

**New Hope Borough**

**June 7, 2021**

**Workshop**

**A public meeting was held at the Borough Municipal Building  
125 New Street, New Hope, Pennsylvania 18938**

Council President Gering called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM.

Present: Council Members, Connie Gering, Dan Dougherty, Tina Rettig, Laurie McHugh, Louise Feder, Peter Meyer, Ken Maisel. Also present were Zoning Officer Tracy Tackett, Michele Fountain, Borough Engineer, Borough Manager Peter Gray.

Absent: Mayor Keller

**Consider Design Consultant proposal for the Parking Facility**

Ms. Gering Thank you. First on the agenda is the Mansion Inn to review the Certificate of Appropriateness. Are you missing people, Frank? You're first on the agenda. Mr. Cretella I know. Let me go out and check the parking lot. I don't see anybody. Ms. Gering Alright, we're going to skip the Mansion Inn then.

Ms. Gering Next is to consider design consultant proposal for the parking facility. I just want to acknowledge that we don't normally vote in a workshop, but because of the grant application we have a deadline. So, Pete, do you want to read what you sent to Council, so everybody knows Mr. Gray Certainly. On May 11, 2021, 6 proposals for the Parking Facility RFP's (Requests for Proposals) were submitted to the Borough. From the 6 proposals, 3 proposals were reviewed and selected by Peter Meyer, Michele Fountain, Dave Truelove and myself, for presentations to the Parking Facilities Committee. Last Tuesday, June 1, 2021 the Parking Facilities Committee along with Michele Fountain, John Fenningham and myself met with representatives of each of the 3 firms who submitted proposals. After the 3 presentations, the Parking Facilities Committee selected THA Consulting for recommendation to Borough Council for consideration to perform the design work on the garage. Council is asked to consider THA Consulting for the design work on the proposed Parking Facility for New Hope Borough, in the amount of \$422,000, subject to legal review and preparing the agreement by the Solicitor's office. Ms. Gering Thank you so much. Peter Meyer is the Chair of the Parking Facility Committee Mr. Meyer I'm sure that this was set up this way on purpose, as the other members of the Parking Facilities Committee are on either side of me. Connie, who is obviously President of Council, Laurie who Chairs the Parking Committee of the Borough. So to create this Ad Hoc Committee on Parking Facilities.

Let me recap what we have done and what we have learned pursuant to the authorization from Council to issue and RFP for Architectural and Engineering services related to the construction of a parking garage. First, we prepared an RFP in consultation with our Borough Solicitor and Engineer, drawing on RFPs previously issued by other Pennsylvania localities for similar garages. That RFP was issued and disseminated on April 21, the day after the issuance was approved by Council. The RFP provided the opportunity for potential bidders to ask clarifying questions and a number of interested parties contacted the borough for guidance. Six detailed bid responses were received by the deadline of 11:00 AM on May 11. Those responses were provided to the preliminary review committee for review. All responses divided the work into two major phases; (1) the execution of preliminary designs, which would be developed in close consultation with the interested parties in the Borough and multiple meetings for public input for standards to be met and for review of design alternatives, and (2) preparation of the final design, which would result in the completion of all the construction specifications that would be the basis for an RFP to be issued for a garage builder. The review committee, consisting of the Borough Engineer, Solicitor and Manager with the Chair of the Parking Facilities Committee, met at 3:00 PM on May 14 and narrowed the field of potential consultants to three. That narrowing was based primarily on the extent of experience of the lead organizations in each responding team with parking garages in particular as well as their understanding of our

local conditions and experience with municipal parking facilities in Pennsylvania. Those three were then invited to make in-person presentations to the Parking Facilities Committee on June 1. The committee was supported by the Borough Engineer and Manager along with our special Counsel in meeting with and questioning the three finalists. Our interactions with the candidate consultant teams in each instance went further in depth than anticipated and extended over the intended time limit for presentations. All presenters went beyond their original proposal details to describe the technical assistance with (a) financing, (b) maintenance, and (c) management they would provide to the Borough. The Parking Facilities Committee then met after the presentations and concluded that the strongest offer was the team headed by THA Consulting, subject to clarification of some timing issues related to their schedule for delivery of final construction documents and the schedule the Borough has to meet to assure receipt of the \$1.75 Million grant from the Commonwealth. That clarification satisfying concerns about timing, the Borough is now preparing to contract with THA Consulting for architecture and engineering services. The contract to be negotiated will have contingencies with respect to any decision not to proceed with a garage or other uncertainties faced by the Borough. That's where we are on that. Ms. Gering Thank you. Can I have a motion for approval? Mr. Dougherty I'll make that motion. Ms. Gering Can I have a second? Ms. Rettig I'll second it. Ms. Gering Thank you. Any discussion from Council? Anyone who has a comment, you can make a comment right now.

