

**County of Fairfax, Virginia
Planning Commission Meeting
December 9, 2020
Verbatim Excerpt**

SITE-SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT – 2019 SOUTH COUNTY

PC19-MV-002 – ENGLSIDE TRAILER PARK / RAY’S MOBILE HOME COLONY – Located at 8431, 8453, 8459, 8463, 8465, 8529, 8537, 8541 Richmond Highway; 8500 Greenleaf Street; 106, 222 Denfield Drive; 4116, 4117 Melon Street; 4115 Galen Street; 8537, and 8543 Forest Place, Alexandria, VA, TMP#s, 101-3 ((1)) 28, 29B, 30B1, 30C, 31C, 32, 33; 101-3 ((9)) (1) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 500, 501, C1; 101-3 ((9)) (2) B. Current Plan: Base: Residential use at 5-8 du/ac. Option: Mixed-use comprising 75% residential use at 16-20 du/ac and 25% retail and office use at an intensity of 0.5 FAR with substantial parcel consolidation and urban/town center design concept, among other conditions. Nominated Change: Revise adopted plan option for residential use to 20-30 du/ac with neighborhood retail and/or office use, and without substantial parcel consolidation. (Mount Vernon District)

During Commission Matters

(Decision Only) (Public Hearing on this application was held on November 18, 2020; Decision Only from December 2, 2020)

Commissioner Clarke: Yes. Good evening. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A Site Specific Plan Amendment for PC19-MV-002 – Engleside Trailer Park/Ray’s Mobile Home Colony – first, I want to begin by thanking the public for all of their comments and also thanking my colleagues from the Latin community and all the outpouring of concerns that we have about this nomination. So, last week at the work session, we a robust conversation and there’s lots of passion around our neighbors who are in the community. It really highlights – which makes the Fairfax County community a great place to live, work, and play and truly care for our neighbors. So before making – moving a motion tonight, I will be accepting and entertaining a friendly amendment to my motion from Commissioner Sargeant that will be read. Again, I want thank staff for helping with the modification and working through the concerns that we’ve heard from public and from our colleagues. And furthermore, many of additional discussions that have taken place since last week’s deferral to now – it’s clear that the preservation task force recommendation from the County reviews of the policies related to mobile home parks and permanent – that is paramount to the decision that many will be made at the nomination area and the communities that reside within them. In light of this, I want to put forward my – my thoughts of what the Planning Commission decision tonight means – what the SSPA process could look like going forward and why the SSPA process would be superior to future Board authorization with a concurrent rezoning. We anticipate inserting the friendly amendment, as I’ve already stated. And first, the Planning Commission recommendation tonight is not the final decision on the Work Plan revision. The revisions of tonight will be reviewed by the Board of Supervisors as an Action Item at their meeting on January 26, 2021. The Board would take on action on the work program. There is no official testimony, but the public comments may be submitted to the Clerk Services Office and will be shared with the Board Members till such date. The action by the Board to add the nomination to the work program simply forwards the SSPA nomination to the next level of analysis and community review. It is not an endorsement of the redevelopment or the proposed comprehension plan change. The subsequent review will provide structure for engaging the residents and neighbors through public meetings of the SSPA Task Force. The public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors and any additional outreach that may be identified. The Board of Supervisor’s action could be to retain

the current planned redevelopment options for the area as it stands now or to adapt an amendment to the current plan. So part of that friendly motion tonight is that we will review of the amended should begin subsequent to the conclusion of the Affordable Housing Preservation Task Force and should consider, as part of the evaluation and the resulting Board action, including any Countywide changes to the County policy regarding mobile and manufactured housing resulting from these efforts. Mr. Sargeant?

