

CITY OF DOVER
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES
January 21, 2026

A Regular/Hybrid Meeting of the City of Dover Board of Adjustment was held on Wednesday, January 21, 2026, at 9:05 A.M. in person in the City Council Chambers and using the phone/videoconferencing system Webex. Members present were Mr. Swalm, Acting Chairman Mr. Coburn, Ms. Brinkley, Mr. Wagner and Mr. Senato (virtually).

Staff members present were City Solicitor Mr. Daniel Griffith, Mrs. Melson-Williams, Mrs. Savage-Purnell, and Mrs. Duca.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Swalm made a motion to first delete the approval of the Meeting Minutes of December 17, 2025 as they are still being prepared and he would like to also include in the motion, to postpone what's on the agenda as #3, which is the continued discussion of Draft Rules of Procedures for the Board of Adjustment, and I would like to postpone this specifically for the March meeting.

Mr. Swalm moved for approval of the agenda as amended. The motion was seconded by Ms. Brinkley and unanimously carried 5-0.

COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

Acting Chairman Coburn mentioned that the next Board of Adjustment meeting date is Wednesday, February 18, 2026 at 9AM if we have any applications. Are there any other items from Staff?

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that Staff can confirm that you do have a variance request that will be scheduled for that February 18, 2026, meeting, so please mark that on your calendar. I have no other items specifically from Staff, but certainly just a general info bit for the greater Dover area. Certainly keep an eye to the weather and remember that the city has snow clearing operations that may need to take place and you are of course responsible for removing snow from your sidewalk in front of your house that's along the street.

Acting Chairman Coburn asked if there were any questions; there were none.

NEW BUSINESS

Mrs. Melson-Williams read the Procedure Statement for New Business.

Mrs. Melson-Williams noted that the public notice for items on this agenda was completed in accordance with the code requirements and will be noted specifically for this item. The meeting agenda was posted on January 14, 2026, in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act requirements.

NEW BUSINESS**Application #V-26-01 Proposed 7-Eleven Convenience Store with Fuel Pumps Sign Variance Request**

Series of properties referred to as 736 N. DuPont Highway. A Request has been made for a Variance from the requirements of *Zoning Ordinance*, Article 5 §4.7 associated with signage for a new convenience retail store with fuel pumps and site improvements. The Variance Request seeks to allow the installation of a 99.6 SF pylon sign along the North State Street frontage of the development area (current property at 1021 N. State Street). North State Street is an urban minor arterial where pylon signs are not a permitted freestanding sign type. The development area consists of four (4) properties to be consolidated and that are zoned C-4 (Highway Commercial Zone). The owners of record are Harrington Four Seasons, LLC and Asher Four Seasons, LLC; the equitable owner is Dover DuPont State, LLC. Property Addresses: 736 N. Dupont Highway, 738 N. DuPont Highway, 1021 N. State Street and 1027 N. DuPont Highway. Tax Parcels: ED-05-068.09-01-07.00-000, ED-05-068.09-01-06.00-000, ED-05-068.09-01-04.01-000 and ED-05-068.09-01-04.00-000.

Mrs. Melson-Williams gave a brief overview of the Application V-26-01 referencing the Staff Review Report and Recommendations.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that it is a proposed 7-Eleven convenience store with fuel pumps and associated sign variance requests. It requests an area variance related to signage. Specifically, there was a Review Report that was provided to the members of the Board of Adjustment and that Review Report also has a series of Exhibits lettered A through I. So by reference, I'd like to enter all of those items into the record. I will note that for Exhibit A, which is the Application form itself, we did receive an update to that form, clarifying the actual ownership at the present time of the location. That was placed on your desk this morning. The applicants formerly are Harrington Four Seasons, LLC and Asher Four Seasons, LLC, who is the current property owner of this series of properties that is proposed to be redeveloped. The legal notice for this Variance Request was published in the Daily State News on January 9, 2026 and property owners within 200 feet of the subject site were notified by letter sent by the Planning Office.

