost opening. You had conditionally approved that previously? Conditioned upon a couple of things. One was that the actual design of the door would come back to you for approval, which is where we are now. It was mentioned in that original approval that you wanted to maximize the height of the door in the opening. Also conditioned in the original approval was

that it would be painted black and that door height shutters would be provided. So right now, the window shutters are provided at the height of the window. So, one of the other conditions was that new shutters would be provided that would be the height of the door. So, Mr. Menge had worked with a designer to come up with the details of the proposed door. Instead of having the entire opening be a door, he is proposing that there be a transom at the top. And he had mentioned briefly in his materials that they felt this was necessary in talking with his designer just to help with the frequent use of this as a retail opening, that it would provide better support. So, the proposal is to have a three-light transom at the top and then the door below. We did provide the dimensions of the lights. And this would be a true divided light design, not a simulated. The dimensions, the height is matching the existing dimensions at 18 in of the lights that are in the window. The width is a little bit narrower. These are ten-inch lights as opposed to the 13-inch lights that are in the windows. And again, the applicant is proposing using a heavier, a wider muntin, an inch and a half wide muntin. And again, the argument there is just to better support this because it's going to be frequently opened and closed. And just today Mr. Menge provided this additional drawing. It's the same drawing that you have in your packet. It just omits all of the dimensions. So, it gives you a cleaner view. So, I'll leave that up here for your viewing and can go back to any of the slides if you wish.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Welcome. Anything to add?

Manuel Simpson: Nope.

Tim Clites: Say hello with your name. We know it but for the record.

Manuel Simpson: Hi Manuel Simpson, representing Tom Beckbe.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin, do we want to start with you?

Punkin Lee: The transom, is it going to match the transom over the original front door? I mean, if, you know, looking across.

Manuel Simpson: Like the height of it. I think that's the plan is to have that be on the same plane. Is that the right?

Punkin Lee: Yeah, that's what I was wondering about. Other than that, I think it'll look very, very nice. Thank you.

Manuel Simpson: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Virginia Jenkins: I have a question. Because I'm having trouble with this drawing. I mean. Everything will be painted black, right?

Tim Clites: We'll get to that.

Virginia Jenkins: Okay.

Tim Clites: Linda?

Linda Wright: No, I think I'm fine with it. I don't have any other questions.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia. Beyond the black.

Virginia Jenkins: Beyond the black, is it? I mean, is it all black that the door is going to be all black?

Tim Clites: I think that's a question that we want to confirm this evening.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm not quite sure from the drawing. I'm not sure how the what I call mullions, what you call muntins, are inset or are they part of the door?

Tim Clites: They're part of the door. It's a very traditional construction for the door.

Virginia Jenkins: Then I would assume they would be all black.

Tim Clites: And the muntins and the door would all be the same color whatever we decide. I think if I read the documents right, that we did recommend black in our last review of this, now that we see the unit, we with the transom if that's agreeable and seems consistent, we I guess could entertain whether we want it to be a different color than black or if we still like that idea.

Virginia Jenkins: No, I just the only reason I'm asking is because I'm looking at the picture of the whole front of the building. Right. And so, it would be slightly different.

Tim Clites: Right. Yeah. Because the existing front has white below the window, we see the window muntins that are white. And now with a transom above, the front door has white sticking in the transom, but a black door. But the black door has no glass.

Virginia Jenkins: Yeah. So.

Tim Clites: Yes.

Virginia Jenkins: I'm okay with it now.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I don't have any questions at this time.

