

THE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW MEETING WAS HELD IN THE BASEMENT CONFERENCE ROOM AT CITY HALL ON MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1979 AT 7:30 P. M.

PRESENT: Mrs. Ruth Wadlington, Mrs. Lloyd Smith, Mrs. Charlotte Ramsey, Mr. John Farmer, Mr. Edward Lay, Mr. Warren Martin and Mr. Van Groll.

ABSENT: None

CITY OFFICIALS PRESENT: Mr. Frank Muse and Mr. Ron Higgins

The meeting was called to order by Mrs. Wadlington. The minutes of the February 21, 1979, meeting were read and approved by a 6 to 0 vote of the Board. Mr. Lay abstained from voting. With regard to paragraphs 6 and 7 on Page 3 of the minutes, Mr. Lay wanted the Board to understand that he had not asked the Board to delay a decision (on Queen Charlotte Square) until it heard his comments.

Mrs. Wadlington opened the discussion of Queen Charlotte Square by referring to her memo (dated March 6, 1979) that was sent to each Board Member. She reviewed the options that were presented in her memo. Mrs. Wadlington announced that she had received written comments from two Board Members, Mrs. Smith and Mr. Van Groll. These comments, she said, would be entered into the minutes of the meeting.

Mrs. Wadlington asked the Architect, Mr. Norris, if there was additional information to be presented to the Board in this case. Mr. Norris said that the new information had been available in his office. Several Board members indicated that they had seen the new material in Mr. Norris' office.

Mrs. Wadlington asked Mrs. Smith to read her comments to the Board.

Mrs. Wadlington expressed her appreciation for the excellent presentation by Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. Wadlington then read Mr. Van Groll's comments to the Board and for the record.

Mr. Farmer addressed the Board with the following comments.

"Referring to the Board of Architectural Review's memo to the Planning Commission, dated January 5, 1979, (which is the format for the comments by Mrs. Smith and Mr. Van Groll) I am still troubled by concept #3 on Page 1. I find that the design, while much improved, is still lacking in the area of Architectural Concept, especially as it relates to its environment. By and large, it does not have a feeling similar to its surrounding neighbors.

"For a case in point, one can look at the Towers Medical Building - a seven story building near the University Virginia Hospital - and in the same view see the 2½ or 3 story, older brick buildings housing antique shops and the like, across the Street on West Main. These buildings (the new and the old) bear no relationship to each other. I'm afraid that the results will be quite the same if Queen Charlotte Square (as currently designed) is built in the Historic District.

THE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW MEETING WAS HELD IN THE BASEMENT CONFERENCE ROOM AT CITY HALL ON MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1979 AT 7:30 P. M.

PRESENT: Mrs. Ruth Wadlington, Mrs. Lloyd Smith, Mrs. Charlotte Ramsey, Mr. John Farmer, Mr. Edward Lay, Mr. Warren Martin and Mr. Van Groll.

ABSENT: None

CITY OFFICIALS PRESENT: Mr. Frank Muse and Mr. Ron Higgins

The meeting was called to order by Mrs. Wadlington. The minutes of the February 21, 1979, meeting were read and approved by a 6 to 0 vote of the Board. Mr. Lay abstained from voting. With regard to paragraphs 6 and 7 on Page 3 of the minutes, Mr. Lay wanted the Board to understand that he had not asked the Board to delay a decision (on Queen Charlotte Square) until it heard his comments.

Mrs. Wadlington opened the discussion of Queen Charlotte Square by referring to her memo (dated March 6, 1979) that was sent to each Board Member. She reviewed the options that were presented in her memo. Mrs. Wadlington announced that she had received written comments from two Board Members, Mrs. Smith and Mr. Van Groll. These comments, she said, would be entered into the minutes of the meeting.

Mrs. Wadlington asked the Architect, Mr. Norris, if there was additional information to be presented to the Board in this case. Mr. Norris said that the new information had been available in his office. Several Board members indicated that they had seen the new material in Mr. Norris' office.

Mrs. Wadlington asked Mrs. Smith to read her comments to the Board.

Mrs. Wadlington expressed her appreciation for the excellent presentation by Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. Wadlington then read Mr. Van Groll's comments to the Board and for the record.

Mr. Farmer addressed the Board with the following comments.