Presenting on this application, the first Exhibit shows us where the property is located. It is actually a series of four properties highlighted there in yellow. They are collectively known by the address of 736 North Dupont Highway but also include the current addresses of 738 North Dupont Highway, 1021 North State Street and 1027 North State Street. All of these properties are zoned C-4, which is the Highway Commercial Zone. The Variance Request today is associated with the Sign Ordinance provisions that are found in *Zoning Ordinance*, Article 5 Section 4.7. The Request is associated with Signage for the 7-Eleven convenience store with fuel pumps that is proposed for this location. The variance seeks to allow installation of a pylon sign on the North State Street frontage of the development area and to allow for the size of that sign to be 99.6 square feet in sign area. The property on Exhibit B gives us an aerial view of the area. There are existing buildings that will be removed for the project. The project itself for redevelopment of the property is a separate Site Plan review that occurred with the Planning Commission. Today the Board of Adjustment is just dealing with the variance requests for the pylon sign. The City's Sign Regulations as noted are found as part of the *Zoning Ordinance*. In general, signage is

related to the specific type of use, road type and sign type. It's the State Street frontage, which would be the street that we see running up and down on the left. North State Street is an urban minor arterial. It is different than Dupont Highway which we see kind of running diagonally on the right. Dupont Highway, also known as US Route 13, is an urban principal arterial when it comes to our Sign Regulations. Included in the Report was additional information from the Sign Regulations. As a series of definitions for you to understand what we are looking at. Specifically, the Applicant has proposed a Pylon Sign on the North State Street frontage. It is labeled in their information as Sign P2. It's noted that the project has a series of other signage that were initially identified in a Sign Permit application for the project. The Planning Staff and our consultant provided early guidance to them regarding the signage that was being proposed and identified the proposed Pylon Sign P2 as shown here. There is a little red dot on the left-hand side of that image that shows the proposed location of the Pylon Sign.

For variances, the review of the application charges the Board of Adjustment with looking at a series of criteria. To evaluate the area variance in this case. Those items quickly are the nature of the zone in which the property lies. This property is zoned C-4 (Highway Commercial Zone).

The second criteria relates to the immediate character of the vicinity and the uses in that area. This is an area of transition. We find commercial uses as well as residential property located across North State Street in the form of an apartment complex. As we move down State Street there are a variety of other commercial entities, including a small shopping center and other restaurants before it truly transitions to the northern residential area of Downtown.

The third criteria that they are charged with looking at is whether the restriction upon the applicant's property, if it were removed, how would that removal affect the neighboring properties and uses? The Applicant has responded that they feel it does not adversely affect their neighboring residential properties. However, the Staff response, is indicating just the opposite. We believe that it would affect the neighboring properties in that this type of roadway on North State Street has lower speeds and is actually a secondary frontage for this development parcel.

The fourth item of criteria focuses on if the restriction is not removed, how would that create unnecessary hardship or Exceptional Practical Difficulty for the property owner in their efforts to make normal improvements on the property? The applicant discusses that they feel it would be an Exceptional Practical Difficulty if they were not granted this variance request. Staff notes that just the opposite as we feel that it would not pose an Exceptional Practical Difficulty.

The Site is eligible for pylon sign. They have proposed such on the North Dupont Highway frontage of the property. There is the opportunity to install a monument sign on the State Street frontage in order to identify the property, and there is opportunity to also present the price per gallon information as well. So, in summary, the Planning Staff is recommending denial of the Variance. We have noted the denial reasons for such. We don't believe that they have demonstrated the inability to install a Pylon Sign that creates an Exceptional Practical Difficulty for them. We recognize that there are two streets and they are permitted a Pylon Sign on one of them and a Monument Sign on this North State Street location. Both areas can present the price per gallon and by following the sizing parameters within our Sign Regulations. We note that if a variance is granted, the proposed signage would not be in keeping with the character of the North Street corridor and the surrounding area where we don't really see that type of a Sign proposed.

Our Report included some information about signage in the area in general, and we are concerned that it could establish a precedent along that corridor specifically and other minor arterial roadways in Dover. So that is the summary of the request that is before you. So again, it is a Variance Request to allow installation of a pylon sign on the North State Street frontage of the property. With that Mr. Chair, I would look to you to continue consideration of this Application and we will hear shortly from the Applicant on this request.

Acting Chairman Coburn asked if there were any conflicts of interest. There was none.

Representative(s): Ms. Laura Mercier, Applicant Representative

Ms. Laura Mercier was sworn in by City Solicitor Mr. Griffith.

Presentation

My name is Laura Mercier and I'm the applicant representative of the project at 736 North Dupont Highway for the proposed pylon sign.

