

**Town of Ashland
Planning Commission Minutes
Town Hall Council Chambers
October 10, 2012 – 7:00 p.m.**

A regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Town of Ashland, Virginia, was held on October 10, 2012, at 7:00 pm in the Town of Ashland Council Chambers, located at 101 Thompson Street, Ashland, Virginia, those present were:

Present: Robert Brown, Chairperson
Alan Abbott, Vice-Chair
Lou Ann Jewell
Felix Stevens
Bob Flanagan

Absent: None.

Others present: Nora Amos, Director
Planning and Community Development
George Spagna, Council Liaison
Andrea Erard, Town Attorney
Nancy Quesenberry, Administrative Assistant

CALL TO ORDER:

Mr. Brown called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Ms. Jewell Here
Mr. Flanagan Here
Mr. Abbott Here
Mr. Stevens Here
Mr. Brown Here

All members were present.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM:

Mr. Brown stated that there was a quorum.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Mr. Brown asked if there were any changes to be made to the Agenda; there were none.

CITIZEN INPUT

Mr. Brown opened the floor for public comment.

There being none, Mr. Brown closed that portion of the meeting.

PRESENTATION OF MINUTES:

A. June 13, 2012, minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Brown to approve the June 13, 2012, minutes as presented.

ROLL CALL:

Mr. Stevens Aye
Ms. Jewell Aye
Mr. Flanagan Aye
Mr. Abbott Aye
Mr. Brown Aye

With all Ayes, the motion passed

B. July 11, 2012, minutes

C. August 8, 2012, work session minutes

D. September 12, 2012, minutes

It was the concensus of the Planning Commission to approve the July 11, 2012, minutes, the August 8, 2012, work session minutes, and the September 12, 2012, minutes as presented.

PRESENTATION:

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. **REZ12-0831 TS Development Associates, LLC** – A request to rezone from M-1 (Light Industrial) District and B-2 (Highway Commercial) District to B-2 (Highway Commercial) District on the property indentified as GPIN 7880-20-0120 consisting of +/- 9.985 acres. The subject property is located on the southern side of Junction Drive, approximately 500 feet west of Hill Carter Parkway. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as appropriate for Interstate Commercial uses.

Mr. Phillips reviewed the staff report as presented in the Planning Commission packet.

Mr. Phillips stated that the Comprehensive Plan designates this property as appropriate for Interstate Commercial uses, which accommodates a mixture of higher-end hotels, restaurants, retail, and general commercial serving both the residents of Ashland and interstate travelers.

Mr. Phillips stated that a portion of this site consisting of approximately 3.75 acres is proposed to be developed as a Tractor Supply Store, which would provide additional retail uses for residents and visitors to the Town.

Mr. Phillips stated that the Applicant has submitted a list of proffers for the rezoning, most of which apply to the Tractor Supply Store:

- 1.) The development of the northwestern portion of the Property (the “Tractor Supply parcel”) will be generally consistent to the layout plan prepared by Timmons Group, dated August 3, 2012, entitled “Tractor Supply Company, Junction Drive, Ashland, Virginia Schematic Site Layout (w/Autoturn)” as submitted.
- 2.) The Tractor Supply Store will be constructed as indicated in the submitted elevation.

Mr. Phillips stated that this rezoning request does not require a traffic impact analysis per Virginia Department of Transportation’s Chapter 527 requirements.

Mr. Phillips stated that Tractor Supply is expecting approximately 200-250 customers per day during the week and up to 400 customers per day during the weekends; with peak times being 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. with approximately 25-50 customers per hour during the weekday and approximately 35-50 customers per hour during the weekend.

Mr. Phillips stated that Tractor Supply is proposing a 19,097 square foot retail store with a 15,000 square foot fenced outdoor display area on the southern side of the building. A 5,200 square foot permanent trailer and equipment display area is also proposed on the northwestern corner of the site which would be screened from Junction Drive by landscaping required in a 20 foot landscaping setback.

Mr. Phillips stated that the site would be accessed by a new road to be constructed off Junction Drive, which would also serve any future development on the remaining portion of the subject property. The proposed retail store would face this access road, and most of the parking would be located between the building and the road.

