



**MINUTES OF THE HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND
LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD**

Wednesday, August 21, 2024, 6:30 PM

This was a hybrid public meeting held both in person and through electronic communication means.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Omari Davis, Chair
Kaydee Myers, Vice Chair
Nan Dreher
Andrew Fackler
Joan Lawrence
Mark Turnbull
Andrew Wenchel

VIRTUAL MEMBERS: Gray Handley (Medical; Sebring, FL.)
Gerald Laporte (Personal; Arlington, VA.)
Rebecca Meyer (Personal; Arlington, VA.)

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Robert Dudka
Alex Foster
Carmela Hamm
Dick Woodruff

STAFF PRESENT: Lorin Farris, Acting Historic Preservation Section Supervisor
Mical Tawney, Historic Preservation Associate Planner
John McNair, Historic Preservation Specialist

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

The Chair Omari Davis called the meeting to order and asked Historic Preservation Program (HPP) staff to please call the roll. Ms. Farris called the roll and determined that there was a quorum. Mr. Handley joined the meeting virtually at 6:31 PM, Ms. Meyer joined virtually at 6:33 PM, and Mr. Laporte also joined virtually at 6:34 PM. Additionally, Ms. Myers joined the meeting at 6:32 PM and Mr. Wenchel joined at 6:35 PM, both in person. They all joined the meeting after roll had been called.

EXPLANATION OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES

The Chair explained the in-person and electronic Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB) public hearing procedures. Mr. Davis described the logistics of participating virtually in the hybrid meeting via the Microsoft Teams platform and/or the call-in number.

APPROVAL OF THE JULY 2024 MEETING MINUTES

The Chair asked for any comments on the draft July 17, 2024, meeting minutes. Hearing no comments or questions, Ms. Dreher made a motion to approve the July 2024 minutes. Ms. Myers seconded the motion. Mr. Davis asked for HPP staff to call the roll. Ms. Farris called the roll and the motion passed 7-0-1 with Ms. Lawrence abstaining.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (CoAs)

Consent Agenda

There were two items on the consent agenda. Mr. Davis asked if commissioners had any questions about the items on the agenda. Ms. Lawrence asked a question about the item at 2911 Columbia Pike (CoA 24-17); she wanted to know if the relocation of the logo portion of the sign had been resolved. Ms. Tawney confirmed that the applicant had relocated the logo portion of the sign to the ground level as requested by the Design Review Committee (DRC). Hearing no other questions, Mr. Davis asked for a motion to approve. Ms. Lawrence moved to approve the items on the consent agenda; Ms. Dreher seconded the motion. Ms. Farris called the roll and the motion passed 10-0.

PARK NAMING: HARRIS TEETER SITE PLAN – 624 NORTH GLEBE PARK

Ms. Tawney explained that the applicants were attending virtually and that they would be giving their presentation to the HALRB. Ms. Senn of Southeastern Development began the presentation. She noted that Southeastern was one of the developers of the site at 624 North Glebe Park. She noted they were about to start Phase 2 of the project. She familiarized the HALRB with the site location noting that it was called the Harris Teeter site because of the Harris Teeter grocery store located on N. Glebe Road. Phase 2 of the project would include the construction of the second building, located at the back of the site, and the creation of the public park. She presented the park plan outline on the screen and noted it was located between N. Tazewell and N. Thomas streets.

Ms. Senn described the three main zones of the park. The first zone is the “urban zone” which welcomes visitors to the park with a plaza that is delineated by hardscaping, such as pavers and seating areas, and softscaping, such as canopy trees and other plantings. This portion also would have an open lawn for gathering/socializing. The second zone, the “pollinator meadow zone,” invites visitors to traverse a soft meadow of landscape along the primary promenade, and also includes seating nodes that encourage reflection and discussion. This section also includes a dog run. The third and final zone is the “woodland zone” which has a denser canopy of trees. Ms. Senn noted that the overarching theme was “ecology.” In the public engagement for this park, she shared that it was important to the public to feature the pollinators and nature overall.