Cathy I live on 60 N Main St. My question is, Council member take your mask off to talk. Cathy Is it's fait accompli for the location for the garage and so I have a few questions about location and as to how the decision was made? What other location is there might be? And also, my understanding that there was to be some community involvement. How did you get to the point, today, and what can you say about that? Thank you.

Ms. Gering Thank you, Cathy. Any other public comments? All in favor? All - Aye. Ms. Gering Motion passes, thank you.

### **Certificate of Appropriateness – Mansion Inn**

Ms. Gering The Mansion Inn Certificate. Mr. Fey. Mr. Fey I'm Ralph Fey, Architect. Ms. Gering It's difficult to hear with a mask, take it off when you're speaking and just put your mask on when you're done. I think that will work out the best for everybody. Mr. Fey I'm fully vaccinated. Ms. Gering Is this different than what we have? Ralph, are you giving us something different? Mr. Fey We were asked to give one additional view – to give a straight-on view. It is different than the package before. We were requested this on Friday. And we had this prepared for you today. Mr. Dougherty asked for a head-on view of the two additions how they relate to the adjacent buildings, from the street view. The original was taken from an angle, which would not depict clearly the distance from each of the buildings. Wanted to let the Council know that it was his request. Mr. Fey This is a projection straight on and one of the reasons that you do not see us using this, to answer your question, Dan, is from this location, the entire addition to the left is not seen. I did take two steps to the left, so you could see the addition. I stood exactly on the corner of the buildings, so you could see the addition from 60' back and I put it in your packet some dimensions so you can be very clear as to how far it is from the Marsha Brown building and how high it is and all that. The forth page has the dimensions in red on it. The distance between the wall of Marsha Browns and the wall of our addition is 19' 8" and the addition sticks out 8' from the side of the Mansion Inn toward Marsha Browns. When I'm standing in the middle, the entire addition is. Mr. Dougherty So the question for Tracy, then, is does that not require a variance or had they gotten that already? Ms. Tackett They received the variances already. Mr. Fey The width from the property line is 13' 1" and does not require a variance... for this building. Mr. Dougherty Do you agree or disagree. Ms. Tackett I don't have it in front of me, but that sounds reasonable. I think the setback is no more than 12'. So, if he's saying it's 12', then they did not need a variance for that. summary: I don't have it in front of me, but it would be in your memo. Mr. Dougherty For some reason I recall they didn't need a variance because it was in excess of 12'. I recall that at some point and it looks like it is currently 13' 1". Is 12 the magic number? Ms. Tackett for the CC district, yes. Mr. Dougherty That was my recollection. Ms. Tackett Sure. I can't remember all the variances, but they are listed in my memo. Mr. Dougherty Thank you. Mr. Fey and, just for a point of clarification, the area of the addition closest to Marsha Browns the dimension is 19' 1." So this is 19' from our addition, you can see the overlap, as they become closer for about 10'. It's not the entire length. I wanted to clarify. Let's go to the right side. This is in your packet for review. Showing to you, again, that in the