Ms. Mercier stated that we are requesting a variance to allow a pylon sign at the North State Street entrance to support a new fuel station and convenience store located at this Site. So, we understand the Staff concern that North State Street is classified as the urban minor arterial and that the property is considered adjacent to residential use. Our request is very specific to this location and does not seek to change the overall intent of the Sign Regulation. The proposed sign is located more than 150 feet from the nearest residential property and is oriented perpendicular to the residential view. We have a visual screening by mature trees and existing street. So, because of this condition the sign will not cast light toward the nearby residents and will not be visible from the residential property. For fuel stations and convenience stores advanced visibility is important so motorists can identify the site early and make safe and predictable turning movements. A monument sign at this location will be significantly less visible due to the roadway geometry, vegetation, and the commercial scale of the surrounding corridor. So, this request is limited to this site specific and focused on accommodating a new business. While remaining compatible with the surrounding area. We believe the proposed sign meets the intent of the regulation by protecting nearby residential use while providing appropriate identification for a commercial use at a major roadway intersection.

Why the sign would be here is like the entrance serves as local traffic approaching North State Street. The sign provides clear will entrance and self-access for motorists.

We thought about a monument sign, but it will be visually obstructed by the vegetation and the roadway, and it will not be adequate for the visibility of the fuel station, as it will be a new convenience store. If we look for the impact regarding the residential, it is located 150 feet away and it is not oriented around the residences, so it should not affect lighting or like highway.

Why is it not on Route 13? We already have one freestanding sign on Route 13. This one is specifically for the north side highway traffic. This sign serves as a different approach and identity specifically to the North State Street entrance. So, we believe that this will not affect the surrounding area or even the North State Street. I think we believe we can work together to maybe get something from it. Sorry, that will be my final conclusion. And if you have any

questions, I'm more than happy to answer. And if you have any technical or structural questions, I will have my tech support with me Eddie to answer any questions.

Acting Chairman Coburn asked if there were any questions from the Board of Adjustments members.

Mr. Senato mentioned that along the North Dupont Highway, either heading south or even north, a lot of the establishments had the required legal pylon sign which is a major highway because the speed is a lot higher. On the North State Street you come up from the lake area, which would be coming out of Dover and hitting the traffic light area near the Country Eatery and looking up towards the fitness center. There are a few of the smaller signs and from my understanding and my reviewing of the code, research and the paperwork regarding codes. Those are the only signs that are there and that particular area is only required as an urban (minor arterial) area, I believe, and which requires the lower smaller type of sign.

Ms. Brinkley mentioned that she did not remember seeing anything that determined the normal visual distance for reading the pylon sign coming into Dover on the Dupont Highway to be able to read the gas pricing information. Does the developer's request have any information on that? Ms. Mercier asked if the question could be repeated please.

Ms. Brinkley asked, do you have any information available that determines the normal visual distance that would be required to see the gas pricing information on the pylon sign coming into the Dover area on the Dupont Highway side before you even get to the North State Street coming into Dover? Ms. Mercier replied we don't have a single fixed distance so far for like the fuel pricing. That's why we try to make a sign visible like by the height that lists it so you can see it from a distance. We don't have any identification. I don't have something like right now to provide you to show you like the distance from it or if maybe Eddie can help with this.

Ms. Brinkley asked, is the pylon sign going to be higher than the sign that exists for the TD Bank?

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned that Ms. Brinkley references the TD Bank, which is the adjacent property to the north or to the top of the page if you're looking at the image. It may have other signage, and its pylon sign is likely representative of its location on the Dupont Highway corridor in how it's placed. That's a kind of a triangular shaped intersection there. Pylon signs do have a height limit based on their placement from the street right-of-way.

Acting Chairman Coburn asked the Board if they had any additional questions. There was none.

Acting Chairman Coburn opened the public hearing.

Good morning, my name is Michael Harrington Jr., 1002 Quail Run, Wyoming Delaware.

Mr. Harrington Jr. was sworn in by City Solicitor Griffith.

Mr. Harrington Jr. stated that we are the current owners of the property: Harrington Family Ties, Harrington Four Seasons, and Asher Four Seasons. We've owned the property for quite a few

years and pieced the property together; and currently it's underused. We do have the seller, or the buyer that is developing the 7-Eleven. We are not actually developing it; we are selling it.

