

THE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW WAS HELD IN THE BASEMENT CONFERENCE ROOM AT CITY HALL ON WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1978 AT 2:00 P. M.

Board Members Present: Mrs. Wadlington, Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Ramsey, Mr. Farmer, Mr. Lay, Mr. Martin and Mr. Van Groll.

City Officials present: Mr. Muse, Mr. Huja and Mr. Higgins.

The meeting was called to order by Mrs. Wadlington. She announced that the matter before the Board at this meeting is the revised design for Queen Charlotte Square. The drawings, illustrating the revised design, were distributed to the Board members just before the meeting was called to order.

Mr. Huja announced that he needs the Board's comments by December 28, 1978, in order to send out his package to the Planning Commissioners twelve days prior to the January 9, 1979, meeting of the Planning Commission. He did agree, however, that December 29, 1978, would be alright.

A representation of the Architect's Office presented and explained the revised design. He pointed out the various design changes that have occurred since the presentation to the Planning Commission earlier this month. Several Board members asked questions related to the changes - points of clarification.

Mr. Lay asked if a revised model was available to the Board for review. The architects representative said no. (The old model was not available at this meeting.) Mrs. Wadlington asked if the swimming pool is still in the same location. Yes.

Mr. Lay then asked a series of questions, all of which were answered by Mr. Norris, the Architect:

1. Height of building? 75 feet.
2. Number of units? 90 units.
3. Can the number of units be reduced? No. The economics of the situation will not justify a reduction in number of units.
4. Since the High Street side has been raised by one floor, has any consideration been given to the impact of the shadow cast by the building? Yes. There will be little or no shadow in the interior courtyard, in the winter. The building is no taller than the trees on High Street. The shadow cast by the building on High Street will be no greater than that caused by the trees.

Mrs. Wadlington asked about the height of the small projections on the High Street side. Mr. Norris replied that all three were 2 stories in height.

Mr. Lay said that, in his opinion, the 2 story height on High Street is O. K. He liked the idea of recalling the roofscapes in the area of the Historic District. He felt that a continuation of the plaza arcades will be an improvement. But, he said relating to the surrounding buildings is difficult without a model. Mr. Lay and Mr. Norris then discussed the height of the High Street projections - 2 stories versus 3 stories.

Mr. Van Groll stated that the Board of Architectural Review is being kicked around by the scheduling of reviews and comments, without allowing sufficient time for this process. He asked, "Why should we review this project without a model of the new design"? We shouldn't review this scheme until the presentation is complete", he said. He noted that the Planning Commission will need a new model for its consideration of the project. We shouldn't set a precedent of reviewing incomplete presentations, he said.

Mr. Norris disagreed with the requests for a new model. We are trying to address the concerns of the BAR, he said, but a new model is unnecessary.

Mr. Martin reminded the Board of his comments made at the last meeting of the Planning Commission. He repeated many of his comments. "There has been no change in concept," he said. "The special permit should be granted."

Mr. Van Groll asked why the Planning Commission sent Queen Charlotte Square back to the BAR, if it wasn't for a serious review. He stated again that he was opposed to reviewing it without a model.

Mrs. Smith said, "there has been a change in the concept. We are now faced with two building parts that are the same height. The massing is different; consequently, there are new considerations". She stated that a new model would be very helpful in reviewing the big building blocks and the placement on the site.

Mr. Norris said, "all of these changes are being used against me." He stated that we should push ahead to get the Special Permit, and then discuss architectural detailing. "There will be plenty of time between getting the Special Permit and the Building Permit", he said, to build another model and talk about details." He told the BAR that he is getting pressure from his client, from the Planning Commission and from the Board of Architectural Review, and stated that he is trying to meet the demands of all three parties. "The delays," he said, are causing problems for me."

Mrs. Wadlington stated that she likes some aspects of the new design better than the previous one.

Mr. Norris reviewed some of the changes that have been made and his reasons for making them. He noted that the building and its occupants will be an asset to downtown Charlottesville.

Mrs. Ramsay felt that discussion of the new design would be possible and, in fact, desirable at this time. The Planning Commission could then be advised of the new comments according to its wishes.

Mr. Van Groll reminded the BAR of the hurdles that must be cleared by any design, and by any designer. He recognized that Mr. Norris is in a difficult position, but certainly not an impossible position. He disagreed with Mr. Norris by saying that the design of Queen Charlotte Square is at a very important stage right now, even critical as far as the Board is concerned.