winter without foliage and to reshove you the distance between the sunroom/conservatory addition in the rear and the existing buildings. Another view which is much further back. When I say further back, you can see more. Mr. Dougherty May I ask you a question? The back patio of that area, there, there's an entrance way to the back of the Mansion and that's, I think, sort of been chopped up. The way I'm looking at this now, there are the windows on the back of the Mansion that are on ground level. They're still staying? Is that true. That the addition is behind the back and the two large windows stay. Mr. Fey So, this is the view of the existing. There's a window inside – those windows are staying. There were some questions about the windows and I think, Peter, specifically would like to see more arched windows, the carrying through of the existing arched windows on the existing building to the addition. All the windows that now face the street on this side have all been changed to the arched windows with the shutters that match. That is showing a different image that we can bring up. Mr. Dougherty Ralph, is it intentional on the addition that these first floor windows are... the new first floor windows the arched-topped are 2 over 2 and the second floor is 1 over 1? Mr. Fey We took the dimensions and details from these four windows and put them here. So, they are 2 over 2s. Mr. Dougherty And this picture that I'm looking at, this big blow-up is along the second floor. Mr. Fey We actually did that this morning and, Mr. Dougherty So they'll be exact copies? They'll be 2 over 2, I guess. Mr. Fey Arch-topped, yes. Mr. Maisel Those shutters look different than, the existing. Mr. Fey So, if you look here, you'll see that they're a half-rounded shutter, so when they close it fills the arch. We will exactly match those shutters, that trim detail. Mr. Maisel Is that the basis for architectural design? They're not same, they're 1 on 1, which is... Mr. Fey We thought it was more appropriate to match the corner. We could certainly change this, but this would be ... Mr. Maisel I just noticed it and was wondering if anyone would notice it. Mr. Fey Again, we can change it to match. It felt a little wide for the space. The window is 7 feet and we only have 9 feet that were working with. Mr. Maisel questioned the shutter. Mr. Fey So, this shutter fills full, while this shutter fills half. Any other questions on the left side? Mr. Dougherty Just a question about the balcony above the second floor addition on the left. That is the balcony to support a room there, I take it. Correct? Mr. Fey Yes and that's the side elevation. One of the reasons that we added that since the last is to be able to push the third floor back even farther. And give it more air from the existing building. We can remove that balcony facing this side, if not, if you prefer not to see that. Mr. Dougherty talking about the railing, itself is farmhouse...I don't know what that is, ... Different than the style of the building, doesn't tie it to anything. Mr. Fey the railing chosen can be something that is classic. It could be a simple picket railing. Recreate a Victorian railing. In this case we wanted it to be metal and light, instead of creating another feature. Mr. Dougherty Just pointing out that it is not like the rest of the building. Ms. Retig I think because you've done – I think if we attempt to replicate anything on the front of the building, we wanted it to look like a related building by not exactly like the Mansion Inn. I think the railing on top is, Mr. Maisel I think from HARB's standpoint .... the second floor...the best of my recollection it is discouraged to have second floor balconies. I don't have the exact numbers. Mr. Fey I think you are making reference to the deck component of the HARB guidelines, Where a second story decks are not referred, because decks are not of architecture.. I certainly understand your concern. Mr. Dougherty What happens is there are 800 parcels downtown and, if they have a flat roof, they want to put in a deck. We'd have 400 decks because they have flat roofs. I had forgotten that, honestly. So, this is visible from Main Street. The other one we decided to put in the back, like Ralph said, you can't see it. I understand the idea, so people in that room can go out and stand on the deck and look out and see stuff and it's visually appealing. The church, but perhaps that railing could sort of start to the left and extend leftward toward the next window. Mr. Fey So it doesn't face the street? Mr. Dougherty It would start at the door and run further backward, that way you probably wouldn't see much of it and it wouldn't have to extend 10 feet. Just have to come in and attach to the building. Mr. Fey So, what you're saying is it would be great if this railing was not here and it would be starting that way and attach to the front of this little balcony and then continue on? Mr. Dougherty I think if it could go further back and still have the square footage. Mr. Fey I completely understand. Mr. Dougherty The use of a metal roof on this addition on the left hand side. Mr. Fey It is a metal roof. The pitch is steeper to make sure the pitch is lower than the existing building. It has almost no pitch and it is successful with the limited amount of pitch we have, no shingles are going to work. Metal is more of the ones that works. Mr. Dougherty - Is there a metal anywhere else on this roof. Mr. Fey That's the proposal. Mr. Dougherty I'm not questioning the, I'm just trying to find out or not the addition is the same and then there's a sort of, again, a farmhouse sort of metal roof as opposed to Victorian. Mr. Fey From here, you won't see much of the roof on an angle it's a very modest pitch – not very bold in the architecture and we chose it for it to be successful Mr. Dougherty Because the front of the