Tim Clites: All right. And my only point of clarification is it looks like the glass is ten inches, nine inches and ten inches. And that may just be the way the CAD file is. I won't get into the specifics of it, but the way it's dimensioned, it's as if there's an entire double-sided ovolo sticking at the perimeter, which there wouldn't be. So, if I were to assume that they or maybe we just say that they should the glass should be the same width for all three, whether that's ten inches or some fraction of ten inches. I think it'll be a noticeable difference between the ten, nine, and ten. I don't know if you all can see that. Yeah. There we go. But my guess is by looking at the detail, you can see that they've dimensioned the flat of the door at 4.5 inches, plus the half inch data or the sticking, but in the elevation, it's drawn an inch and a half. It looks like a little bit of a CAD glitch to me. So, the simple solution, if we like this design, is to just ask that the three widths of glass be the same. Sorry if I've confused anybody. Do we need to come back to, is there any comments from the committee about whether we want to reconsider all black or all white or a combination thereof? I'm not suggesting any of those. We just in the last meeting we talked all black, which means these muntins. Let's be clear, they're going to be about probably I'm going to eyeball it and say probably twice as wide as the muntins in the windows. And so, if they're white, they'll be considerably more white in the muntins than the windows. So, the black does allow for that to disappear. And I think if we have a black door, the transom should be the same color. I think the trim around it could be white, like the trim the casing around the other openings. That's just my opinion. I'll just pause and let anyone have any comments on that. Hey Manuel, what do you think? Any comments on any of that?

Manuel Simpson: No, strangely didn't even realize that they were white for a second. Because I was paying attention to the door. But I think we're open, obviously, to any of the colors that you guys suggest that it could be done, but I would prefer a black door. Yeah.

Cindy Pearson: Yeah. I think the door being black is good, but I agree with, you know, how the white is over the original door, that something white around the top would probably make the case more like a door.

Manuel Simpson: The casing.

Cindy Pearson: Something that's for Tim to say more clearly.

Tim Clites: I'm just having a discussion. Yeah. The thing that does concern. [multiple speakers]

Manuel Simpson: Or it could mimic the top of the window there. I think that red that's just higher that's not. Punkin, is that why you asked that question is because of that red went up higher than that. And I think that's just [multiple speakers].

Tim Clites: The existing masonry opening.

Manuel Simpson: Right.

Tim Clites: I think Punkin's question, if I understand it, was the horizontal white line above the black door defines the door and the transom. And her question I think was, is that the same line for this door. Right. And if it's all black, it may not matter. I think what I look in the shop drawing and see is that the panels of glass are the same height at 18 inches. Okay. Any further comments or would someone like to make a motion?

Punkin Lee: I have one. I have one more question. You are going to put a shutter.

Manuel Simpson: Correct.

Punkin Lee: Is that going to match the shutter on the original front door? So, the door shutters match because it's got that curve, and the window shutters are straight across.

Manuel Simpson: I can't speak to that, but I think that would be awesome.

Tim Clites: Well, I think.

Manuel Simpson: I wasn't. [multiple speakers] I know that we're putting a floor length or a door length shutter, but.

Punkin Lee: The front, the original door shutter has that curve in it. And if you're making another door, should they distinguish it with that arch on it as a door versus straight across as the window was?

Manuel Simpson: Well, that's because it has an arched transom there though. Is that?

Punkin Lee: Right? I was just, you know, curious.

Manuel Simpson: Yeah. I think it'll be neat when it's the door length. [multiple speakers]

Punkin Lee: That's fine. I just clarifying it.

Will Moore: And just to clarify further, the original approval you gave which conditioned upon the door height shutters specified the square top shutter.

Punkin Lee: That's what I thought. Okay. Thank you.

Manuel Simpson: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Any further comments?

Virginia Jenkins: I agree with anybody who's saying that the white piece on top should remain.

Tim Clites: I want to understand what you just said.

Virginia Jenkins: You don't understand what I said.

Tim Clites: No, I want to. The white piece on top. Mr. Moore, can we get the front door up and in a big.

Virginia Jenkins: Front door against the window.

Manuel Simpson: The window casing at the top.

Virginia Jenkins: That I guess it's wood piece at the top, which defines.

Tim Clites: The piece that touches the brick, will stay white. The trim is that what you're saying?

Virginia Jenkins: Yes.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Okay. Yep. Any other comments?

Cindy Pearson: Can you make that?

Tim Clites: You want me to make?

Cindy Pearson: Yes.