"While it is true that the project must come back to us for a Certificate of Appropriateness," he said, "we must question and review it thoroughly now, before the final specifications are written, and before the contractor (who, most likely, will apply for the Building Permit) is hired. Otherwise, it will be too late." He again stated that the Board should insist on design information that is complete, up-to-date, and appropriate for the size of the project. He expressed concern about future projects of this type.

Mr. Martin disagreed with Mr. Van Groll. He reminded the Board of the various stages of approval that any project must go through.

Mrs. Ramsay asked if this review was a courtesy to the Planning Commission.

Mrs. Wadlington stated that the Planning Commission will act on Jan. 9, 1979. "The Commissioners need our guidance," she said.

Mrs. Smith expressed concern with the building masses and the sameness in height. Her first reaction, she said, was to shift the blocks around and try changes in the site design. "I am afraid," she said, if we say yes to the site plan now, that we may have a different opinion later when we see it in model form."

Mr. Norris spoke about the practicalities of the design. "The height is fixed"; he said. The building is a practical building. We are trying to get the best building for Charlottesville." Mr. Norris stated that he has done 15,000 or 20,000 living units in his career. "People will not buy a monument," he said.

Mrs. Smith said she is not necessarily suggesting that the number of living units be reduced. "We are discussing aesthetic considerations as well as the practicalities of building," she said. Mrs. Smith said that she would like to see other concepts tried on the site.

Mr. Norris responded by saying that he had tried all sorts of concepts — "X" shaped buildings, "Y" shaped buildings and many others. The "L" shape works best on this site," he said. As to the shift in height, Mr. Norris said that he had made a mistake in the earlier designs. Given the height restrictions, he again said that the "L" shaped building is the best solution.

Mr. Van Groll commented that the height restriction is a mistake in itself.

Mrs. Wadlington suggested that the Towers Building, near U. Va. Hospital, is about the same height as the proposed Queen Charlotte Square.

Mr. Van Groll said again that the height restriction is wrong. "What will be the impact of this tall building standing so close to the synogogue and the Catholic Church?" he asked.

Mr. Norris commented that the synogogue will probably sell its property and move to the suburbs. "In this case, there would be no impact," he said.

Mr. Van Groll replied, "that's exactly why the Queen Charlotte Square project is so important. "It may be the first of several large projects here in Charlottesville. "It should be designed carefully and reviewed thoroughly. It will set a precedent."

Mr. Norris noted that the City owns a large portion of the block now occupied by the Synagogue. "It is unlikely that the entire block will be developed," he said.

Mr. Farmer stated that he had a few general comments to make. "first of all, he said, "I am not prepared to review this design today. "We just got the drawings minutes before this meeting started. Trying to review them today would be a disservice to the project and to the City. We should take the time that the Ordinance allows us for the Review process."

Mr. Farmer continued with the following comments: The burden is on the developer and his representatives to demonstrate to the City why this project is worthy of a Special Permit. A Special Permit is just that - special. It is a privilege, and not a right. In applying for a Special Permit, the developer should feel that a complete and thorough presentation of the design is essential to the success of the project. We have not seen a complete presentation. A new model is necessary.

The Zoning Ordinance, of which the Historic District Controls are a part, is not necessarily intended to allow property owners maximum profit from the use of their property - a reasonable profit, yes, but not necessarily maximum possible profit. It is said that Queen Charlotte Square must have 90 or 91 living units to make it economically viable. Does that mean 90 or 91 units for maximum profit, or reasonable profit? This question needs answering, in detail.

If less number of units were planned, a lower building could be considered. This would help, as Mrs. Smith has suggested, achieve other concepts that might be more appropriate. It seems to me that a lower building should be considered.

Mr. Lay said that he agreed with Mr. Farmer's comments, with one exception. "My remarks, he said, "will not be any different several days from now than they are at this moment." However, he noted that the volumetrics of the project have changed with the introduction of a new design. "While the building seems to respond in some ways to its surroundings, it is difficult to evaluate it in a three-dimensional sense without being able to see the buildings around it", he said. A model and more drawings on the High Street side will help, in his opinion. Mr. Lay stated that the context of a building does make a difference. A film or slide presentation of the streets surrounding the project would be extremely helpful. Mr. Lay said that he had made this suggestion during one of the first meetings concerned with Queen Charlotte Square.