Commissioner Sargeant: Thank you, Commissioner Clark. Just to add a few other comments too. As - as echoed by Commissioner Clarke too, adding this nomination to the work program does not mean that the review of the amendment will need to start immediately. It does not. The review of the timeline the nomination can occur subsequent to the conclusion of the Affordable Housing Preservation Task Force and any subsequent policy changes supported by the Board of Supervisors. And the amendment can be considered in the context of those policy changes. At the same time, not adding this to the work program means the status quo in terms of the site's future. The site can currently be redeveloped by-right under the existing C8 zoning for certain commercial purposes and without any specific considerations for the residents beyond what existing law requires. In addition to this, if consolidation moves forward with the neighboring property, the current redevelopment option of residential use at 16 to 20 dwelling units per acre with no specific site considerations for the residence, beyond compliance with the County's voluntary relocation assistance program could be implemented through a rezoning application. Quite simply, if you think we create certainty for the Engleside residents by opposing this nomination, please think again. If you think you can predict market trends or an owner's decision-making criteria of when to redevelop, please reconsider. Indeed, we have heard from many of you and really appreciate how important that the recommendations from the affordable – Affordable Housing Preservation Task Force are and that's why we're prepared to take action to confirm their role in our recommendations. Thank you, Commissioner Clarke.

Commissioner Clarke: Thank you Sir. So, Mr. Chairman, if there are no – oh, I'm sorry.

Commissioner Strandlie: Mr. Chairman. This is Commissioner Strandlie.

Chairman Murphy: Commissioner Strandlie.

Commissioner Strandlie: I just – I have had said two things. Last week, from a safe procedure – procedural perspective, I believe Mr. Clarke – Commissioner Clarke had made a motion that was still on the table when we agreed to the motion to defer. So, I believe he should with – rescind the motion from last week and start anew with his motion for tonight, which I believe is substantively different.

Commissioner Sargeant: Commissioner Strandlie, if I may add, we are adding a friendly amendment to the existing motion...

Commissioner Strandlie: Okay, so it is-

Commissioner Sargeant: -that is still on the table.

Commissioner Strandlie: It is the same exact language?

Commissioner Sargeant: Yes. The motion – the base – the foundation of the motion that was read last week is, as Commissioner Clark will clarify, is the original motion that we will read tonight with consideration of a friendly amendment.

Commissioner Strandlie: Okay. Because I – I didn’t see that. But thank you. I also wanted to request that the – the verbatim from this be circulated to the community in Spanish and whatever other language is prevalent in the community, so that we can get that information out.

Commissioner Clarke: That’s a very good point, Commissioner...

Chairman Murphy: I believe we have a translator here this evening. We have a translator in room –

Commissioner Strandlie: I – it would be helpful if we could put it out and in – in writing so that they can read it.

Chairman Murphy: I don’t know about that, but we have a translator here. Okay?

Commissioner Clarke: Okay.

Chairman Murphy: Commissioner Clarke.

Commissioner Clarke: Mr. Chairman, if there are no further comments, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT THE NOMINATION, PC19-MV-002, IS ADDED TO THE 2021 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT WORK PROGRAM WITH THE FOLLOWING CONSIDERATIONS MODIFIED FROM THE STAFF AND TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATION:

- CONSIDERATION OF REVISIONS TO THE PLANNED OPTIONS FOR RECOMMENDATION AREA III OF THE SUBURBAN NEIGHBORHOOD AREA BETWEEN SOUTH COUNTY CENTER AND THE WOODLAWN CBC’S TO INCREASE THE PLANNED DENSITY FROM 16 TO 20 DWELLING UNITS PER ACRE TO 20 TO 30 DWELLING UNITS PER ACRE, AS WELL AS ADJUSTING THE RECOMMENDED NEIGHBORHOOD RETAIL AND/OR OFFICE USE COMPONENT;
- THE AMENDMENT SHOULD CONSIDER THE REQUESTED DENSITY ONLY WITH SUBSTANTIAL IF NOT FULL CONSOLIDATION OF THE LAND UNIT AND WITH THE REPLACEMENT OF THE EXISTING AFFORDABLE RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON-SITE AND A REDEVELOPMENT OF A ONE-TO-ONE BASIS.

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman, at this point I WOULD LIKE TO OFFER A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT. THAT AMENDMENT WOULD INCLUDE IN THE MOTION THIS – THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE:

- REVIEW OF THE AMENDMENT SHOULD BEGIN SUBSEQUENT TO THE CONCLUSION OF THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING PRESERVATION TASK FORCE

AND SHOULD CONSIDER, AS PART OF THE EVALUATION, ANY RESULTING BOARD ACTION, INCLUDING ANY COUNTYWIDE CHANGES TO COUNTY POLICY REGARDING MOBILE MANUFACTURED HOUSING RESULTING FROM THIS EFFORT.