So, the way I look at the corridor on North State Street has changed over the years. From Silver Lake, you have McGlynn's and they have a monument sign there. As you come further north, you have Planet Fitness, you have the apartment complex, and then as you come even further north it tends to come into a more commercial area with TD Bank, which is on the corner. The way we see it is that the context or the nature of that whole area, especially on the north corridor, has changed. I don't think it is going to change any differently in the near future. The apartments are there, shopping centers, and TD Bank. So, all that will be improved, and the good part about the project is that it fronts onto both State Street and also North DuPont Highway. By having a monument sign, the visibility is not as good for the current use or for the future use of a convenience store and the visibility of just showing gasoline prices is changing. So that's why we are requesting signage other than a monument sign. I don't see any obstruction or impact of the surrounding area. I think it's only going to be an improvement. And it will be more visible to answer your question, Ms. Brinkley. The coming south off of the highway has much more visibility, even though I don't know what the distance is but it's certainly less than a quarter mile I would think. Because as you come off of that turn, you veer off to the right going south off of the highway onto State Street. Visibility of a pylon sign would be much better for the convenience store than a monument sign. So, that's really from a business standpoint in marketing. I think that's where it would be a definite benefit for the business.

I don't think it sets a precedent for that area because I think the area is pretty much developed. I don't think it's going to change. It's only going to be improved by this project. And just in concept, you know, 7-Eleven is becoming more of a Wawa, Royal Farms. So, with EV stations, gas stations, convenience stores, it's not your typical 7-Eleven; they have a new model throughout the country, and this will be the first one in Dover. So, we are requesting the pylon sign as opposed to the monument sign for those reasons and for the benefit of the business itself. Again, I do not think it sets a precedent for other areas, but specifically for this area, I think it would be appropriate to grant this variance. Thank you.

Mr. Senato mentioned correct me if I'm wrong, Dawn. Coming out of Dover from State Street and Governors Avenue and I forgot the name of the street to the left near the lake and then heading up crossing the bridge over the lake, I don't recollect any pylon signs of that magnitude. The only signs that I see are similar to the one at Planet Fitness. I just want to make that clarification if I'm correct. Thank you.

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned Mr. Chair, Staff can answer that question recognizing we are in the public hearing portion of it. As Mr. Senato noted coming out of Downtown Dover, as you proceed north onto North State Street, you cross the bridge over Silver Lake, there are several locations. Compass Pointe has what I would call a taller monument style sign that I believe was subject to a variance request at some point; that's on the north side of the road. The Country Eatery has a pylonlike sign; however, that likely predates our current sign regulations as that establishment in some form has been there for a number of years. The other locations are some smaller businesses with monument signs. The Planet Fitness shopping center, which is the Silver Lake Center, has more of a monument style sign, but I believe that our report noted some of the history of some of those signs in general. Then continuing up to the TD Bank, it does have a

monument sign on the State Street frontage and then a pylon sign on its DuPont Highway frontage as noted by our Planning Consultant. So, there is a variety of signage in the area. Some of which may predate the current sign regulations or may have been subject to their own variance requests over the years.

Acting Chair Coburn asked if there was anyone else that would like to speak in favor of? He asked if there was anyone online wishing to speak. Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned that Applicant Laura appears to have another comment. So we can first go to her and then I will check on the other attendees.

Ms. Mercier mentioned she wanted to add regarding what exists. We can see that we have another business located in the same area as 7-Eleven that has a significant freestanding sign as well. The business is Dover Pools and at the same time, we can see that the sign is a pretty freestanding sign that is high and has an illuminated sign with LED display with a changing message. I wanted to get back to you regarding the speed limit because I know that you have a difference between like the busy streets that have a different speed. And that is the request about adversing the sign. It gives like more of a chance for the driver to take a distance (look) and have enough time to recognize the new business. It's not like a business that was previously existing. This is completely a new store that will be built and installed over there. The residents or even the people that are living over there are not used to having it. So, they need like a little time to have a safe and predictable way to get there and lower their distance. I mean, getting this fuel within the new freestanding sign and getting a clear visibility of the business where you can see the pricing and have time to turn safely. It will also help with direction. That was just a point I wanted to add regarding the business. It is clearly a new convenience store and I know it's not easy but we are not trying to go over the ruling of the Ordinance. But by what we see and as we said the district is pretty much developed. I know we may be asking for something bigger, but it's really specific to the business. That's, that pretty much what I wanted to add regarding the application. Thank you.