Mr. Norris responded by saying that he had offered (and, in fact, planned) a video-tape presentation. Mr. Lay, he stated, said at the time that this was unnecessary. Mr. Lay disagreed that he had ever made such a statement. Mrs. Wadlington supported Mr. Lay.

Mr. Lay said that Concept #1, as defined in the Board's report to the Planning Commission, has not changed. Concept #2, he said, should address the question "Has the mass changed sufficiently to alter our previous comments?" The comments listed under Concept #3 may change as the design changes, according to Mr. Lay.

Mr. Martin made a motion to accept the earlier comments as still being valid. Mr. Lay seconded the motion. Discussion followed.

Mr. Lay said again that he could not see the building in its context for lack of a model.

Mr. Van Groll said that if this motion passes the whole system is falling apart. "We are compromising ourselves, he said "and the entire process of design review." He reminded the Board that the new design had just that afternoon been made available for consideration.

Mr. Farmer said that he had come to the Basement Conference Room on Tuesday, hoping to see the new drawings. They were not posted in advance of the meeting as had been the case earlier for the first design, he said.

Mrs. Ramsay stated that the new material should have been sent out to the Board members in advance of today's meeting. "We should have material to review without having to seek it out," she said. "We volunteer our time to serve on the Review Board, and it shouldn't be wasted".

Mr. Norris said that if the Board would give him three days after the first of January, he would have a model ready for review.

Mr. Martin said that he felt a new model is unnecessary. "The building in its context hasn't changed that much," he said.

A discussion regarding the time limits, as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance, followed. It was noted that if the BAR could prepare its comments for the Planning Commission on Jan. 4, 1979, that date would fall twelve days prior to Jan. 16, 1979 - a possible Planning Commission meeting date. It was also noted that Jan. 4, 1979, falls fifteen days after today's date, the date that the BAR received the new design for Queen Charlotte Square. Fifteen days is the exact amount of time that the Ordinance allows for the Board's review.

Mr. Lay offered a motion as a substitute to the motion on the floor. The substitute motion was stated as follows:

The Board of Architectural Review feels the need for a complete package of material, including a new model, illustrating the new design for Queen Charlotte Square, in order to comment on the change in massing of the project. The Board is willing to meet again at 7:30 p.m. on Jan. 4, 1979, to consider the complete package of information from the Architect. The Board understands that this proposed meeting, and its resulting comments, may affect the Planning Commission's schedule for consideration of Queen Charlotte Square. Without a meeting on Jan. 4, 1979, the Board of Archi-

tectural Review cannot comment on the change made to the building. The Board will not delay its comments following the Jan. 4th meeting. If the Architect's package is complete (model and drawings all agreeing with each other) the Board will issue its comments immediately on that date.

Mrs. Ramsay offered a second to the motion. The substitute motion passed on a unanimous vote of the Board.

Mr. Van Groll asked the Board to comment on a proposed project that is planned for Hedge Street, between First Street and Second Street. He explained that five apartments are being proposed facing Hedge Street. In order to fit five apartments on the site, he said a zoning variance is necessary to take 20 feet away from the rear yard of the house at the corner of First Street and Hedge Street. This variance application is being heard before the Board of Zoning Appeals on Dec. 21, 1978. Mr. Van Groll expressed his concerns in this matter. Mr. Muse offered a more detailed explanation of the requested zoning variance. Mr. Martin said that, in his opinion, the Board of Architectural Review did not have enough information to make a comment one way or the other.

Most Board members seemed to agree, and no comment was made on this matter.

There was no further business to come before the Board. The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p. m.

Respectfully submitted,

John B. Farmer, Jr.
Secretary

Chairman

Minutes

(1)

Board of Architectural Review

December 20, 1978

2:00 p.m.

City Hall -

Location: Basement Conference Room

Board Members Present: Mrs. Wadlington,
Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Ransay, Mr. Farmer,
Mr. Lay, Mr. Martin, Mr. van Groll.

City Officials present: Mr. Muse, Mr. Huija
Mr. Higgins (?)

The meeting was called to order by Mrs. Wadlington. She announced that the matter before the Board at this meeting is the revised design for Queen Charlotte Square. The drawings, illustrating the revised design, were distributed to the Board members ~~at the meeting~~ just before the meeting was called to order.