Mr. Phillips stated that in conclusion, it was staff’s opinion that the request to rezone to B-2 is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Subdivision and Zoning Ordinances; and that the current M-1 zoning does not correspond with the zoning of adjacent properties.

Mr. Phillips stated that the Future Land Use Plan identifies this property for Interstate Commercial uses, and not industrial uses.

Mr. Phillips stated that the applicant has proffered layout plans and elevations for the proposed Tractor Supply store, and that future development of the remainder of the property should be compatible with surrounding properties.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends approval of this request.

Mr. Brown asked what the buffer would be between the Sedgefield Mobile Home Park which was in his opinion, a really nice neighborhood, and the future development of this request.

Ms Amos stated that there is not a minimum buffer requirement in the Ordinance and if the Planning Commission would like to have a discussion regarding requiring a buffer then now would be the time to do so.

Mr. Flanagan stated that one of the proffers discussed the buffer between the trailer display area located on Junction Drive, and asked what type of buffer screening would be in place.

Mr. Brown opened the public hearing and asked the applicant to come forward.

Ms. Jennifer Mullen, Williams/Mullen - spoke on behalf of the Applicant.

Ms. Mullen stated that with her were Clark Jones, and Chris Pecci as part of the development team.

Ms. Mullen gave a brief presentation on their request.

Ms. Mullen stated that with regards to the screening of the trailer display area on Junction Drive, the Applicant would be willing to extend the deciduous shrubs along Junction Drive, with the goal being to maintain as much of the existing landscaping as possible, and that they would be willing to show this on the Landscaping Plan.

Mr. Flanagan asked about the land between the shopping center adjacent to the site and whether or not the trees and woods were proffered at the time of development.

Mr. Phillips stated that he did not know, but he could research and report back.

There was discussion regarding the area between the buffer, the Sedgefield Mobile Home Park and the Tractor Supply Store.

Mr. Brown asked if there was anyone from the public that would like to speak for or against the request.

There being none, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Brown stated that a 25 foot buffer did not seem to be very much of a buffer for what was in his opinion the nicest mobile home park he has ever seen.

Mr. Flanagan asked if there has been any discussion regarding ingress and egress, walk ways, fencing, or lighting of any type between the mobile home park and the Tractor Supply store.

Ms. Mullen stated that there has not; however, the building does have security lighting.

Ms. Mullen stated that with regards to the buffering concerns, the Applicant is willing to work with the Landscape Architect to either maintain what is in the 25 foot buffer or finding something that is sufficient to screen any of the B-2 uses from the 10-12 residents that live along that area.

Ms. Amos stated that there is also a buffer that currently exists on the property of the mobile home park.

Mr. Flanagan asked if a developer would be able to connect the hammerhead road onto the road within the mobile home park neighborhood that could lead out to Route 1 and asked if that has been a concern for the Town.

Ms. Amos stated that one could connect to that road, but the Town would need to approve that connection.

Ms. Jewell stated that she would like to request a 50 foot buffer be proffered between the mobile home park and the Tractor Supply store for the noise and loading docks.

Mr. Flanagan asked for clarification asking if the Sedgefield Mobile Home Park has a 25 foot buffer, and the Tractor Supply Store would be required to have a 25 foot buffer, then that would give them a 50 foot buffer.

Ms. Mullen stated that this parcel is currently zoned M-1 and the mobile home park is currently surrounded by M-1 zoning which does not require a 25 foot buffer and that the Applicant would like to stay with the 25 foot buffer to keep their options open between the property and the mobile home park property line and will maintain what already exists.

Mr. Brown asked in what way the Applicant would be willing to maintain the 25 foot buffer on the Tractor Supply Store adjoining the mobile home park.

Ms. Mullen stated that the Applicant is willing to commit to maintaining the existing trees and vegetation within that buffer area.

Mr. Phillips stated that in the event that these trees do have to come down, there are landscape requirements that the Applicant would have to meet with street trees and evergreen shrubbery which would be required to be extended to that area as well.

Ms. Amos stated that staff understands the concerns of the Planning Commission and can work with the Applicant and the Landscape Architect to make certain that the language is sufficient; and that proffers would be a part of what is advertised for the Town Council and she would be willing to send a copy to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Jewell stated that it was her opinion that the Applicant has extended their good faith in this project.