building presents a flat roof a mansard that it's a flat roof. Let me ask you a question. It looks like you have brick. The addition's brick. The part I'm looking at here that faces Main Street. It appears to be sort of antique whitewashed brick, in order to try to look old. Is there a reason that we used a kind of siding, like the first floor appears to be stucco, is that true? Mr. Fey it's all brick. Mr. Dougherty – Since the entire building is wood, someone else told you to make it brick? Mr. Fey I understand the question, on the existing porch roof, again, because there's not much pitch it was our choice of the primary material and I'm just going to ask Louise to reinforce this discussion. We were to not follow the existing building, we were to create an understanding of where the 107 year-old building is and where the new building is, it doesn't dissuade us from getting material with that patina. That's the goal of this building. We chose the brick because it is something that we can patina and age. We can get premade bricks and then we can further soften and age it and blend it to a likeness of this building with the whitewash. So we see that slight textural difference, acknowledging it, but, from a distance we wanted it all to blend in light and airy in white. Again, we take our cues from the Board and since it is a clapboard building, we present what we have, so far. Ms. Gering Any other questions from Council? Ms. Feder I was curious about the fence in the front and the gate, when looking at the building, on the right hand side. I thought that we...the gate is still on there and there's no path behind it and I'm curious if you can tell us why the gate is there and the reason that, the gate has been there for so long, since it is not going to be used as an entrance to the Inn, I don't see it as a reason to disrupt something that is there. I understand building the wall underneath it, getting on solid foundation. I anticipate it is a question that HARB will have for you, just because it has been there for so long, seems like a big change. Mr. Fey I'm going to direct you to the drawing that you speak of. So, in the last meeting there was much discussion about this area. We agreed upon a primary place to bring people in and out of. Mr. Cretella I just thought there was an effort to save the second gate and be using it and the same. Mr. Fey We are trying to make the main entrance a little wider. It's a really narrow entrance, right now and we'd like to move the gate to the side to make a wider entrance. Ms. Feder – I appreciate the effort. But because of the preexisting and historic and given the nature of the building, it is a change and cutting out part of the fence and moving it is not a permanent solution. It is a beloved façade in New Hope and I understand the main entrance is important and the fence is an important part of New Hope. Mr. Cretella Honestly, I don't think that cutting is necessary, just repositioning what we have. If you want us to eliminate that other entranceway, we will. Ms. Feder Creating a wider entrance in front of the main door, question about the second section. Mr. Cretella It is actually easier for us to eliminate that second opening. Mr. Dougherty I've been there a few times and I think we have to be aware of some degree of functional obsolescence. When it was a house and a Doctor's office, it had a few patients, you know one in and out. One/two in and out. Existing gate / entranceway needs to be made wider to accommodate current use of the Mansion Inn. The existing staircase is not adequate. We're trying to improve for the rooms and seats and all that, two people cannot get through there. So, we understand the need to improve the existing opening and repurpose the existing gate, but the question. I guess part of us are a little worried that there's three gates and all that and you're saying..., but I'm torn because I'd rather have the gate that is just as historic as the fence remain with the rest of the fence for another 100 years. Mr. Fey So, perhaps there can be a commitment to keep the gate in a part of the building for future use. Ms. Feder Concern over storing the gate and not being used. History of the building is important. Concern over quick decision to change the openings. Mr. Cretella This was not a quick decision. This was a major part of the plan. We've been in front of HARB, maybe four times. That thing has been resolved. It's impossible to operate something that has a little tiny gate that is so restricted and unwelcoming to go through. We were told, by past HARB, to repurpose the gate. And we have. And when we met with Council, we made changes to satisfy Council. Now I hear talk about, coming back to HARB. This is insane! It's insane. You can't just change what we've already gotten approved. And we're trying to get this property right so it will live and afford to be maintained in a manner it deserves for many, many years to come. Ms. Feder - concern over people entering the third gate. Mr. Cretella about eliminating the gate and what we did, because everybody was afraid that people were going to enter and exit, so we eliminated the pathway, completely, to solve the problem. We repurposed that beautiful gate, keep it as part of the front and satisfy the needs that were decided on a year and a half ago about the wide entranceway. If you want to eliminate that gate, I'll keep it in the basement. Ms. Feder That's not what I'm saying. I understand that operating is different. I went over the minutes of the April meeting that was discussed to see if there was a way #1 to not have a third entrance to the property, and I grant you that's wonderful that you don't have anymore. My concern, which was discussed in April was changing the façade of the building, the fence is a really big part of the way you interact with the