While transitioning to the next slide in the presentation, Ms. Tawney sought confirmation that everyone attending virtually could see the slides on the screen. She noted that someone wrote into the chat stating that they could not see the slides. Ms. Senn confirmed that the slides were visible. Ms. Senn then continued the presentation and presented the three proposed park names. She stated that the names followed the naming conventions of Arlington County. All three names include the word “Buckingham” which ties the park to the area’s history since it is located closely to the Buckingham Garden Apartments, a historic resource in Arlington. The first proposed name, “Buckingham Pollinator Park,” highlights the importance of pollinators and offers an educational opportunity. The second name, “Buckingham Meadow Park,” draws from the characteristic pollinator meadows in the park. The final name, “Buckingham Garden Park,” highlights the geographic proximity to the Buckingham Local Historic District. Ms. Senn noted that “Buckingham Meadow Park” was the most popular option during public engagement.

Mr. Gonzalez, the planner from the County’s Department of Parks and Recreation assigned to this project, presented next. He shared a brief overview of the process associated with park naming in the County, why the HALRB was reviewing the project, and what the next steps in the process were after the HALRB hearing. Upon the completion of the presentation, Ms. Tawney thanked the applicants for presenting and shared that the HALRB would now hear from Dr. Berne who had signed up to speak virtually on behalf

of the Buckingham Community Civic Association (BCCA). Dr. Berne had previously submitted the following written comment for HALRB consideration:

As the president of the Buckingham Community Civic Association (BCCA), I would like to inform you that the BCCA voted on July 27 to recommend the naming of “Buckingham Pollinator Park” for the new park that will be located at 624 N. Glebe Road. The park will be within the BCCA’s neighborhood.

The park will be located on the former sites of an automobile dealership’s parking lot and a halfway house. It will be outside of the Buckingham Village Historic District. As the site never contained any of the Village’s buildings or grounds, it has no significant historical importance.

The HALRB will consider the following three names that County staff has proposed for this park:

- Buckingham Pollinator Park
- Buckingham Meadow Park
- Buckingham Garden Park

The first of these names identifies the Buckingham neighborhood. The name also emphasizes the importance of adding plants within the park and neighborhood that will increase populations of monarch butterflies and other native pollinators. Those populations have greatly declined within the County because of its development and urbanization.

The Buckingham neighborhood now mostly contains townhouses, multifamily dwellings, and grassy lawns. As a result, the neighborhood does not have many such plants. BCCA members supported the name "Buckingham Pollinator Park" because the park will help the neighborhood restore its historic pollinator populations.

The park’s so-called “Pollinator Meadow Zone” will be quite narrow. It is not likely to resemble an actual meadow. The name “Buckingham Meadow Park” would therefore not be appropriate for the park.

The park will not contain a garden. The name “Buckingham Garden Park” would therefore not be appropriate for the park.

Please therefore vote to support the naming of “Buckingham Pollinator Park”.

Ms. Tawney informed Dr. Berne that his five minutes had begun, and he confirmed that his audio was clear. Dr. Berne began by introducing himself, but then he lost connectivity, and everyone was unable to hear him. His audio and video were eventually restored, and Ms. Farris shared with him that the HALRB had been unable to hear what he had shared thus far due to the loss of connectivity. Ms. Farris offered that he start over. Dr. Berne began again and shared that the BCCA had voted on July 27 to recommend the name “Buckingham Pollinator Park.” He noted that the park would be located in the BCCA’s neighborhood boundaries and that it was not located in the Buckingham local historic district (LHD) boundaries and noted that the site did not have historical importance. Unfortunately, Dr. Berne’s connectivity was lost once more. When he returned, Ms. Farris shared with him again that he had cut out again and would need to repeat portions of what he had shared. She suggested that he turn off his video since that may help with his internet connection. After turning off his video, he began again. He re-shared the three names proposed for the park and noted that all three make a connection to the neighborhood by including the word “Buckingham.” He said that the first name, “Buckingham Pollinator Park,” notes the importance of pollinators in the neighborhood; he shared that the pollinator plants and species in the

County had greatly declined due to development. He said that the BCCA supported the first name because it highlighted the importance of restoring the neighborhood’s historic pollinator populations. He continued by saying that the meadow portion of the park would be quite narrow and unlikely to resemble a meadow which is why the BCCA felt the name “Buckingham Meadow Park” would be an inappropriate one. Similarly, he noted that the park would not contain a garden, thereby making the name “Buckingham Garden Park” inappropriate. He asked that the HALRB support the name “Buckingham Pollinator Park” as the BCCA had suggested. This concluded his public comment.