Tim Clites: Oh, dear. I move that we approve COA 24-21 request for a new door and transom as submitted with the following clarifications. That the width of the three panes of glass be equal, which is approximately ten inches, and that the door and the transom be painted black, and that the casing be painted the white to match the window casings, and that the shutters previously approved to be the height of the door or the height of the door, and the transom combined and they're square at the top.

Cindy Pearson: Second.

Tim Clites: All those in favor?

All Committee Members: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain? Thank you. Thank you.

Manuel Simpson: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Next last item from revisions for last month. I want to look and see. Do we have someone from the applicant here? Mr. Moore, should we?

Will Moore: We do. We have the actual owners who are here.

Tim Clites: Okay. So, this is COA 24-23 request of a revision to from the original request for Baron Buckner All About Fences for a fence at 105 Garden Cottage Lane. Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you. So, you'll recall this from a previous meeting. Mr. Buckner is with the fence company but Mr. Renniker, the owner, is here this evening. So, you'll recall that the original request was for an eight-foot total height fence, which would have been seven-foot board fence with a one-foot lattice section atop. After much discussion with the contractor at the previous meeting, and considering excuse me that the actual property line sits down a little bit from the level of the adjoining parking lot, you conditionally approved a six foot total height fence, but with the same design that had been presented that is a board portion with a one foot lattice top. So, after the contractor had discussed this with the owner, and considering that the overall height was reduced from the original request, the owner is returning requesting a different design, and that would be to omit the lattice section atop. He would still request the six-foot total height, which you approved. But instead of this type of design, it would just be a six-foot board fence, similar to what you see here. It would be painted white after a period of curing.

Tim Clites: Thank you. And anyone from the applicant wish to address the committee. Welcome. How are you? For the record, state your name and address.

Bob Renniker: Okay, I'm Bob Renniker. This is my wife, Kim Renniker.

Tim Clites: Nice to meet you and welcome.

Bob Renniker: We had planned to be here in the first hearing. I'm sorry we weren't. We had a family emergency we had to be in Texas then. We would like. I know you guys know the history on the trees being torn down between us, and I can speak to that more if you would like me to. But the topography of our property is such that now that we have all these 40 foot plus or minus trees that have been removed from our property. Given the topography of the land, we start off several feet in most places below the grade of the commercial property next to us and the rest of the surrounding area. Those pictures, the top left shows what it looked like before. All of these are before and so it was very well screened. We never thought much of it. And now this is the same view. And it's very unfortunate that the contractor who's been great and communicative and not shirk the responsibility. I don't have anything bad to say about them, but the property owner, according to him, told him that the trees were on their property when in fact they were on ours. So, we arrived back home to find that all of those trees had been removed. This was two weeks before our daughter's wedding with a lot of guests coming in, and it was more emotional than I might have guessed it would have been, but it's now. It literally feels like we live on that parking lot, and they have a shed with a tar roof and people good, good folks. But it's a construction company and they're coming out to their trucks and there's debris loaded up, and it's a really bad situation, and there is no solution that really puts it back the way it was, obviously maybe 20 or 30 years from now. And so, at the last hearing, I understand that this committee approved a, as Will said, a six-foot fence inclusive of a foot of lattice at the top. And we're just asking to make it a six-foot fence without lattice. I've been all around town. I know part of the goal of the committee is to preserve the look and feel and historic nature of the district, which we care a lot about, and one of the reasons we love living here. And there are many, many, many examples of six-foot fences without lattice around residences, certainly bordering commercial properties. We actually have an existing six-foot fence between us and the church, which is the other border, and I don't know if I provided a picture of that in the last set that's the view. So, this will show two things. This is from the church and the entrance to the commercial property. And that is a six-foot fence that happens to have pointed pickets or pointed tops of the fence members. But that picture also gives a nice perspective of how much shorter it seems from everywhere else except our property because of the drop off. So, we want to replace that fence with a square top and do a similar fence on the perpendicular line that would provide some semblance of screening between us and the commercial property, and I'm happy to delve into more detail on any of that. I don't want to take up too much time, but.

Kim Renniker: The church fence is falling down.