property. I think saying that we're repurposing it by putting it in a place where it has never been on the property, Mr. Cretella – Take it out. Ms. McHugh – The fence is still there. I don't think it's being taken out. Summary: discussion about repurposing the gate. Ms. Gering I'm going to stop this. I think this discussion has been quite extensive upon the gate. I think Council needs to be sensitive to, if you are going to run your business safely and property, you having a proper opening in the front. That is just me. I think the consensus is you need a wide opening to run a business properly. As long as the other gate is repurposed and visible and not being destroyed and made so nobody can open the gate, then I don't see why there would be an issue with the gate not being preserved. Mr. Meyer - Concern over having a situation where a sign would be hanging on the gate directing to enter at other gate putting sign on the gate. Mr. Cretella I would not put a sign on the gate. We would just make sure that it is not be operable. Mr. Meyer That would be the only concern I have. Mr. Cretella Yes, and I agree. Mr. Dougherty The fence is in sections. I think they might be 12s or 18s, something like that. We're going to have an extra one when this is done, I think. You'll utilize them. You'll either returns on the side, so all of the fence will still be there and both existing gates, original gates will still be there. So, technically, everything we're talking about here is reversible. Could you just commit to us that it's going to be 44" or that it's going to be something --- you can't have a restaurant that has 60 people that they have to enter in a single line. It's a safety concern. Ms. Gering Alright. Any more questions from Council? Ms. Feder - I understand the consensus and it has nothing has to do with you guys. The reason is, when we are doing wonderful new development, I don't want it coming at the cost of retrofitting our historic buildings to a big developer. I think the reason we are being so careful and I am excited, but the Mansion is a big part of our town history and I don't want to set a precedent where, just because we want to put in something new and exciting at the expense of history in this part of town. Ms. Gering Not sure what your next position is, because you guys were here two years ago. Mr. Gray They are coming before Council for approval for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Dougherty – I have a questions along those lines. Are we permitted to vote today? Ms. Gering - Next Council Meeting Mr. Dougherty – So you can come before us at our next Council meeting. Ms. Gering - OK. Thank you so much.

Mr. Dougherty – I apologize, but what we didn't do today is discuss the right hand side. Is that a fair statement? I'd hate to have you come back to the Council meeting and we would give a bunch of other feedback, and then, you would have to come before the next meeting.

Mr. Maisel – Before we get into that, we would have to go back to what we talked about. This was not brought before HARB, is that correct.

Ms. Gering – Hold on, the reason you've come back to us, and please correct me if I'm wrong, this Council was acting as HARB when we did not have a HARB Board. And it's my understanding that you came to us why we're continuing the process of being the HARB Board. Mr. Fey – So, along those lines, if we can. We come back to the Council meeting and then we start talking about the right hand side of the addition. This is the Right side of the building. Previously in your packet, we were asked to do an overlay and I'm just going to point a few things out on the overlay. The window that was previously in the wall will be used on the third side of it. So this bay will be original windows. I like to use the word reconstructed, the additional pieces were removed. The bay is cut down the middle with the current addition. In our early presentations two years ago, it was uniformly agreed that bringing this bay back to its full bay would be the best option. We will move this forward, so we can complete the bay and take this window and put it in the third side of the bay and then the rear addition can become a conservatory. This is a photograph with the intended change. In my mind it is about 25% wider and about 15% taller So if that's substantial, Mr. Dougherty 15% taller? So I guess that doesn't include the cupola. Mr. Fey The cupola is not included. Mr. Dougherty So when you get to 15, you just don't count the cupola on top of it? So how much taller is it when you count that on top of it? Mr. Fey It is 23 feet to the top of the cupola. Ms. Rettig and how does that compare to the third floor. Mr. Fey Several feet taller. Mr. Dougherty One story building that is 23 feet tall. Mr. Fey Well the building, we're going to always disagree about the height of the building, because the buildings are not measured in height – They're measured from the plate to the roof. But having accepted that difference of opinion, the height of the wall is 13' 2" Mr. Dougherty which is approximately the first floor of the existing building. Mr. Fey It is approximately the first floor if the Inn. This is a modest notch hole roof. The cupola is in the center, Mr. Dougherty Is there a giant coffered ceiling inside that room? I mean, you must have designed the interior of this space with the windows of the cupola letting light in? Mr. Fey Sure, we would like it to have it