Mr. Davis thanked Dr. Berne and asked if there were any comments or questions. Ms. Lawrence said that Dr. Berne made several good points and stated that she would support “Buckingham Pollinator Park.” Mr. Turnbull also offered his support for that name and stated that he lived close to the site. He offered that “meadow” made him think of a more expansive place and that the garden apartments, while critical, were several blocks away from the park site and therefore, not connected to the site in question. He also felt that highlighting the importance of pollinators, as the BCCA suggested, was appropriate. Ms. Myers also noted her support for “Buckingham Pollinator Park.”

Ms. Dreher shared that she felt the name “Buckingham Garden Park” could also highlight the three different types of gardens, if you were to broaden your understanding of garden, in the park (i.e. the woodland garden, the meadow garden, and the pollinator garden), but that there was no reason to overrule the civic association’s desired name. Mr. Davis agreed that “Buckingham Pollinator Park” was appropriate. Ms. Farris asked if anyone attending virtually had any comments. Mr. Handley said he agreed that it was not really a meadow and liked the inclusion of the name “Buckingham.” He did ask if anything historically significant has been located at the site. He thought it had once contained farmland and wondered if the name should reference that at all. Ms. Tawney asked Mr. Gonzalez if, in the development of the project, he had come across anything. Mr. Gonzalez noted that they did look at the history of the site. Ms. Senn also shared that they had not uncovered anything of significance. She also noted their desire to avoid using people’s names in the name of the park.

Hearing no other comments, Mr. Davis made the following motion:

I move that the HALRB recommends the 624 N. Glebe Park (Harris Teeter Site Plan) be named Buckingham Pollinator Park.

Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion. Mr. Davis asked HPP staff to call the roll. Ms. Farris did so, and the motion was approved 10-0.

ENVISIONING DISCUSSION FOR ARLINGTON 2050 INITIATIVE

Ms. Tawney explained that in February 2024, Arlington County Board Chair Libby Garvey announced the Arlington 2050 Initiative, a year-long effort to engage County residents and neighbors over the question, “What do you want Arlington to look and be like in 2050?” She further explained that the goal of the initiative was to gather findings to be presented at the December County Board Meeting, and that the Board had asked County commissions to provide feedback. She clarified that she did not have many details about the strategic plan, and that answering the question would be the focus of the discussion. She also stated that HALRB members could submit their opinions to her via email, and that both written comments and the meeting minutes would be submitted to the appropriate offices in the County. She then read two discussion questions to the HALRB and displayed them on the viewing screen for reference. The questions read:

1. What are the HALRB’s top three priorities? If resources were not an issue, and you were able to implement those priorities in 2025, what would the effects be by Arlington 2050? Would this impact all of Arlington or just your neighborhood, industry, or field?

Example: “Because Arlington heavily invested in its transit connectivity, in 2050, no resident needs a car to get around within Arlington. There are no car accidents and there is less pollution than there was in 2024. Residents are more active and healthier. Arlington has truly become a 15-minute city because anyone can get anywhere within 15 minutes.”

2. In 2050, what new topics do you think your group will be focusing on? What are the issues that you believe Arlington will face – and what does success in those areas look like? What could be possible challenges to that success?

Ms. Tawney opened the floor to either casual discussion or focused discussion on individual questions. She called on Ms. Rebecca Meyer, who was attending virtually and had her in-app hand raised. Ms. Meyer responded that this was an error. Mr. Gray Handley then began the discussion. He explained that he had considered these questions before the meeting, and wished to provide a vision for short term changes that could lead to longer term impact. He then read the following statement for discussion:

Expand County residents and others’ appreciation of Arlington as a county with an interesting and diverse history through the preservation of existing historic assets and the expansion or establishment of additional educational facilities and tools such as museums, markers, and experiential learning opportunities.

Mr. Handley explained that he believed this approach by 2050 could lead to a permanent home for the Black Heritage Museum of Arlington, convey the importance of that history to the larger community, and to the give attention to the immigrant communities that have made the fabric of Arlington County interesting through the end of the 20th century and up to the present. He also provided for consideration a goal of creating an additional 10 or 20 historic site markers or better improved labeling at historic sites, as well as the creation of one or two learning trails focusing on specific aspects of County history that could be available for students and interested outsiders. Ms. Tawney thanked Mr. Handley for his thoughts and effort.