Bob Renniker: Oh yeah. That fence is falling. We have a view problem here. The other fence needs to be replaced. And I, to the extent that this is some a variance of some sort, I would respectfully submit that

just from walking 2 or 3 blocks around our property, there are many, many fences, including at one of the historic properties that's listed, that's shown and pictured in the guidelines that have six foot or a little taller square top fences. So, we're comfortable and happy that it will preserve the look of the area and the town, that it comports with what's there now. And obviously hope you all will agree, because the circumstances that led us to get around to needing this are pretty unfortunate. And we're on view to people and it literally feels like we live on that parking lot so.

Tim Clites: Can you help us with the question that I don't recall we knew the answer to very well.

Bob Renniker: Sure.

Tim Clites: I'm looking at the picture that shows the steps going up to the parking lot.

Bob Renniker: Right.

Tim Clites: And the black truck all about is on the right.

Bob Renniker: I'm sorry. What is on the right? [multiple speakers] Okay.

Tim Clites: And so, the new fence where is the bottom? If that's one, two, three, four, five, six, seven steps at about seven, or it's about a 48 inch plus or minus. I'm just counting steps and doing quick math. It's about a four-foot rise from the paving to that upper step. Where is the fence in that grading? Where's the bottom of the fence in that? Is it above the wall? And.

Bob Renniker: No, it's on this side of the top couple of steps as I recall.

Tim Clites: Yeah.

Bob Renniker: And so, the land starts dropping off there. It drops off quite dramatically as you get that last tree before the shed on the right it drops off, starts dropping off quite a bit around that point. So, the from the street view, I think the visual perspective of the fence would be something under six feet. But you know, 5.5ft something like that. And then it starts dropping off pretty dramatically after that.

Tim Clites: As you go to the right, the grade drops.

Bob Renniker: Right. Correct.

Tim Clites: Yeah. [off mic]

Bob Renniker: Yeah. You can't tell in this picture. But we walk up to the house so the living room in fact we had a family member who hadn't been to our house yet and looked out and said, is that a? And was shocked to see the parking lot there. It feels like it's right outside the window. If I'm grilling on the deck, I'm waving to the people coming out to their trucks. And you know, it's not the best situation.

Tim Clites: Not what you moved into.

Bob Renniker: Right.

Tim Clites: We understand.

Bob Renniker: Right. Yeah.

Tim Clites: Okay. Right.

Cindy Pearson: On this picture, if you can blow it up, I don't think you can. Well, there's stone fence down at the bottom there. So, it will be on the other side of the stone fence up. Is that where your bottom is?

Bob Renniker: The stone fence is at the very bottom, and it's a kind of a planter enclosure of sorts. The property line is along the hill going up from there.

Tim Clites: That's what we didn't know, right where the property line was.

Will Moore: Right. And one of the conditions which I would respectfully suggest should remain if you modify your approval is that I would have to meet with the contractor to verify the property line before installation, just to make sure. But yeah, it is. It is definitely above or say to the west of the low stone wall. And it's somewhere along that grade as you go up the stairs.

Bob Renniker: And we would certainly have them locate the pins and make sure that it follows the property line.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I think the new fence submission is a vast improvement without the lattice.

Bob Renniker: Oh, good. Thank you.

Punkin Lee: No, I think it's to me it fits. [multiple speakers]

Bob Renniker: I agree with you and have a little surprised to find how common it is in town. I hadn't really noticed before, but I think it'll blend well.

Punkin Lee: I mean, it's still a fence, but it becomes less of a fence without all that lattice and to look at, I think.

Bob Renniker: That's a good point. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: No, I'm fine with the change in the design. And I think because of all the landscaping you have on your side, plus what they've sort of planted this really small on the other side.

Bob Renniker: Right.

Linda Wright: Once it's painted white, I think it's going to just sort of blend right in there and hopefully help your view. Right.

Tim Clites: Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: I agree with Punkin and Linda. And plus, the fact once you get the vines and things like that, it'll be fine.