That would be my friendly amendments, sir. Do you accept?

Commissioner Clarke: Mr. Commissioner, I DO ACCEPT THE FRIENDLY AMENDMENT.

Commissioner Sargeant: Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Alright, you heard the motion. All those in favor of the motion, as articulated by...

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Yes.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Mr. Chairmain. I – I would like to go ahead and offer a perspective on this motion, please?

Chairman Murphy: Go ahead, Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Thank you. My colleagues will recall my vacillation at last week's consideration of the nomination – of this nomination. I appreciate Commissioner Clarke's willingness to defer final consideration until this evening. In the interim, I had the opportunity to discuss this nomination with Commissioner Clarke, other commissioners, and with staff and to more fully consider last week's extensive Commission discussion. I don't recall in my time on the Commission having to consider a matter with such direct implications for a sizable and stable community, much less one whose circumstances could pose a barrier to being fully heard in our land use considerations. Over 125 homes could potentially have the land upon which they rest literally taken out from under them. This also at a time when we have within the County a crisis in the availability of affordable housing. I have concluded, however, that the status quo offers less protection for this mobile home community's interests than the SSPA process, particularly with the expectation that the existing affordable residential units be replaced on-site in a redevelopment on a one-for-one basis. With one caveat, I believe the community – with diligent County commitment to meaningful public engagement – will have more opportunity to be heard in the consideration of future uses of this site, than if left simply to the vagaries of the owner's by-right decisions or even the property's future were – or even if the property's future were later to be considered in the context of an out-of-turn amendment evaluation. This said, my one residual concern was what – was that the tasks – that the work of the Board's Affordable Housing Preservation Task Force – which is charged specifically with considering policy options for addressing the future of mobile home communities – would not be completed before the SSPA process is undertaken for this set of properties. I am therefore appreciative of Commissioner's – of Commissioner Clarke's willingness to accept the friendly amendment by Commissioner Sargeant with the language that addresses the matter and, if approved by the Board, would ensure that the nomination for this property is undertaken within an established County policy framework. In summary Mr. Chairman, I will vote in support of this motion.

Chairman Murphy: All right. Was their second to the motion made by Commissioner Clarke and Sargeant?

Commissioner Lagana: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Yes.

Commissioner Lagana: This is Commissioner Lagana. I just have a few – a few comments, as well.

Chairman Murphy: Hold on. Let me just clarify that procedurally. Do we have a second to the motion?

Commissioner Ulfelder: I'll seconded it, Mr. Chairman. This is Commissioner Ulfelder.

Chairman Murphy: Okay. Seconded by Commissioner Ulfelder. Discussion of the motion? You've heard discussion from Commissioner Niedzielski -Eichner. Now Commissioner Lagana.

Commissioner Lagana: Thank you. So, working backwards, even before – before this – this nomination came forward, I think that there are some – there are some general structural issues for a – with the SSPA process that have – in thinking of this, it made me visit just exactly how we treat nominations and what nominations can and should be considered and how they're evaluated. I realize that there are – we can't control what a nominator will do. But there can be a few improvements, notably who can put forward a nomination. In this case, the nominator does not live in the – in the community, nor do they have an ownership interest. In – I think that it's a practice of good government and especially in the spirit of the SSPA process, which is supposed to encourage communities to take the initiative to find fixes to the Comprehensive Plan or to put forward fixes that we – we make a policy change in that area. How – how that's done and where the balance is between what's – what – practical and also serves the interest of the community. It just strikes me as strange that someone can put forward a nomination for parcels of land that they don't own that people live on and that these folks aren't notified. The other – the other stuff is within the SSPA booklet put forward by County staff, we do ask that not – nominations are encouraged that they submit supporting documentation and plans along with their nominations. Now, we would – I think it's reasonable we wouldn't expect them to be as thorough in an otherwise standard application, but – especially for applications that have such a wide-ranging impact as this – where there are there are clear economic, social and even political implications – you know, I-I guess what I'm saying is I was struck by a lot of rigor – that the – in the nominator's application. Or it – I wouldn't expect them to have as much as they normally would, but I certainly – given the circumstances we're facing now – expect them to put forward more than they did, to be candid. They asked us for quite a lot. I'm not convinced that the one-for-one requirement is adequate, in part because it's not – it's – it isn't an exact transfer. In fact, it's a reduction in what these folks have. And we even saw some of that in the documentation that was sent over public comments today where you saw just the amount of money that many of these – the residents have put into their – into their mobile homes and into their homes. And the – and that they all affirmed in public written statements to us that they were not notified of – of this. And I think it – in general, they're taking this in a totality, I'm surprised that this was able to move as far as it did, to be blunt. And I do appreciate the efforts to modify the – the nomination.