Mr. Davis said that he liked the idea of supporting a physical museum and other established places for the purpose of gathering local history, and that this would be a logical outcome of expanding upon historical outreach in the County within 10-25 years.

Ms. Joan Lawrence said that she agreed with the previous statement, and that she worried there would be few structures of historical value by 2050 if the County did not take a more proactive position to preserve what currently exists. She referenced the case of the former Febrey-Lothrop estate as a tragedy and explained that while she liked the idea of having a museum, she also did not want all County history to be consigned to a museum. She emphasized the need for living, active buildings that represent Arlington's history instead of historic markers and museum exhibits, and that County policies should favor preservation more strongly. She also referenced demolitions of historic properties in Cherrydale for new construction and how these actions have implications to the inventory of available affordable housing. She further stated her hope that by 2050 there would be minimal change in the County’s historic structures, that the County had expanded the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI), and that they would have identified additional commercial, school and residential buildings that are part of Arlington’s history to enable actions for preservation.

Mr. Mark Turnbull added that an earlier project at the old lawyers' row building near the Bozman Government Center had included discussion about repurposing the site as an Arlington historic museum, but that no museum was developed, and the building was now gone. He stated that there had not been commitment to either cause.

Ms. Nan Dreher said that she believed the need to anticipate the potential obstacles of climate change, which would require working with or against changing climate to be able to make preservation workable. She cited flood control, storm control or temperature changes as examples. She also said that she agreed with Mr. Handley's idea for the development of educational trails. She stated that she believed there were parts of Arlington that were compact enough to make it work. She cited the Freedom Trail in Boston, Massachusetts as an example where printed footprints on the pavement that visitors can follow to different historical sites. She further stated that this approach would be experiential and address Ms. Lawrence's point that history would not be contained in one building.

Mr. Handley added that he felt it would be important to find a way to either strengthen the County regulations or develop more amenable processes by 2025 to meet Ms. Lawrence's concerns for historic site protection. He said that he believed part of the problem that contributed to the loss of historic sites in recent years had been the paperwork, and that there were not strong enough protections to slow those projects to the degree that careful study and other discussions about options could take place. He also said that it needed to be a big priority to get legal or regulatory protections in place, or else the County would always be playing catchup behind economic and other pressures that move quickly to clear lots and stay ahead of the of the regulatory structure. He clarified that he believed this to be more important in the short term than the long-term development of a museum facility. He also stated that he found it disturbing that the Black Heritage Museum had to move locations three times and still had no permanent location or County support, while the County continued to support other expensive endeavors. He said that this should not be neglected in the short term.

Mr. Gerald Laporte said that the discussion of museums also required the inclusion of the Arlington Historical Museum on Ridge Road, which had been established as a public-private partnership between the County and the Arlington Historical Society in the 1960s, through which the County provided the initial capital, the site and some lots behind the site. He stated that it was a museum for all groups, and that it had displays on African American history, and possibly some on immigrant history. He also said that this could be a site to preserve all County history, but that the County had never provided operational funds, and so it was not as strong of a facility as one would expect for a community the size of Arlington. He expressed his belief that by 2050, the County should be able to come up with a way to better support the Arlington Historical Museum, to make it something that would make the whole community proud.

Ms. Kaydee Myers said that she hoped to see historic buildings in 25 years, especially some of the smaller buildings such as homes. She clarified that she was not anti-development, and cited the Langston Boulevard plan as a project that she was excited about, as well as the Orange Line and Columbia Pike plans as examples, and that these areas had pockets of historic homes. She said that these represented how many people think of Arlington, and that it would be interesting to see if that remained true in 25 years. She raised the issue of homes being demolished with no immediate construction, as she had seen demolitions of historic homes in her neighborhood that were being left as lots for over a year. She pointed out that some areas require building permits to declare the intended construction before demolition, and that these open lots were not always well maintained. She further stated that setbacks were making neighborhoods look disorganized, as new build setbacks were often further up than historic homes. She proposed incentivizing residents to save historic buildings, as they could provide density and adaptive reusability. She said that she found it shocking how little adaptive reusability she had seen in Arlington, and that the County could pursue more adaptive reviews. She also said that she would like to see more financial support for the HRI, as there might be more opportunities for different building types to receive

policy guidance, such as residential areas and churches, which are currently missing in the HRI. She acknowledged the difficulty and importance of including churches, as many were perceived to be safe but were now increasingly at risk for redevelopment.