"Referring to the Board of Architectural Review's memo to the Planning Commission, dated January 5, 1979, (which is the format for the comments by Mrs. Smith and Mr. Van Groll) I am still troubled by concept #3 on Page 1. I find that the design, while much improved, is still lacking in the area of Architectural Concept, especially as it relates to its environment. By and large, it does not have a feeling similar to its surrounding neighbors.

"For a case in point, one can look at the Towers Medical Building - a seven story building near the University Virginia Hospital - and in the same view see the 2½ or 3 story, older brick buildings housing antique shops and the like, across the Street on West Main. These buildings (the new and the old) bear no relationship to each other. I'm afraid that the results will be quite the same if Queen Charlotte Square (as currently designed) is built in the Historic District.

"Specifically, with reference to the 16 Savannah Criteria, I find the building (Queen Charlotte Square) acceptable as regards criteria #7, #8, #9, #13 and #14, but deficient in the other 11 categories.

"While I strongly support the use of this property for living units and shops (or offices) in combination, I do not think that the building presented to us tonight is appropriate in the Historic District. It is my intention, therefore, to vote against it."

Following Mr. Farmer's comments, Mr. Lay addressed the Board.

Mr. Martin reminded the Board of his position in this case. He felt that Queen Charlotte Square is appropriate, and was confident that more details would be forthcoming for the Board's consideration. Mr. Martin said that he liked the differences in scale on the various facades, and that he liked the way the building changed as "you go around it". He felt that the architect had given "a good deal of thought to the concept." I can't find much wrong with it, he said.

Mrs. Ramsey made a motion to grant the Certificate of Appropriateness, subject to working out the brick and bonding details for approval. Mr. Martin seconded the motion.

Mrs. Wadlington said that the brick detailing along with the size and mass of the structure, particularly as viewed from High Street, were her main concerns. She worried about the building's effect on High Street, one of the major Streets in the Historic District.

There was no further discussion. The Board voted on Mrs. Ramsey's motion as follows:

In Favor: Mrs. Ramsey, Mr. Martin.
Against: Mrs. Smith, Mr. Farmer, Mr. Lay, Mr. Van Groll.
Abstain: Mrs. Wadlington.

Mrs. Smith made a motion to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Van Groll offered a second to the motion. There was no discussion. The Board voted on Mrs. Smith's motion as follows:

In Favor: Mrs. Smith, Mr. Farmer, Mr. Lay, Mr. Van Groll.
Against: Mrs. Ramsey, Mr. Martin.
Abstain: Mrs. Wadlington.

The Board of Architectural Review denied the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Queen Charlotte Square.

The Board set March 21, 1979 as its next meeting date.

There was some general discussion about possible changes to the Zoning Ordinance as regards set backs in the Historic District. Possible extension of the Historic District at some future date was discussed also.

Mr. Lay reported on his work with the Landmarks Commission.

Mrs. Wadlington commended the Board for its hard work in the Queen Charlotte Square case.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 P. M.

Respectfully submitted,

John B. Farmer, Jr.
Secretary

* See attached Comments on Plans for Queen Charlotte Square by Ashlin W. Smith, Theo van Groll and K. Edward Lay.

Minutes

Board of Architectural Review

Monday, ~~February~~^{March} 12, 1979

7:30 p.m.

Basement Conference Room

Present: Mrs. Wadlington, Mrs. Smith,
Mrs. Ramsey, Mr. Farmer, Mr.
Lay, Mr. Martin, Mr. VanGroll.

Absent: none

City Officials Present: Mr. Frank Muse and
Mr. Ron Higgins

The meeting was called to order by Mrs. Wadlington. The minutes of the February 21, 1979, meeting were read and approved by a 6 to 0 vote of the Board. Mr. Lay abstained from voting. With regard to paragraphs 6 and 7 on page 3 of the minutes, Mr. Lay wanted the Board to understand that he had not asked the Board to delay a decision (on Queen Charlotte Square) until it heard his comments.

Mrs. Wadlington opened the discussion of Queen Charlotte Square by referring to her Memo (dated March 6, 1979) that was sent to each Board member. She reviewed the options that were presented in her memo. Mrs. Wadlington announced that she had received written comments from ^{two} Board Members, Mrs. Smith and Mr. van Groll. These comments, she said, would be entered into the minutes of the meeting.