I do. And I appreciate the thoughtfulness. I understand and have always understood the tradeoffs that we're making. I don't think, however, that – also, to put it bluntly, I think that this is – this is – we are doing what the nominator wants us to do, being very candid with my fellow Commissioners – with Commissioner Sargeant. This is what the nominator wants us to do. I believe that. And yes, you can develop it C-8, and no, you can't predict the market. I know the market and the commercial market very well. Sure, they can build something there, but the vacancy rate in the County tells me more likely than not, they will – they want this to be residential, as you can tell by their nomination. And yes, it may seem like a gamble, but I can't take myself away from the notion that this is precisely what the nominator wants and this nomination – this nomination is incredibly cruel and heartless, given our current circumstances and given the pressure that many of these people feel every day. We're talking about community input. I – I don't know how we do that. What does community input look like? Does anyone know? I mean, if you work two jobs and you're taking – two bus transfers every day and you also have side-hustles, are we gonna have them show up at an elementary school and put stickies on a board and talk about how – the divisions for their community. I mean, we are – they would be – we are asking them to provide input. They're telling us they don't want us to destroy their homes. That's what they're saying to us. I wish there was a better more stoic – an answer where I could – I could provide that – that says – look, this – I know this is the hard answer. This is hard for the public to – to digest, but I know this to be true that this is the right answer. I wish I could say that about this, but I can't. And I can think about the process that we're gonna ask these folks to go through and it's going to be torturous. I do, however – I do commend Commissioner Clarke and Commissioner Sargeant for finding and searching for a more appropriate solution, given the current status of this nomination. But I can't – I can't remove myself from the fact that this is a broken process in some way, shape, or form, we've got of here. And we're doing precisely what the nominator wants, not what's best for the community. The deck is stacked against them. And – and I don't agree that the – the option to – to not go forward with this is – is somehow not as strong as the option to go forward in which they are given more protections. I – I – I – perhaps, we can discuss what community input looks like. I don't know. They have told us very clearly what they want. So I don't – I – I cannot support this - this motion.

Chairman Murphy: Is – Meghan Van Dam in the conference room over at the Herrity Building?

Meghan Van Dam, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Development (DPD):
Yes – Commissioner Murphy, this is Meghan Van Dam from the Department of Planning and Development.

Chairman Murphy: Yeah, we're discussing form and content now. And I just want to clarify about who can make a nomination for our planning process – what we use for a criteria.

Ms. Van Dam: Within the SSPA process, anyone can make a nomination on any piece of property, as long as that piece of property has not been part of a Plan Amendment that has – that the Board has been – that the Board has acted upon within the last four years.

Chairman Murphy: Okay.

Commissioner Lagana: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. Do you mind if I jump in? Is – is that – sorry, Meghan – is there a – maybe it's worth a discussion with the County Attorney. I – I don't know the answer. Yeah. Is there a – are there any – is that fit – is that resolvable by policy? I mean, is

this – is this an area we're studying or there – are there, you know, larger constitutional implications here? I don't know.

Chairman Murphy: Okay. We need to – go ahead, Meghan.

Ms. Van Dam. Well, I'm not – I'm not quite sure of the – the question about resolvable by policy. But – you know, in discussions with the County Attorney, that this – this has been the process for decades and – and it is – it is legal for the Comprehensive Plan, as a guide, about land use planning and land use decisions to – to have a community process whereby anyone can make a nomination on – on another's property. So that – that is alright. If it is – I'll just say that if this is an issue that we would like to examine, we will have an opportunity following the South County SSPA process to discuss the criteria and discuss the process. And this might be – this may be an area we would like – we should look at as we move forward, but – prior to the next round of SSPA.