Mr. Andrew Fackler said that he wished to add to Ms. Dreher’s point about the importance of addressing climate change in preservation with the idea that the building already built is the most sustainable. He provided a hypothetical where property owners could construct a lead-rated recyclable materials building, but that these constructions become less sustainable as they are still gathering new materials, mining and constructing, rather than using the trapped carbon of an existing structure and retrofitting it for current needs. He said the wished for this approach to be emphasized by the County to better meet its proposed climate goals.

Ms. Lawrence supported Ms. Dreher and Mr. Fackler’s ideas, stating that she had once been told it would be cheaper to demolish and rebuild her 1909 home than to make it adaptable.

At this time, Mr. Adam Walker, a CoA consent agenda applicant, informed the group that he would need to sign off. Ms. Tawney informed Mr. Walker that his CoA had been approved on consent, and that he would be emailed the final paperwork tomorrow. A message was then sent within the Microsoft Teams chat informing the public that any other remaining applicants for consent agenda items were not required to stay.

Ms. Farris said that as an exercise, she had posed the question “what does historic preservation look like in 25 years?” to an AI, and that many of the HALRB’s answers coincided with the AI’s answers. She said the AI had provided eight points:

1. Balancing preservation and modernization: Ms. Farris said that the HALRB had discussed this point.
2. Adapting to regulatory landscape: Ms. Farris highlighted how preservation can be perceived as having very stringent regulations and guidelines, but that it should be flexible when possible.
3. Integration of new technologies: Ms. Farris said that the HALRB had discussed this as the potential for continued outreach and education. Solar panels were highlighted as an example.
4. Sustainability with preservation: Ms. Farris said that both this point and point #5 would need to be demonstrated within the program to meet the County’s goals.
5. Climate change mitigation: Ms. Farris said that both this point and point #4 would need to be demonstrated within the program to meet the County’s goals.
6. Community engagement and diversity: Ms. Farris said that this was a priority for both the County and the comprehensive plan, and that they were seeing successes.
7. Education and preservation trades: Ms. Farris highlighted the difficulty with which property owners have in finding contractors who can meet historic preservation needs. She highlighted difficulties experienced by individuals trying to start small businesses in preservation trades that cannot get onto contractor lists, such as the restoration of historic windows. She said that this was an area where the County could improve.
8. Funding and financial support: Ms. Farris said that the HALRB had discussed this point.

Ms. Farris added that many of these points had been included in the Historic and Cultural Resources Plan, and that work was already underway to achieve some of them. She emphasized that they would also need guidance from the County on where priorities lay to continue with progress.

Mr. Handley said that he found the AI exercise interesting. He agreed that these points were good technical fixes, but that they did not address community building in a place like Arlington. He emphasized that Arlington's size, location and history could position it as an example of everything that is unfolding in the United States. He further said that he hoped the story of Arlington, with its great leaders and embarrassments, could be more closely tied to a national story.

Mr. Andrew Wenchel said that he hoped there would be a goal to counter the County's policy to turn traditional neighborhoods into apartment complexes. He said that he supported the idea of conversion of some houses, but that he had also seen house removal and tree removal, wherein small trees had been planted without consideration for growth. He said that he thought the County could set some limits on how much of an area could be redeveloped as multifamily housing, with the goal of saving a percentage neighborhood. He also said that he hoped the County would maintain the neighborhood buildings from the 1940s and 1950s, which were at risk. He asked if the County could communicate with neighborhoods regarding neighborhood conversion plans. He pointed out that redevelopment had led to relatively few multifamily homes, and often led to the construction of mansions. He proposed preservation of front facades in some cases, but that considerations would need to be made to preserve the 1930s-1950s buildings before they were all demolished. He clarified that these homes were underrepresented within the LHDs, and highlighted the work previously supported for Columbia Pike and Garden Apartments that should also be applied to the single-family neighborhoods throughout Arlington, with a percentage in mind to be retained. He reiterated the need to save the houses or the facades, rather than remove existing trees and demolish buildings that could be repurposed. He hoped that the County would develop guidance on this issue.