Mrs. Melson-Williams noted that the other two individuals online, Eddie Kloiber and Julie Deputy are associated with the Application. If that's correct, I want to check to see if they have any statements.

Mr. Eddie Kloiber stated he is working with Laura Mercier on the project.

Mr. Eddie Kloiber was sworn in by City Solicitor Griffith.

Mr. Kloiber stated that he just wanted to say really quick, he knew that you guys are pushing for a monument sign, but we also need to make sure that the price itself, if it's on a monument is visible. It won't be visible over the northbound traffic when people are coming south. That could create a difficult situation for somebody that's driving, or somebody might try to make a last-minute turn. So, I just wanted to remind people that, you know, we are trying to get this pricing up as well over the cars that are coming by.

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned I also noted Julie Deputy. Is she also part of the project team and does she wish to make statement?

Ms. Deputy stated that Mr. Harrington made the statement that would represent Harrington or Harrington Four Seasons or Asher Four Seasons. He's already spoken.

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned that we do have another attendee listed as a T. Schultz. Do you wish to make a statement regarding this application?

T Schultz

Good morning. My name is Taryn Wilson. I'm here on behalf of the applicant.

Ms. Taryn Wilson was sworn in by City Solicitor Griffith.

Ms. Taryn Wilson stated that she just wanted to state I work with the customers on all of their locations across the east coast. And just from our perspective, you know, these signs help improve visibility for the motorists and pedestrians, especially in areas that they're unfamiliar with. So, you know, allowing us to increase the height of this sign and have that visibility we find that it improves visibility to help drivers identify the location earlier, reducing sudden lane changes, abrupt turns, and in a way, it improves traffic safety. I don't know if you have ever needed gas at the last minute. If you see it and turn in, it's not always the safest. So, we are looking to get those gas prices up as high as possible and just get that visibility for all of the traffic along these roads; so that's my only comment.

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned to the Acting Chairman that is the folks that have attended virtually. I think we've exhausted the members of the public or project team members that would be here today.

I will note that there was no specific written correspondence received for the application. At this point in time, I believe you could close the public hearing on this application.

Acting Chairman Coburn closed the public hearing.

Acting Chairman Coburn made a motion to take a 15 minute recess. Our City's Solicitor has a phone call that he has to make really quick. The motion was seconded by Mr. Swalm and unanimously carried 5-0.

Mrs. Melson-Williams repeated that we are in a 15-minute recess as the City Solicitor has another commitment that he needs to address and then we will be back to this meeting.

Meeting in recess.

Can I get a motion to resume the hearing for Application V-26-01?

Ms. Brinkley made a motion to resume the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Swalm and unanimously carried 5-0.

Acting Chairman Coburn asked the Board if they had any questions.

Are there any questions from the Board of Adjustment members?

Mr. Wagner asked if he could see the original slide that showed the exit of Route 13 into North State Street. Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned to Mr. Wagner that there is an Exhibit in his packet shown as a visual labeled Exhibit C. If we need to see a little bit more, we can pull up an aerial of the area. So, in your packet Exhibit C shows the subject property. It looks like it has three buildings there right in the center.

Mrs. Melson-Williams asked Mr. Wagner if that was enough visual for him. Mr. Wagner replied yes.

Mr. Wagner asked if you are coming south on Route 13, you can see the 7-Eleven sign from Route 13. You obviously may not have an entrance off Route 13 for the 7-Eleven, would you not?

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned that there is a location off of DuPont Highway as an entrance. If we can go to one of their other exhibits that shows the plan for the site, probably Sheet 22 (7-Eleven). So, the image on the screen is Exhibit G-2 that shows the layout of the proposed site development. On the right-hand side is Dupont Highway and they are proposing a pylon sign on that location. It's labeled as P1 on this diagram. Their entrance and exit is shown there. It's a one-way circulation to get on and off DuPont Highway. And then you can see on the left-hand side, the full movement entrance from North State Street. At the very lower part of the development plan is label P2 which is where the proposed pylon sign that we're discussing is planned to be located on North State Street subject to this variance request. Mr. Wagner said Thank you.

Acting Chairman Coburn asked the Board if they had any additional questions.

Ms. Brinkley, I just wanted to be clear, it is proposed that they are going to have a pylon sign on the DuPont Highway side, but the monument sign would be on North State Street side.