Mr. Huija announced that he needs the Board's comments by Dec. 28, 1978, in order to send out his package to the Planning Commissioners twelve days prior to the Jan. 9, 1979, meeting of the Planning Commission. He did agree, however, that Dec. 29, 1978.

would be alright.

A representative of the Architect's office presented and explained the revised design. He pointed out the various design ~~refinements~~ changes that have occurred since the presentation to the Planning Commission earlier this month. ~~There were~~ several Board members asked questions related to the changes — points of clarification.

Mr. Lay asked if a revised model was available to the Board for review. The architect's representative said no. (The old model was not available at this meeting.) Mrs. Waddington asked if the swimming pool is still in the same location.
Yes.

Mr. Lay then asked a series of questions, all of which were answered by Mr. Norris, the Architect:

- (1) Height of building? 75 feet.
- (2) Number of units? 90 units

(3)

(3) Can the number of units be reduced?
No. The economics of the situation will not justify a reduction in number of units.

(4) Since the High Street side has been raised by one floor, has any consideration been given to the impact of the shadow cast by the building? Yes. There will be little or no shadow in the interior courtyard, in the winter. The building is no taller than the trees on High Street. The shadow cast by the building on High Street will be no greater than that caused by the trees.

Mrs. Wadlington asked about the height of the small projections on the High Street side. Mr. Norris replied that all three were 2 stories in height.

Mr. Lay said that, in his opinion, the 2-story height on High Street is O.K. He liked the idea of recalling the roofscapes in the area of the

(4)

Historic District. He felt that a continuation of the Plaza arcades will ~~would~~ be an improvement. But, he said, relating to the surrounding buildings is difficult without a model. Mr. Lay and Mr. Norris then discussed the height of the High Street projections — 2 stories versus 3 stories.

8-11/2/72

Mr. van Groll stated that the ~~BAR~~ Board of Architectural Review is being kicked around by the scheduling of ~~Queen Charlotte~~ reviews and comments, without allowing sufficient time for this process. He asked, "Why should we review this project without a model of the new design?" We shouldn't review this scheme until the presentation is complete," he said. He noted that the Planning Commission will need a new model for its consideration of the project. We shouldn't set a precedent of reviewing ~~Mr. Norris~~ incomplete presentations, he said.

(5)

Mr. Norris disagreed with the requests for a new model. We are trying to address the concerns of the BAR, he said, but a new model is unnecessary.

Mr. Martin reminded the Board of his comments ~~at the~~ made at the last meeting of the Planning Commission. He repeated many of his comments. "There has been no change in concept," he said. "The special permit should be granted."

Mr. van Groll asked why the Planning Commission sent Queen Charlotte Square back to the BAR, if it wasn't for a serious review. He stated again that he was opposed to reviewing it without a model.

Mrs. Smith said, "There has been a change in the concept. We are now faced with two building parts that are the same height. The massing is different; consequently, there are new considerations." She stated that a new model would be very helpful in reviewing the big

(6)

building blocks and the placement on the site.

Mr. Davis said, "all of these changes are being used against me." He stated that we should push ahead to get the Special Permit, and then discuss architectural detailing. "There will ~~not~~ be plenty of time between getting the Special Permit and the Building Permit," he said, "to build another model and talk about details." He ~~also~~ told the BATZ that he is getting pressure from his client, from the Planning Commission and from the Board of Architectural Review, and stated that he is trying to meet the demands of all three parties. "The delays," he said, "are causing problems for me."

Mrs. Wadlington ~~said that~~ stated that she likes some aspects of the new design better than the previous one.

①

Mr. Norris reviewed some of the changes that have been made and his reasons for making them. He noted that the building and its occupants will be an asset to downtown Charlottesville.

Mrs. Ramsay felt that discussion of the new design would be possible and, in fact, desirable at this time. The Planning Commission could then be advised of the new comments according to ~~their~~ its wishes.

Mr. van Groll reminded the BAP of the hurdles that must be cleared by any design, and by any designer. He recognized that Mr. Norris is in a difficult position, but ~~certainly~~ certainly not an impossible position. He disagreed with Mr. Norris by saying that the design of Queen Charlotte Square is at a very important stage right now, even critical as ~~far as~~ far as the Board is concerned. "While it is true that the project must come back to us for a Certificate of

⑧

question and ~~that~~ Appropriateness," he said, "~~if~~ we must review it thoroughly ~~right~~ now, before the final specifications are written, and before the contractor (who, most likely, will apply for the Building Permit) is hired, otherwise, it will be too late." He again stated that the Board should insist on design information that is complete, up-to-date, and appropriate for the size of the project. He expressed ~~no~~ concern about future projects of this type.