Ms. Myers added that she had hoped allowing more development in neighborhoods would allow residents to convert older houses into duplexes, which she felt would be appropriate for site density. However, she said that she had been disappointed to see the complete loss of historic homes as the trend. Ms. Lawrence pointed out that this approach goes against sustainability, adversely affects climate and robs areas of character. Ms. Myers agreed that she would have at least liked to see façade or significant portions of original structures saved, and that broad redevelopment was not a good approach for local preservation. Ms. Lawrence cited a historic home in Boston that had been repurposed as student housing as a positive example.

Mr. Davis thanked everyone for their contributions and asked that anyone who had additional thoughts forward them to Ms. Tawney. Ms. Tawney then asked Mr. Handley if he would also send her his written remarks. She also reiterated that additional comments from any HALRB member could be sent to her.

CHAIR'S REPORT

Mr. Davis shared that County Board Chair, Ms. Garvey, sent an email to all the County commission chairs asking them if there were any legislative ideas the County should make a priority for the 2025 legislative sessions in Virginia (at the state level). Mr. Davis offered that the HALRB could discuss anything that came to mind then, but that commissioners could also share their thoughts with him and Ms. Tawney via email.

Ms. Lawrence mentioned the recently adopted legislation brought forward by Delegate Patrick Hope, which dealt with demolition permits and historic properties, and offered that that legislation could be expanded. Mr. Turnbull also noted, based on comments Ms. Farris had shared in the envisioning

discussion just prior, that a legislative priority could be looking at the regulatory standards as related to the licensing of preservation trade workers with skills in historic restoration. Mr. Davis agreed that both topics would be good to mention and that it is important to continue to build the restoration trades work in general. Ms. Lawrence said that because Virginia is a Dillon's Rule state, and therefore, the County can only have powers that are granted to it by the state, it is especially important to be included in legislative discussions at the state level. Mr. Turnbull offered that it was also why the new legislation regarding demolitions and historic properties was important. Ms. Lawrence agreed and stated a wish for it to have been completed sooner but offered that the presence of it in the current legislation was good. This concluded the Chair's Report.

STAFF REPORT

Ms. Farris gave the HALRB an update on the Reevesland Project. She shared that the project had been presented to the County Board in July 2024 and it had been approved. The County Board conveyed the Reeves Farmhouse to Habitat for Humanity and they also allocated \$2.5 million in Community Development Block Grant funding, also known as CDBG funds, to support the adaptive re-use of the farmhouse. Ms. Farris said, although the item was on the consent agenda at the County Board meeting, that Ms. Garvey shared nice remarks about the project and stood to applaud the County staff who made it possible. Ms. Farris then shared that she anticipated the archaeological activities would start at the property in September and that the architectural salvage would also start in September and/or October. Finally, she noted that there were also educational efforts underway. Ms. Farris offered that HPP staff would continue to work with Habitat to brainstorm creative ways to share the history of the site and recorded interviews of the Reeves family with both the public and the new residents of the house.

Ms. Farris then shared an update on the Barcroft Master Financing and Development Plan (MFDP). At the same County Board meeting in July, the Barcroft MFDP was on the discussion agenda. This was also approved by the County Board which signaled that the County approved the land analysis of the project. Ms. Farris shared that the County Board did not have any questions at the meeting about items related to historic preservation. The meeting also served as a reminder to the public that there will be more discussions about Barcroft moving forward. Ms. Farris reminded the HALRB that the Jair Lynch project team, which is leading the efforts at Barcroft in collaboration with the County, will continue coming to HALRB meetings to present different phases of the project's development.

Mr. Handley congratulated the HPP staff on the hard work that went into the Reevesland project. Mr. Handley said the Reeves Farmhouse project was exemplary and that he wished we could have done the same thing with the Febrey-Lothrop House. Ms. Myers shared that she had a few members of the public offer their congratulations on the Reeves Farmhouse project as well. Ms. Farris thanked Mr. Handley and stated she was excited that Arlingtonians were happy about the project and how much work went into making it a reality. Mr. Handley said the project demonstrated the value in the County owning a property such as the Reeves Farmhouse because it offered protections to the property. He expressed a desire for the County to do this more in the future.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:37 pm.