Acting Chairman Coburn mentioned that they are currently proposing a pylon sign for both. They are asking for their variance for the one on the State Street side. Ms. Brinkley said she understood.

Acting Chairman Coburn asked the Board if they had any additional questions. There was none.

Mr. Senato made a motion for Application V-26-01 to deny the request for the 99.6 square foot pylon upon review of the information that the city has or what I heard studied under the Code. It is not in keeping with the character of North State Street and would in his opinion degrade the visual character of the surrounding area. Also, a pylon sign this size is not permitted in or on urban minor arterial areas. We don't really, as I have said before, we don't want to set any type of precedent for the future of this type of request in that particular area. I also refer to Article 5 Section 4 for more details. The motion was seconded by Mr. Swalm.

Mr. Swalm mentioned that he did not believe that the pylon sign fits the nature of the zone either. I think most of the signs on North State Street are monument signs in character. I don't believe the immediate vicinity of the character of that sign being a pylon sign would fit in that zone. And if the restriction upon the applicant's property were removed, I believe that it would affect the

neighboring properties and the uses. Again, I believe that it might set a precedent for the neighboring properties. Whether the restrictions were not removed, would it create any unnecessary hardships for the property owner? If the restriction were not removed, I don't believe it would create any unnecessary hardships or Exceptional Practical Difficulty for the owner, because they could just put in a monument sign like many of the other business owners along North Street have as well.

Acting Chairman Coburn I have a motion by Mr. Senato and seconded by Mr. Swalm to deny the applicant's request for the variance.

Acting Chairman Coburn asked if there was any discussion?

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned before we get into the roll call vote, she wanted to mention that Staff wanted to clarify that this is a motion to deny. So, if you agree with that, your vote is a yes to deny the request.

Ms. Deputy asked if she could make a statement before the vote. City Solicitor Griffith replied I'm sorry ma'am, the evidentiary portion of the hearing is closed; we don't accept comments or statements during the voting process.

Roll Call Vote

- Mr. Wagner – yes, in his mind the egress to this establishment was extremely important from both sides. The purpose of the existing Ordinance was to prevent sign clutter. The Ordinance does give the Applicant the opportunity to provide signage in both places.
- Mr. Swalm – yes, for the reasons that I stated prior.
- Ms. Brinkley – yes, for the reasons stated by the other Board members, and in addition that it has not been proven that there would be an Exceptional Practical Difficulty.
- Mr. Senato – yes, for the prior reasons already stated.
- Mr. Coburn – yes, for the reason stated.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that on the motion to deny the request, there are 5 members in favor of the motion and none against; the motion carries. That is a motion to deny. A formal written Notice of Decision will be prepared and sent to the Applicant. If the applicant has additional questions, you can certainly reach out to Planning Staff and we'd be happy to discuss what your signage options are along that corridor.

Ms. Mercier asked if she could ask the Board a question, if possible, please? City Solicitor Griffith replied, I am sorry that the time to make applications or make comments on the presentation is closed. You do have an opportunity to move for reconsideration, but we do not reargue the application after the votes have taken place. Ms. Mercier, okay, thank you.

OLD BUSINESS

Continued Discussion of Draft Rules of Procedure for the Board of Adjustment

Acting Chairman Coburn stated that we have decided not to continue that until the March meeting.

Public Comments Opportunity

Acting Chairman Coburn opened the meeting to the public giving an opportunity to make comments to the Board. He asked if there was anyone who wished to speak?

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned, just so there's an understanding, the public comment opportunity is given generally as part of all open meetings. If you're a member of the public and would like to address the Board, you can raise your hand or otherwise identify that you would like to speak.

If you are speaking, we ask you to be as brief as possible and your statements are limited to items in the purview of the Board. That does not include the Application that was discussed today. So, if there's any general public comment for the Board, this is the point in time to accept that.

I'm not seeing anyone in the room, I believe all of the individuals that joined us online were part of the Application, today.

Mrs. Melson-Williams asked Ms. Schultz if her comment(s) was a request to provide public comment during the public comment opportunity in general or is it a question regarding the Application? Ms. Schultz replied it is not a public comment, so you can disregard.

Mrs. Melson-Williams mentioned, Mr. Chair, I see no one wishing to speak.

Mr. Swalm made a motion to adjourn the meeting. It was seconded by Mr. Wagner and unanimously carried 5-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:34 A.M.

Sincerely,

Maretta Savage-Purnell