letting light in from the top. It's rather small 4 foot by 4 foot at max and this is the least steep of a roof that we could put on it. Mr. Dougherty So it's 6 or 7 feet tall. If it's 4 feet by 4 feet wide, I can do the math, the cupola is 7 feet tall. It's practically, when starting at the old widow's walk, it's on par with the size of a three story, 40 foot building up there. The original building presents as a flat roof. This thing is going to have almost an A-Frame with a cupola on it. I have a lot of problems with a, what's the size? Is this thing from the ground? Mr. Fey From the top of the cupola to the floor is 23' 2." Mr. Dougherty So the roof, if you will, the roof structure is 10 Ft tall. If the room is 13', right? So it's a 10 foot tall roof. I'm just one person. Mr. Fey I just tried to explain it to you. Mr. Dougherty it's just that a 23' one story building is actually two, that's also and getting extra 30% - 25% wider. It's 25% wider. I was told, last time by, Tracy, you had said that they do not, do they need a variance to get that close to Love Saves the Day or if they needed one, do they have one and if they don't need one, why don't they need one? Ms. Tackett I think Ralph did get a variance. Mr. Fey We did not. We got one for the seating to be closer to the sidewalk. No variance for setback. Ms. Tackett - so, 12 feet, then.... Mr. Fey Per the Adam Crews drawing and it respects, side yard setback, Ms. Tackett Side yard setback is 6 feet, let me pull that up and get the application in front of me. Mr. Dougherty The question on the floor, right now, is A-how close is the new building to the property line and B-does that closeness require a variance? And, if it did require a variance C-did they get the variance. Ms. Tackett - So, they did get the variances and it does look like the actual side yard setback is 6'. \* So, it is compliant. Mr. Dougherty - So it is 6', so it's ok on the side? Ms. Tackett That's correct. So, according to the CC district, the minimum lines are in the front 10', from the side is 6', from the rear is 15'. Mr. Dougherty that's 6' so they did not get a variance, of course, they didn't have to .... Ms. Tackett correct and, as Ralph mentioned, they did...the variance did have to be approved for the seating that's proposed in front and there were some conditions and the Land Development Plan were with the variances that they listed. I apologize, I don't have them here, but we will be putting them on for next week. Mr. Dougherty to me it looks like a very large addition. What's the total width of the new addition, Ralph? How wide is the addition? Mr. Dougherty I think it's close to the original building. It's about 55-60% as wide as the original building. Mr. Fey The diamond line shows the footprint of the existing building, here and here. The additional part is being added here. This dotted line represents. It's this much wider. I believe it's 5 feet wider. Mr. Dougherty Great, so the current building is probably ... I'd say 15-16...and now it will be 20 long, because you need more room. Mr. Fey It's 5 feet wider. Mr. Dougherty But you need that extra 60 square feet of space? In a 13' tall room. Mr. Cretella We don't need that tall height. We do like the idea of the first 13 feet in ceiling height, but the roof is definitely vaulted. Mr. Dougherty my reaction is it's a 13 foot tall roof. That's a lot of roof. So the building is about 39 feet tall. Ms. Gering I think the concern is that it's so massive and I think the concern that we're having, right now, is that when you have this massive addition, we're going to have another massive mass on that whole corner there. Ms. Rettig if you take the cupola off, it reduces the appearance. Whether it actually reduces it. Mr. Cretella we could do that, easily. I'm not opposed to it, but now that, but now that we've talked about it, I do think it makes a difference. Mr. Meyer just to be sure that we've got this clear. When you come back, you'll make these changes. Going with soft gray color. Ms. Gering Any other questions from Council? Mr. Dougherty If you could take a stare at the need for the 5 extra feet on the width of that building...The observation is that these buildings are too big, ok? So, if that....I know space is valuable ...if that could be narrower, a number between zero and 5. Ms. Gering So, if you could do anything to kind of curtail that could give them (the neighbor) more space, that would be wonderful. Any more questions? Any from the public? Thank you, guys.