A motion was made by Ms. Jewell to recommend approval to the Town Council the request to rezone from M-1 to B-2 the property identified as GPIN 7880-20-0102 consisting of +/- 9.985 acres with the following proffers:

- 1.) The development of the northwestern portion of the Property (the “Tractor Supply Parcel”) will be generally consistent to the layout plan prepared by Timmons Group, dated August 3, 2012, entitled “Tractor Supply Company, Junction Drive, Ashland, Virginia, Schematic Site Layout (w/Autoturn)” attached hereto as Exhibit A and Generally consistent with the front elevations prepared by Oxford Architecture, entitled “Elevation” and both sides of the building shall be generally consistent with the side elevation prepared by Gooss+ Associates, AIA, entitled “Right Side (North) Elevation: Tractor Supply Company, Ashland, Virginia” attached hereto as Exhibit B.
- 2.) The Property will be landscaped in general conformance with the plan prepared by Timmons Group, dated _____, 2012, entitled “Tractor Supply Company, Concept Plan” attached hereto as Exhibit C. The twenty-five (25) foot landscape setback (“Southern Buffer”) provided along the southern boundary line as generally shown on Exhibit C shall be retained in its natural state, permitting the removal of scrub and selective thinning, as well as supplemental plantings as needed in the event of damage or removal of the existing vegetation. The Southern Buffer may also include a fence, wall, and supplemental vegetation, earthen berm or any combination thereof, but shall not include buildings, structures, parking, and loading, outside storage or services areas. Utilities and utility easements are permitted within the landscaped areas.

ROLL CALL:

Mr. Stevens Aye
Ms. Jewell Aye
Mr. Flanagan Aye
Mr. Abbott Aye
Mr. Brown Aye

With all Ayes, the motion passed

B. **ORD2012-10** is an ordinance to amend the Code of the Town of Ashland, Chapter 21 “Zoning,” Article XXV “Supplemental Regulations,” Sec.21-266 “General Lighting Standards.” The purpose of this ordinance is to amend the general lighting standards by adding requirements for compliance with lighting standards, establishing a list of prohibited outdoor lighting applications, establishing a list of lighting applications that are exempt from the ordinance, adding regulations for outdoor lighting plans and alterations to previously approved outdoor light plans, and establishing criteria and conditions for administrative exceptions to outdoor lighting requirements.

Mr. Phillips reviewed the Ordinance as presented in the staff report.

Mr. Phillips provided a brief history of this Ordinance as follows:

July 11, 2012, Planning Commission meeting

- Concern raised over proposed 15 year “sunset clause”.
- Planning Commission deferred request to allow for further research.

August 8, 2012, Planning Commission meeting

- Planning Commission and staff discussed eliminating the 15 year clause.
- Planning Commission asked staff to provide examples of nonconforming lights throughout Town that would be affected.
- Planning Commission asked for clarification of a Nit.

September 12, 2012, Planning Commission meeting

- Staff presented a random sample of existing lights.
- Staff provided examples of illuminated signs measured in Nits.
- Planning Commission agreed to remove the 15 year “sunset clause” and that the sign illumination levels were acceptable.

Mr. Phillips stated that the request was to amend Sec. 21-266, General Lighting Standards of the Town Code by:

- Adding criteria for requiring nonconforming lights to be brought into compliance.
- Adding a list of prohibited and exempt lighting.
- Addressing the brightness of lighted signs or displays.
- Establishing requirements for the submission and amendment of outdoor lighting plans.
- Establishing criteria for exceptions to the outdoor lighting requirements.

Mr. Phillips stated that the proposed amendments are intended to address outdoor lighting issues that staff has had no ability to address:

Mr. Phillips stated that the following amendments were made since the last meeting:

- **Nonconforming Lighting Compliance**
 - Addressed existing nonconforming lighting and how such lighting must be brought into compliance.
 - Paragraph (a) – nonconforming lighting may continue except as set forth in paragraph (b) and (c).
 - Paragraph (b) and (c) – establish criteria under which existing nonconforming lighting must be either removed or brought into compliance.
- **Outdoor Dynamic Display**
 - Addressed the brightness of lighting of outdoor signage or display.
 - Any such lighting shall not exceed 5000 Nits during daylight or 150 Nits at all other times.