Chairman Murphy: Okay, thank you for the clarification. Any more discussion on that particular...

Commissioner Ulfelder: Mr. Chair...

Commissioner Strandlie: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Hold on. Commissioner Ulfelder?

Commissioner Ulfelder: Yes. A – a further clarification on what we just discussed. In this case, we're saying that the they landowner was not the – not the person who submitted the nomination. Is that correct?

Ms. Van Dam: The nominator who is on the – on the nomination form did not represent self as the property owner or have an interest in the ownership of the property.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Okay. Did the property owner weigh in on the nomination during its consideration by the Task Force and the staff?

Graham Owen, PD, DPD: So – this is Graham Owen with the Department of Planning and Development. So, we didn't hear from the property owner during the task force process. We – we do know that he was on a number of the calls of the task force and didn't raise any concerns. So, I hope that – I hope that answers your question.

Commissioner Ulfelder: So – so, he never said one way or the other whether he agreed with the nomination and that it fit with his plans?

Mr. Owen: That's correct.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Okay. So, I think Commissioner Lagana – I mean, we do have this process. I think that if – if the process is okay, I think that the Commission can weigh the fact that the landowner himself or herself was not the applicant and did not weigh in one way or the

other on the nomination. We can weigh that as a factor in our individual decisions and votes on the particular application. But it – so, I would see that as factor. That's all.

Commissioner Clarke: So – Commissioner Ulfelder, this is Commissioner Clarke. I, myself, have had conversations with the landowner.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Okay.

Commissioner Clarke: And the landowner has said he would like to take his legal rights of going – having this property built through this process. But he has no intentions of immediately redeveloping the site.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Okay, so...

Commissioner Clarke: With his legal right, he did and would like for this to go through the SSPA nomination.

Commissioner Ulfelder: So, I take that to mean that he would like it to go to the work program and be considered as a possible change to the comp plan for his property. I would take that statement.

Commissioner Clarke: That's correct.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Okay. I think that's the answer.

Chairman Murphy: Yeah. Is there further discussion of the motion?

Commissioner Cortina: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Murphy: From the friendly motion. Ms. Cortina?

Commissioner Cortina: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I tried to look at this from a perspective of the – the cost of living and looked at the demographer's report. And I will just say that under the Mount Vernon Planning District, either a single family home, a single family attached home, a multi-family home – at any of those price points, which are lower for the Mount Vernon District – planning district than others in the County. Even at those median and average prices, they – the residents that live at the mobile homes could not afford replacement. And even what buyouts of the minimum state requirement, \$3,500, all the way up to \$50,000, which is the unit that was recently purchased there – you still don't approximate the monthly cost that they are able to do, even though it may seem expensive to rent a spot for \$1,000 a month at a mobile home site, it is still less expensive than trying to find replacement housing. And – and for that reason alone, I oppose the nomination going forward.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Mister Chairman, I'd like to make a further comment. This is Commissioner Ulfelder.

Chairman Murphy: Yes. Commissioner Ulfelder, please.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Yes, I too had serious concerns about moving this. I felt that with this – this nomination may be represented as sort of getting the cart before the horse. And that I was concerned about moving forward to the work plan – the work program before the County had worked out its policy position on affordable dwelling units and, in particular, on trailer parks. Because there are other trailer parks in the County that are going to be faced with similar issues. So, therefore, I appreciate very much Commissioner Sargeant's friendly amendment and Mr. Clarke's willingness to accept it. So that – even if this moves – even if we move this forward tonight, it will have to wait for policy the catch up before we get into serious work on – on the proposed Comprehensive Plan language. So, that – that – that made me happier. Second, I would hope that if – it moves forward through the work program that the proposed language that we're talking about, as part of the nomination, substitutes for the existing Comprehensive Plan language. It's not added as a sort of third option. I think that we need to clear up the other potential Comprehensive Plan – the uses. And – and – and move on. And I would use the new language to replace the existing language. And that's just my note to staff to say eventually move forward if this – if this is approved. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you. Further discussion of the motion?

Commissioner Strandlie: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Yes. Commissioner Strandlie?