Bob Renniker: Yeah. And I don't you could tell in those pictures, I don't know if you noticed, but we have a lot of climbing vines growing in that area.

Virginia Jenkins: Oh, yeah.

Bob Renniker: We will start training them up on the fence because we'd like to soften the look of it as well.

Cindy Pearson: I don't have any comment. Thank you.

Tim Clites: And I think in the last review, we confirmed that at the top of the steps there would still be a gate.

Bob Renniker: That's correct. Yes.

Tim Clites: Which would just match the design of the fence.

Bob Renniker: Right.

Tim Clites: Yeah. Okay.

Virginia Jenkins: I think is the gate going to be the same height as the fence, or are you going to have it just a little lower?

Bob Renniker: I picture it being a little lower just for esthetic but being the same materials and.

Tim Clites: Okay. Thank you. I have nothing to add to the committee's comments. Mr. Moore. Okay, let's make a motion. Go ahead.

Cindy Pearson: What do we add for you, Will? What would be?

Tim Clites: I think we could say with the same condition that we had in the last meeting for Mr. Moore to be on site. Is that your question? Yeah. I think we could just continue that condition.

Cindy Pearson: Okay. I moved to approve COA 24-23 revision request of Baron Buckner/ All About Fences for a fence at 105 Garden Cottage Lane with what you just said added onto the end of that. Is that okay?

Tim Clites: Yeah. That would require that Mr. Moore visited the site prior to installation.

Cindy Pearson: Thank you.

Tim Clites: You're welcome. All those in favor?

Punkin Lee: Aye. Second.

Tim Clites: Second. I'm sorry. Thank you for keeping me on. Punkin seconded that. Now, all in favor.

Cindy Pearson: Aye.

Linda Wright: Aye.

Punkin Lee: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstain.

Virginia Jenkins: Aye.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you all very much. Appreciate it. You're welcome. Thanks for coming in tonight. And the next item is COA 24-24 request of Matilda Reuter for replacement projecting sign at 2 East Washington Street, the Red Fox. Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You have the proposed design here. A couple comments that I made in my memorandum, just to remind you that this sign is larger than would be allowed today by our zoning regulations, which now limit a projecting sign to no greater than ten square feet. However, in the case of a legally nonconforming sign like this, you can change the face and still keep the size. As long as it doesn't get any higher or greater. And this would match the exact dimensions of the existing sign. So, there's no issue from a zoning perspective there. Also mentioned only because we discussed it in the Tom Beckbe sign application when it first came to you that we do have guidelines as well regarding projecting signs that specifically say they should be mounted perpendicular to the face of the building. And we mentioned that because the original Tom Beckbe proposal would have had an angled bracket similar to this. Again, this is a bracket that has existed for some time and is unique to this historic property. So, I would suggest that continuing the use of this bracket makes perfect sense in this particular application. I just wanted to highlight that. So we're clear that why we would be treating this different than a new installation?

Tim Clites: Thank you for that reminder and clarification. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I don't have any comments right now. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: No comments. Linda.

Linda Wright: I think it's beautiful. I'm glad it's getting redone. Thank you.

Tim Clites: I'm sorry, I forgot. You're welcome to come up and say hello. I apologize, I got ahead of myself.

Matilda Reuter: First time to the podium.

Tim Clites: Yeah. So, say hello. Give us your name and your address. Hi.

Matilda Reuter: Hi. Matilda Reuter, 2 East Washington Street, Middleburg. And really excited, 30 years later to install a new sign with my take on the Red Fox with John here so.

Tim Clites: Awesome. Linda, I already asked. Yep. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I just think it looks really nice.

Matilda Reuter: Thank you.

Punkin Lee: It's kind of a refreshing change.

John Ralph: I am very excited about the design.

Punkin Lee: Yeah. Thank you.

Tim Clites: I thought it looked great, too. Two comments. One for Mr. Ralph. Are you? Because he would know the answer. Do we think there's enough contrast that we're going to be able to see that, or is it going to be really subtle? I know on the screen is not how it ends up. That's why I'm asking, because on

the screen it looks fairly muted, which I don't dislike. But you're driving down the road, is it going to be is there enough contrast to see it?