- **Prohibited/ Exempt Outdoor Lighting**
 - Establishes lists of lighting types or methods that are either prohibited throughout the Town or are exempt from the requirements of the Lighting Ordinance.
- **Lighting Plan and Alterations**
 - Addressed the submission of a lighting plan and alteration to such plans after approval.
 - Paragraph (i) – requires that a lighting plan be submitted for review and approval whenever lighting is required or prepared.
 - Paragraph (k) – requires that any alterations or substitutions to as approved lighting plan be submitted for review and approval.
- **Right of Inspection**
 - States that the Town shall have the right to conduct a post-installation inspection of any outdoor lighting to verify that such lighting complies with the Ordinance.
- **Exceptions**
 - Sets forth the criteria under which the Planning Director may grant administrative exceptions to outdoor lighting requirements.
 - Lists specific situations when as exception may not be granted.
 - Also includes the pedestrian scale lighting exception section of the current Ordinance.
 - ORD2012-08 – approved February 2011.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends approval of the proposed Ordinance as presented.

Mr. Brown opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone that would like to speak for or against this case being presented.

There being none, the public hearing was closed.

A motion was made by Mr. Abbott to recommend approval to the Town Council **ORD2012-10** - an ordinance to amend the Code of the Town of Ashland, Chapter 21 “Zoning,” Article XXV “Supplemental Regulations,” Sec.21-266 “General Lighting Standards” as presented in the staff report.

ROLL CALL:

Mr. Abbott Aye
Mr. Flanagan Aye
Mr. Stevens Aye
Ms. Jewell Aye
Mr. Brown Aye

With all Ayes, the motion passed

ACTION ITEMS:

A. Vitamin Shoppe Sidewalk Exception

Mr. Phillips stated that when the discussion regarding the height exception request came before the Planning Commission, there was a request for a copy of the site plan which was handed out at this meeting.

Mr. Phillips reviewed the application for an exception to sidewalks as presented in the Planning Commission packets.

Mr. Phillips stated that the applicant has submitted a letter for this request which was included in the staff report.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff has also received an additional letter stating additional reasons for the Applicant's request, which was included with the handout.

Mr. Phillips stated that in the original letter, the Applicant stated that it was their opinion that the sidewalks were not necessary for the road because it will be serving only the three industrial lots of this industrial park known as the Virginia Transportation Park, and that it was not necessary for any future industrial tenants of this industrial park. The Applicant also stated that the sidewalk would leave little room for utilities in the right-of-way.

Mr. Phillips provided a brief history of the Virginia Transportation Park:

- This does include the Vitamin Shoppe Distribution Center which is currently under construction.
- This Subdivision Plat was approved on July 24, 2012.
- Early Land Disturbance Plan was approved on August 23, 2012.
- Infrastructure Plan was approved on August 24, 2012.
- Final Site Plan is currently under review.

Mr. Phillips stated that Sec. 17-49.1 states that Sidewalks shall be required along all public roads for major subdivisions.

Mr. Phillips stated that Sec. 17-49.2 states that sidewalk exceptions may be granted in accordance with Sec. 17-5 and the following:

- The proposed street and/or sidewalk are not included on the sidewalk priority area map of the Comprehensive Plan.
- The property abuts a street map of the Comprehensive Plan.
- The Director of Public Works deems the requirement for sidewalk, curb and gutter inappropriate based on clear engineering considerations.

Mr. Phillips stated that after staff reviewed the exception request and the standards of Sec. 17-49.2 and stated that staff agrees that standards one (1) and two (2) have been met; however, standard number three (3) has not been met, as the Applicant has not presented “clear engineering considerations.”

Mr. Phillips stated that staff reviewed this request with the Director of Public Works as well as the Town Engineer who also agreed with staff.