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you. Earlier this week, I – I conveyed to Commissioner Clarke an article about community ownership to save mobile home parks based in Charlottesville.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Yes.

Commissioner Strandlie: It has a lot of instructive information for us. I – I do appreciate the comments from Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner and Commissioner Lagana. This is a very tough case. There's a lot of different circumstances here. I do agree that the task force must complete their work before anything goes forward. And I appreciate Commissioner Sargeant's friendly amendment. I did convey to Commissioner Clarke that – and this is probably a comment for the task force and/or the General Assembly – is that I – I believe we need to have a path forward that would allow non-profits to purchase the land that mobile home parks are on. This – this is a no-win situation. Or, at least, find a policy that would allow a developer to provide adequate compensation for the mobile homes and not just the legally required \$3,500 relocation fee that applies here in Fairfax, plus new affordable housing opportunities. So, I hope those – those points could be considered by the task force. And I know the General Assembly might be considering further legislation in the coming session. So, thank you very much.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you. Is there any other discussion on the motion?

Commissioner Lagana: Commissioner – sorry, Mr. Chairman, this is Commissioner Lagana. I do have a question for staff. Sorry. My – I guess my concern – another concern – or the subject to much of this too is – this is – this strikes me as – you know, wildly would be a strong word, but running far afool of the EMBARK Richmond Highway Comprehensive Plan Amendment, which we just passed in which all of us in some way, shape, or form on this Commission at different times worked on. What – in – when you are assessing this and when we were – when you are you

are reviewing this – the nomination – what considerations, with respect to the Comprehensive Plan, did you make? Given the density increases and given the location of the density increases, relative to the CBCs in the planned BRT stations. Because this nomination is both – is outside of the walk shed of to BRT stations – is in between two BRT stations. I'm just curious about some of the thinking here. Commissioner Ulfelder's remark made me think about this a little bit more. I'm sorry.

Ms. Van Dam: This – this is – this is Meghan Van Dam, with the Department of Planning and Development. So, within the suburban neighborhood areas along the Richmond Highway corridor, that – you had mentioned that – that there was the idea of trying to keep these areas as primarily residential.

Commissioner Lagana: Right.

Ms. Van Dam: However, they're – they're – the plan does contemplate limited redevelopment within them for development that would be compatible in terms of the use in the scale and intensity. And, in terms of the proposed density, the – if you are – the nomination is proposing from 16 to 20 – to 20 to 30. That is not out of – not greatly out of scale with what is planned around it. Directly up the – up the corridor, south of Hybla Valley, there is another site that is planned for 20 to 30 dwelling units per acre. So, there are other opportunities for redevelopment within the plan at the proposed density on the corridor – within a – and I should say, that's within a suburban neighborhood area.

Commissioner Lagana: Okay. I guess where I was going to with this is tangential to this application – or this nomination in our discussion that – I – I'm thinking of that we do want to encourage development in CBCs. And that's where we want the concentration of density to be, especially on this – you know, particularly in this case. I mean – Hybla Valley and the – is the largest CBC on the corridor. So, it's just something to keep in mind as we're density. I would hate – I would not like to see – or it would be – disappointing to see large applications for high dense developments occur on the periphery of CBCs. And I would also add, too, that when we were designing and we were discussion EMBARK, we made a point to avoid – we didn't want to encourage development in – in – in the case of Hybla Valley CBC – in the – the Autobaun Mobile Home Community. And we made a – we made a decision. And I remember those – those – the meetings to not move the boundaries into the mobile home park. So I'm just – I guess that's – that's part of my – my concerns with this is that there's – a lot of this seems to be – this nomination seems to be in congress with much of our previous work and our current aims. But I digress, thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion made by Commissioner Clarke, with a friendly motion by – motion by Commissioner Sargeant, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed?

Commissioners Cortina, Lagana, Jimenez: Nay.

Chairman Murphy: Nay – Commissioner Cortina, nay. Commissioner – yeah, Jimenez nay. Who was the other no?

Commissioner Lagana: Commissioner Lagana.

Chairman Murphy: Commissioner Lagana. Motion carries with three people voting no.

The motion carried by a vote of 9-3. Commissioners Cortina, Jimenez, and Lagana voted in opposition.

JLC