Mr. Martin disagreed with Mr. van Groll. He reminded the Board of the various stages of approval that any project must go through.

Mrs. Ramsay asked if this review was a courtesy to the Planning Commission.

Mrs. Wadlington stated that the Planning Commission will act on Jan. 9, 1979. "The Commissioners need our guidance," she said.

9

Mrs. Smith expressed concern with the ~~was~~ building masses and the sameness in height. Her first reaction, she said, was to shift the blocks around and try changes in the site design. "I am afraid," ~~if we say yes to~~ she said, if we say yes to the site plan now, that we may have a different opinion later when we see it in model form."

Mr. Morris spoke about the practicalities of the design. "The height is fixed," he said. The building is a practical building. We are trying to get the best building for Charlottesville." Mr. Morris stated that he has done 15,000 or 20,000 living units in his career. "People will not buy a monument," he said.

Mrs. Smith said ~~that~~ she is not necessarily suggesting that the number of living units be reduced. "We are discussing aesthetic considerations as well as the practicalities of building," she said. Mrs. Smith said that she would like to see other concepts tried on the site.

Mr. Novins responded by saying that he had tried all sorts of concepts — "X" shaped buildings, "Y" shaped buildings and many others. "The "L" shape works best on this site," he said. As to the shift in height, Mr. Novins said that he had made a mistake in the earlier designs. Given the height restrictions, he again said that the "L" shaped building is the best solution.

Mr. van Groll commented that the height restriction is a mistake in itself.

Mrs. Wadlington suggested that the Towers Building, near U. Va. Hospital, is about the same height as the proposed Queen Charlotte Square.

Mr. van Groll ~~again~~ said again that the height restriction is wrong. "What will be the impact of this tall building standing so close to the Synagogue and the Catholic Church?" he asked.

Mr. Norris commented that the Synagogue will probably sell its property and move to the ~~suburbs~~ suburbs. ~~There will be no impact~~ "In this case, there would be no impact," he said.

Mr. van Broll replied, "that's exactly why the Queen Charlotte Square project is so important." It may be the first of several large projects here in Charlottesville. "It should be designed carefully and reviewed thoroughly. It will set a precedent."

Mr. Norris ~~also~~ noted that the City owns a large portion of the block now occupied by the Synagogue. "It is unlikely that the entire block will be developed," he said.

Mr. Farmer stated that he ~~would~~ had a few general comments to make. "First of all, he said, "I am not prepared to review this design today. We just got the drawings minutes before this meeting started. ~~today~~ Trying to review them today

would be a disservice to the project and to the City. We should take the time that the Ordinance allows us for the Review process."

(Discussion of Concepts?)

Mr. Farmer continued with the following comments: The burden is on the developer and his representatives to demonstrate to the City why this project is worthy of a Special Permit. A Special Permit is just that - special. It is a privilege, and not a right. In applying for a Special Permit, the developer should feel that a complete and thorough presentation of the design is essential to the success of the project. We have not seen a complete presentation. A new model is necessary.

The zoning Ordinance, of which the Historic District Controls are a part, is not necessarily intended to allow property owners maximum profit from the use of their

(13)

property — a reasonable profit, yes, ~~but~~ but not necessarily maximum possible profit. It is said that Queen Charlotte Square must have 90 or 91 living units to make it economically ~~profitable~~ viable. Does that mean 90 or 91 units for maximum profit, or reasonable profit? This question needs answering, in detail.

If less number of units were planned, a lower building could be considered. This would help, as Mrs. Smith has suggested, achieve other concepts that 'might' be more appropriate. It seems to me that a lower building should be considered.

Mr. Lay said that he agreed with Mr. Farmer's comments, with one exception. "My ~~comments~~ remarks, he said, "will not be any different several days from now than they are at this moment." However, he ~~is~~ noted that the volumetrics of the project have changed with the

introduction of a new design. "While the building seems to respond in some ways to its surroundings, it is difficult to evaluate it in a three-dimensional sense without being able to see the buildings ~~see~~ around it," he said. A model ~~will help~~ and more drawings on the High Street side will help, in his opinion. Mr. Lay stated that the context of a building does make a difference. A film or slide presentation of the streets surrounding the project ~~would~~ would be extremely helpful. Mr. Lay said that he had made this suggestion during one of the first meetings concerned with Queen Charlotte Square.