Mr. Phillips stated that it is staff’s opinion that sidewalks should be provided along public roads to provide pedestrian access and travel opportunities, and that the sidewalks along Vitamin Way would provide employees of the Virginia Transportation Park a place to walk and to get out during their lunch time. Mr. Phillips stated that while trails are proposed to be provided on the Vitamin Shoppe Distribution Center Parcel it is not known whether these would be made available to other tenants of the Virginia Transportation Park.

Mr. Phillips stated that staff is recommending denial of the sidewalk exception request of the Virginia Transportation Park.

Mr. Brown asked why Vitamin Way is considered a ‘public’ road.

Ms. Amos stated that the Town does not allow private roads.

There was discussion regarding the sidewalk exception request.

Mr. Brown asked the Applicant if they would like to come forward to speak.

Sam Saunders, Civil Engineer with Timmons Group, representing the Vitamin Shoppe Distribution Center.

Mr. Saunders stated that Andrew Burton was also present with him and was the representative with Johnson Development, which is the developer for this project.

Mr. Saunders stated that no matter what happens at the meeting this evening, they are appreciative of the help that everyone has provided to get this project going.

Mr. Saunders stated that it was their opinion that installing a sidewalk on this project does not make sense and that the nearest sidewalk of any description on Route 1 is approximately one (1) mile to the south.

Mr. Saunders stated that the engineering arguments to not have a sidewalk are that they are trying to work a lot of utilities into the corridor in the road; and from the traffic safety engineering it is not helping, rather creating some concerns.

Mr. Saunders stated that it was his opinion that the Planning Commission does have the authority to approve this request for a waiver to the sidewalk requirements and respectfully disagrees with the Public Works Department.

Mr. Saunders stated that while they will have curb and gutter in this project, it was their opinion that this still a rural setting because it is in the north end of the Town.

Ms. Jewell asked Mr. Saunders what the purpose was of the proposed trails on this parcel.

Mr. Saunders stated that he was not certain that the discussion was such that he could make a promise of that, there has been some discussion of installing trails so that the employees could have someplace to walk during their lunch break.

Ms. Amos stated that it was her understanding that the Vitamin Shoppe would like to have trails for their employees, it is a part of their philosophy to promote a healthy work environment, but it would be a secure site, so it would not be open to the public.

Ms. Jewell asked that in the event that there would be public transportation how employees would get to work.

Mr. Saunders stated that he did not know where public transportation would go but it was his opinion that it would almost be better for public transportation to come onto the Vitamin Way road instead of stopping on Route 1.

Mr. Abbott asked if Mr. Saunders knew what was going to take place on the other two (2) parcels in the Park.

Mr. Saunders stated that he did not.

Mr. Stevens asked what the zoning was on the parcels coming south from the Industrial Park.

Ms. Amos stated that they are M-1 and RR-1 and B-2.

Mr. Flanagan stated that while he does agree with Mr. Saunders that Route 1 is not the ideal location for pedestrians; there are people that may need access to the business or others that may come in the Virginia Transportation Park.

A motion was made by Mr. Flanagan to recommend denial to the Town Council the request to allow the Vitamin Shoppe sidewalk exception.

ROLL CALL:

Ms. Jewell Nay
Mr. Flanagan Aye
Mr. Abbott Aye
Mr. Stevens Nay
Mr. Brown Nay

With all three (3) Nays, and two (2) Ayes, the motion failed.

A motion was made by Mr. Stevens to recommend approval to the Town Council to allow the exception to the Vitamin Shoppe Sidewalk request as submitted in the application.

ROLL CALL:

Mr. Abbott Nay
Mr. Stevens Aye
Ms. Jewell Aye
Mr. Flanagan Nay
Mr. Brown Aye

With all three (3) Ayes, and two (2) Nays, the motion passed.

Ms. Amos asked if the Planning Commission would like to pass onto the Town Council their reasoning for the way that they voted.

Ms. Jewell stated that it was her opinion that the Applicant should not be required to install sidewalks in the development; to have sidewalks for 700 feet to Route 1 and with the way the property on Route 1 is zoned is not feasible; and this section is not on the Town of Ashland's original Sidewalk Plan. Ms. Jewell added that she is a big sidewalk fan.