John Ralph: I mean we have it stated it as [off mic] one shot metallic gold, which is way, way more muted than gold. [off mic] As the old sign [off mic] right? As far as enough contrast, I think. Absolutely. Okay. It just won't have that pop gold leaf that we're trying to avoid now.

Tim Clites: That you're trying to avoid that. Right? Right. Cool. And this has nothing to do with your application. But where's the old sign going? Because it's awesome.

Matilda Reuter: It's mine.

Tim Clites: Good. Yeah. As long as it's. Yeah. Going to be well loved somewhere else, right?

Matilda Reuter: We have a plethora of old signs hanging in our shop at the farm, so it'll go there.

Tim Clites: Perfect spot.

Matilda Reuter: Yep.

Tim Clites: The fact that it was coming down reminded me of a long time ago when the Mosby sign came down, and that was another. You know, it's that John Ralph does a beautiful job with signs.

Matilda Reuter: He does.

Tim Clites: But they don't make them like they used to.

Matilda Reuter: Well, he's going to make this one like it was because he gave me a 30-year guarantee.

Tim Clites: Really?

Matilda Reuter: Yeah.

Tim Clites: Good. And he's probably going to get up on that bracket and give it a good test now, actually, thank you for clarifying for the committee. Yeah. The bracket is something we discussed without you knowing in a previous application. Because as you heard, our guidelines say, that they're supposed to be perpendicular to the facade, and there was a desire to replicate that. And we just thought that this building, having the precedent and the history of it, should stand alone in that privilege. So, we think it's awesome.

Matilda Reuter: Great.

Tim Clites: It's a cool.

Matilda Reuter: Thank you, well I'm assured if passed tonight, it will be up before Christmas in Middleburg. So, if you could add that please to the requirements, then I think we have a deal. [laughter]

Tim Clites: I think that's a little out of our purview, but why don't we start by doing what is in our purview? Someone like to make a motion?

Punkin Lee: I'd like to make a motion that we pass COA 24-24 S24-09. Request to Matilda Reuter for replacement projecting sign at 2 East Washington the Red Fox.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda. All those in favor?

All Committee Members: Aye.

Tim Clites: Oh, you know. Because I'm a. Thank you. Motion passes.

Matilda Reuter: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you.

Matilda Reuter: Thank you. Appreciate it.

Tim Clites: All right. And our last action item of the night. See you. Thank you all. Take care now. COA RS 24-05 request of Gretchen Yahn for a new single-family dwelling at 600 Martingale Ridge Drive, Middleburg Residence, lot nine. Mr. Moore.

Will Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You have the materials. It's been a few months since you've seen a home. [laughter] The last one you saw was in the Stable Section. So that's the one that's currently under construction, The Stables. This would be the I'm counting. Right. This would be the 12th home in the Vineyard section. You see the location relative to the others here on the color map, and yeah, you have the typical materials. This one would be clad in the lap siding. And I'm sure Ms. Yahn can answer any specific questions you have on it.

Gretchen Yahn: So, this one is going to finish out this kind of residential section. We are going to go with Revere Pewter. So, in keeping with our desire to not have two homes next to each other that map indicates that we're staying true to that. It'll be situated in phase to be very similar to the house that's to the north of it, that would be the one that is in the Kendall Charcoal. So, this one being a little contrasty. It's going to be kind of nice because we have the Bruton White one, which is our whitest white next to the contrast of the Kendall Charcoal. And then to a little bit more of a muted off white at the end here. So, I think in color palette, it's, you know, meeting all the desires that we want to have out there. This one will similarly have a view out on the right elevation, which is very typical of what you see over there on the one that's existing there right now and on the only changes on the back elevation, the rear elevation they requested, like we did on lot number 13, to have a window to the back. So as opposed to the one that's existing on number lot number nine, which has a barn door on the front and the back. This one will have the barn door to the front, and we will have a window to the back. Other than that.