Mr. Norris responded by saying that he had offered (and, in fact, planned) a video-tape presentation. Mr. Lay, he stated, ~~had~~ said at the time that ~~this~~ this was unnecessary. Mr. Lay disagreed that he had ever made such a statement. Mrs. Washington supported Mr. Lay.

Mr. Lay said that Concept #1, as defined in the Board's report to the Planning Commission, has not changed. Concept #2, he said, should address the question "Has the mass changed sufficiently to alter our previous comments?" ~~There is insufficient information to discuss Concept~~ The Comments listed under Concept #3 may change as the design changes, according to Mr. Lay.

Mr. Martin made a motion to accept the earlier comments as still being valid. Mr. Lay seconded the motion. Discussion followed.

Mr. Lay said again that he could not see the building in its context for lack of a model.

Mr. Van Groll said that if this motion passes the whole system is falling apart. "We are compromising ourselves," he said "and the entire process of design review." He reminded

(16)

The Board that the new design had just that afternoon been made available ~~to~~ for consideration.

Mr. Farmer said that he had come to the Basement Conference room on Tuesday, hoping to see the new drawings. They were not posted in advance of the meeting as had been the case earlier for the first design, he said.

Mrs. Ramsay ^{stated} ~~noted~~ that the new material should have been sent out to the Board members in advance of ~~the~~ today's meeting. "We should have material to review without having to seek it out," she said. "We volunteer our time to serve on the Review Board, ~~we should be prepared to do our best~~" and it shouldn't be wasted."

Mr. Norris said that if the Board would give him three days after the first of January, he

(17)

would have a model ready for review.

Mr. Martin said that he felt ~~the~~ a new model is ~~the~~ unnecessary. "The building in its context hasn't changed that much," he said.

A discussion regarding the time limits, as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance, followed. It was noted that if the BAR could ~~write~~ ^{prepare} its comments ~~to the~~ ~~Board~~ for the Planning Commission on Jan. 4, 1979, that date would fall twelve days prior to Jan. 16, 1979 — a possible Planning Commission meeting date. It was also noted that Jan. 4, 1979, falls fifteen days after today's date, the date that the BAR received the new design for Queen Charlotte Square. Fifteen days is the exact amount of time that the Ordinance allows for the Board's review.

Mr. Lay offered a motion as a substitute to the motion on the floor.

substitute

(18)

The Motion was stated as follows:

The Board of Architectural Review feels the need for a complete package of material, including a new model, illustrating the new design for Queen Charlotte Square, in ~~otherwise, the Board cannot~~

order to comment on the ^{change in} massing of the project. The Board is willing to meet again at 7:30 p.m. on Jan. 4, 1979, to consider the complete package of information from the architect. The Board understands that this proposed meeting, and its resulting comments, may affect the Planning Commission's schedule for consideration of Queen Charlotte Square. Without a meeting on Jan. 4, 1979, the Board of Architectural Review cannot comment on the change made to the building. The Board will not delay its comments following the Jan. 4th meeting. If the architect's package is complete (model and drawings all agreeing with each other), the Board will issue its comments immediately on that date.

Mrs. Ramsay offered a second to the motion. The substitute motion passed on a unanimous vote of the Board.

Mr. van Groll asked the Board to comment on a proposed project that is planned for Hedge Street between First St. and Second St. He explained that five apartments are being proposed, facing Hedge Street. In order to fit five apartments on the site, he said, a ~~zoning~~ zoning variance is necessary to take 20 feet away from the rear yard of the house at the corner of First Street and Hedge Street. This variance application is being heard before the Board of Zoning Appeals on Dec. 21, 1978. Mr. van Groll expressed his concerns in this matter. ~~Mr.~~ Mr. Muse offered a more detailed explanation of the requested zoning variance. Mr. Martin said that, in his opinion, the Board of Architectural Review did not have enough information to make a comment ~~on~~ one way or the other.

(20)

Most Board members seemed to agree, and no comment was made in this matter.

There was no further business to come before the Board. The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

JOHN B. FARMER, JR
Secretary