Mr. Stevens stated that he concurred with what Ms. Jewell stated and added that especially with the potential of sidewalk not matching up to this island of sidewalks. Mr. Stevens added that he is a huge sidewalk fan.

Mr. Flanagan stated that the reason that he voted against this request is because it was stated that the three (3) standards must be met. Mr. Flanagan also stated that he does not know what precedence this sets by going against what is required for a waiver. Mr. Flanagan stated that the sidewalk that is being discussed is actually within the property, depending on how the second and third parcels are used, it could be that pedestrian traffic along there is requested. Mr. Flanagan stated that a lot of the discussion at this meeting was regarding Route 1; but what about when those two parcels are purchased; the sidewalk that is being voted on tonight is along the side road and with the unknown of what the future land uses might be; once this is done it cannot be undone without the Town footing the bill.

Mr. Abbott stated that he voted the way that he did because we will not ever have the grid of sidewalks unless we start owning up to this. Mr. Abbott added that it gives the other lots more potential to be developed and it looks nicer and they could utilize those sidewalks. Mr. Abbott stated that we do not know what is going in the other lots; we do not know where the road off of the cul-de-sac is going to extend to. Mr. Abbot stated that it was his opinion that the Town set that plan in motion for the three (3) exceptions so that we can get sidewalks in this Town. This may not connect to other roads right now, but we do not know what this area will look like in 50 years.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES:

A. Town Council – George Spagna

Dr. Spagna stated that reports of the Town Council actions were in the Planning Commission packets and reviewed them for the Planning Commission.

Mr. Brown asked staff if there was a sample of the pervious paver available that will be used to pave the municipal parking lot.

Ms. Amos stated that one is available to look at.

Dr. Spagna stated that the pervious paving is one that allows the water to penetrate through the spaces between the pavers and that there will be several feet of large crushed stone with approximately 40 percent of void underneath that to allow rain water to seep through that and be held underground and slowly seep into the rain garden before going into the drainage system.

B. Ashland Main Street Association – Nora Amos

Ms. Amos stated that the Ashland Main Street Association is preparing for Train Day on November 10, 2012.

Ms. Amos stated that the Ashland Museum will have their grand opening on November 10, 2012.

Ms. Amos stated they anticipate hiring and announcing an Executive Director later this month to manage their program.

C. Economic Development Authority of Ashland, Virginia – Nora Amos

Ms. Amos stated the EDA continues to work on getting educated on how move forward with the Strategic Plan or a Marketing Plan.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

UPCOMING ITEMS

A. Amendment to Non-Conforming Uses Ordinance update.

Ms. Amos stated that the Planning Commission has no further items other than the Amendment to the Non-Conforming Uses Ordinance and that two (2) members will be absent from the regularly scheduled meeting for November.

Ms. Amos asked if the Planning Commission would like to schedule a work session for a different date in November.

A motion was made by Mr. Brown to cancel the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting for November 14, 2012, and schedule a Comprehensive Plan Work Session to cover Chapter 3 for November 1, 2012, at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Mr. Stevens Aye
Ms. Jewell Aye
Mr. Flanagan Aye
Mr. Abbott Aye
Mr. Brown Aye

With all Ayes, the motion passed.

Ms. Amos provided an update on a couple items that staff is working on as follows:

- The on line version of the Comprehensive Plan, to be more user friendly.
- Working with We Think In Ink to get a hardcopy of the Comprehensive Plan printed.
- The Cox Group should present staff with a copy of the draft document of the Design Guidelines very soon.
- Ashland Main Street held a public meeting and there was a very good turnout of over 30 people and Ms. Amos provided a copy of the handout that was provided at that meeting. When all of the public comments are collected then they will move forward with creating a plan for the Downtown Main Street area.
- At the end of November the Town will have an intern named Troy Leftwich who will be working on his graduate project and will concentrate on England Street and looking at our Comprehensive Plan and what it recommends and making a design from that.
- In December the Annual Report will be presented to the Planning Commission for them to forward on to the Town Council.
- The Capital Improvements Projects will come to the Planning Commission at their November 1, 2012, work session with the Planning Commission to vote to hold a public hearing at the December meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:31 p.m.

The next scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission is November 1, 2012, at 6:00 p.m.