### **Public Comment**

Ms. Gering Any Public Comments? Please identify yourself. Mr. Clapper - My name is Bill Clapper 170 N. Main Street here in New Hope. Before I get started, I wonder if I might ask for a point of clarification. On the most recent Council Workshop agenda you make note that a participant requesting a discussion on a specific item, will be considered an agenda item for future workshop agenda. I understand that. But, it is in a little bit of a conflict with the public participation information associated with the regular Council meetings. What is the difference between the two? Ms. Gering Well the reason, we decided to go that avenue is, questions asked of Council and our staff, is we would not always have the accurate information to give you and, in order to give you a true answer to whatever discussion you want to have. That's why we need better information for everyone that comes up here to give them that opportunity to put you on the agenda for the workshop meeting, like we are having now. And we would have that information that you're requesting. Mr. Clapper Ok. I understand that and that's reasonable, obviously. But the public participation says I should submit the Wednesday before the Council

meeting and this one says, for the workshop, 30 days out. Ms. Gering Send it in and we will be glad to address it. Mr. Clapper Ok, so can I send in the Wednesday before the Tuesday meeting? Ms. Gering Depending on how full the agenda is. Mr. Clapper Ok. So I take a chance at getting on the agenda. I wonder if I might make one other comment before. As you know I'm associated with New Hope Speaks, a blog that was started about three months ago and it was started by friends and neighbors coming up to me and asking if we could figure out a way to get more transparency and communications between Council and the residents. And I wanted to reemphasize that here today to every Council member that, as far as I'm concerned and, as members of New Hope Speaks, we're all on the same page. I mean we have one goal and that's to make a better New Hope. And we think one of the better ways to do that is to have a more open communication than what many people, currently, have perceived. So, I just wanted you to know that, that we're working in a united, what I call, positive direction. No agenda, no political issues, no partisan issues. People have different views along the various issues. They're welcome to make their own views. We're only interested in the idea of communication. I want everyone to know that, first of all. The way we're sending out our communication are blogs. And that is, you look at them there are never any personal attacks on anybody, there's never anything trying to direct people's thoughts to any one direction. They are entitled to form their own. And to communicate to them to Council. Not coming through New Hope Speaks. Just trying to facilitate. I feel there's an opportunity for the Council to even use New Hope Speaks to gauge some of the community interest. It's amazing when we're up to about 140 people that are logging in to and I feel very confident, by the end of this year, we'll probably be pushing 500 people, because this ...and what the other aspect that interests me is that sometimes asking questions about things that I'm really not prepared to answer and nor do I want to, but rather something that Council should answer. So, there is the opportunity for you folks, the Council, to use New Hope Speaks to reach out and gather information from the community. We have the capability to capture information, so if you want me to do that at no cost. So, we volunteer that time to help. There are five issues that we're focused on now. Based on response and request from the townspeople who are currently members of the blog. And I'd like to get these started, so you can get us on the agenda, whether it's workshop or any meeting.

These aren't in any particular order at this point.

1-Financial Reporting

2-Issues around the parking garage

3-Continuation of Zoom or access to the Council meetings by electronic means.

4-Zoning in process. Very high interest.

5-Lot of interest looking toward the future, in terms of revenue sourcing for the town or the future needs of infrastructure construction. How are we going to generate the revenues associated with that?

So, those are the five directions that we're heading now. I'll take your guidance. See if we can get on the agenda. Any questions of me.

Ms. Gering thank you. any further comments? Yes, Steve? Mr. Coppens Steve Coppens. Did I understand correctly that Zoom costs \$22,000? Is that what I heard. Ms. Gering We're not going to answer you. You can send it in and we will address it. Mr. Coppens I've been working in town. Curbs in front of the house. Ms. Gering Steve, if it's things that need to be improved, you have to send them to our Borough Manager. Mr. Coppens Purchases? Ms. Gering You'd need to be put on the agenda for that. Mr. Coppens - Do we still have Jr. Council? Ms. McHugh No. COVID killed it. Ms. Gering Any other public comments? May I have a motion to adjourn? Ms. Rettig I make that motion. Mr. Meyer Second. Ms. Gering All in favor ALL Aye.