Tim Clites: Can I interrupt you just so everyone understands? Because I see Virginia looking, if you go to the rear elevation, the window you're speaking about is in the gable of the second floor.

Gretchen Yahn: Correct.

Tim Clites: Yep. Right there. That's the window instead of the shutter. You're welcome. I'm sorry, Gretchen.

Gretchen Yahn: It's okay. All good. Other than that, everything is the same on this vineyard model of the main house. The garage is also similar to the other models. It will appear to have a bump out in the back like it has a full bath, but it doesn't have a full bath to it. It's just going to be more storage for them. So, from that regard, it's the same. Color scheme will be the same of the kind of Revere Pewter with the black on any type of shutter. So, and the roof and the like.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Cindy.

Cindy Pearson: I don't have any comments. Thank you.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Virginia.

Virginia Jenkins: No comments.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Linda.

Linda Wright: I'm fine with everything. I like the window on the back and the top. I think that's kind of a nice addition not repeating both sides. So, I think that's kind of nice. Otherwise, I'm fine with everything.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin.

Punkin Lee: I agree with Linda. I like the window on the back. It's a nice.

Gretchen Yahn: I think it'll look nice from Pendleton because, you know, we do have the gooseneck on and those two you see like lot number nine and lot number eight, I think it'll look nice to have kind of a juxtaposition between the two a little bit.

Punkin Lee: So that's my only comment.

Tim Clites: Great.

Gretchen Yahn: Oh, and this one is in lap siding. Sorry it's not stucco. It is a siding house.

Tim Clites: I don't have any additional comments beyond that. So, I'm happy to have someone to make a motion unless there's additional comments from the committee.

Cindy Pearson: I move to approve COA RS 24-05 request of Gretchen Yahn for a new single-family dwelling at 600 Martingale Ridge Drive, Middleburg Residence, lot nine.

Tim Clites: Second.

Punkin Lee: Second. Oh, yes.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Punkin second. All those in favor?

All Committee Members: Aye.

Tim Clites: Any opposed? Any abstaining?

All Committee Members: Aye.

Tim Clites: The aye was for in favor. It came a little late. Virginia, now come on. I know, because I'm sorry you ladies have to, I apologize. I keep my mic on, and you can only have so many on, so I keep messing you up. That was all in favor?

All Committee Members: Yes.

Tim Clites: Thank you. Motion passes. Thank you.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Discussion items. Anybody have any discussion items? Does the staff have any discussion items? Are we behaving better, Rhonda? Yes, she says. [laughter]

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Mr. Moore. Do you have anything for us?

Will Moore: I do not.

Tim Clites: Do you have any updates on anything at the. Maybe not. Maybe I shouldn't bring that up in a public meeting out of town staffing updates.

Will Moore: I am.

Tim Clites: Continuing to work on that.

Will Moore: We're continuing to work on that.

Tim Clites: Great. We have a question.

Punkin Lee: I do have a question which came to mind looking at this application. What's ever happened to the numbers on the houses? And will this house be constructed with the incorrect back flip number?

Will Moore: I will have to follow up. My understanding was that all of these lights were disabled, and a an alternate light that shines from above was installed in the housing for the numbers. So, I'll have to go over there and check. But yeah. So, the same boxes remain the same and they want to continue using those. The last correspondence I had on that with Gretchen was quite some time ago, and she was disabling the back light and putting a small pin light up in the top of the box to shine down so they wouldn't be backlit, but they would still be lit, which is okay.

Tim Clites: Awesome.

Punkin Lee: Thank you.

Tim Clites: Steal from the playbook down at the other end of town. [laughter] Awesome. Well thank you. Meeting December 5th. Does anybody know right now if they have a conflict? Otherwise, just let the staff know and they'll keep track of it for us. Thank you, Rhonda, for doing that. We're adjourned.

Punkin Lee: I think we need to thank Rhonda again for the nice party she had for every committee.

Tim Clites: Yes, actually.

Punkin Lee: It was very, very nice. Thank you.

Rhonda North: Thank you. [multiple speakers]

Linda Wright: Thank you.