Mrs. Wadlington asked the architect, Mr. Norris, if there was additional information to be presented to the Board in this case. Mr. Norris said that the new information had been available in his office. Several Board members indicated that they had seen the new material in Mr. Norris' office.

Mrs. Wadlington asked Mrs. Smith to read her comments to the Board.

(3)

Mrs. Wadlington expressed her appreciation for the excellent presentation by Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. Wadlington then read Mr. Van Groll's comments to the Board, and for the record.

~~Ch. 2~~ (9)

Mr. Farmer addressed the Board with the following comments.

"Referring to the Board of Architectural Review's memo to the Planning Commission, dated January 5, 1979, (which is the format for the comments by Mrs. Smith and Mr. van Groll) I am still troubled by Concept # 3 on page 1. I find that the design, while much improved, is still lacking in the area of Architectural Concept, especially as it relates to its environment. By and large, it does not have a feeling similar to its surrounding neighbors.

"For a ~~similar~~ case in point, one can look at the Towers Medical Building — a seven story building near the U. Va. hospital — and in the same view see the $2\frac{1}{2}$ or 3 story, older brick buildings housing antique shops and the like, across the street on West Main. These buildings (the new and the old) bear no

5

relationships to each other. I'm afraid that the results will be quite the same if Queen Charlotte Square (as currently designed) is built in the Historic District.

"Specifically, with reference to the 16 Savannah Criteria, I find the building (Queen Charlotte Square) acceptable as regards Criteria #7, #8, #9, #13 and #14, but deficient in the other 11 categories.

"While I strongly support the use of this property for living units and shops (or offices) in combination, I do not think that the building presented to us tonight is appropriate in the Historic District. It is my intention, therefore, to vote against it."

Following Mr. Farmer's comments, Mr. Lay addressed the Board.

Mr. Martin reminded the Board of his position in this case. He felt that Queen Charlotte Square is appropriate, and was confident that more details would be forthcoming for ~~the~~ the Board's consideration. Mr. Martin said that he liked the differences in scale on the various facades, and that he liked the way ~~that~~ the building changed as "you go around it." He felt that the architect had given "a good deal of thought to the concept." I can't find much wrong with it, he said.

Mrs. Ramsey made a motion to grant the Certificate of Appropriateness, subject to working out the brick and bonding details for approval. Mr. Martin seconded the motion.

Mrs. Waddington said that the brick detailing along with the size and mass of the structure, particularly as viewed

⑦

from High Street, were her main concerns. She worried about the building's effect on High Street, one of the major streets in the Historic District. ~~There~~

There was no further discussion. The Board voted on Mrs. Ramsey's ~~most~~ motion as follows:

In favor: Mrs. Ramsey, Mr. Martin.
Against: Mrs. Smith, Mr. Farmer,
Mr. Lay, Mr. van Groll.
Abstain: Mrs. Wadlington.

Mrs. Smith made a motion to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness. ~~The~~ Mr. van Groll offered a second to the motion. There was no discussion. The Board voted on Mrs. Smith's motion as follows:

In favor: Mrs. Smith, Mr. Farmer,
Mr. Lay, Mr. van Groll.
Against: Mrs. Ramsey, Mr. Martin.
Abstain: Mrs. Wadlington.

The Board of Architectural Review denied the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Queen Charlotte Square.

The Board set March 21, 1979, as its next meeting date.

There was some general discussion about possible changes to the Zoning Ordinance ~~and~~ as ~~it~~ regards setbacks in the Historic District. Possible extension of the Historic District at some future date was discussed also.

Mr. Lay reported on his work with the Landmarks Commission.

Mrs. Wadlington commended the Board for its hard work in the Queen Charlotte Square case.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, John B. Farmer Sr.

THE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW MEETING WAS HELD IN THE BASEMENT CONFERENCE ROOM AT CITY HALL ON MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1979 AT 7:30 P. M.

PRESENT: Mrs. Ruth Wadlington, Mrs. Lloyd Smith, Mrs. Charlotte Ramsey, Mr. John Farmer, Mr. Edward Lay, Mr. Warren Martin and Mr. Van Groll.

ABSENT: None

CITY OFFICIALS PRESENT: Mr. Frank Muse and Mr. Ron Higgins

The meeting was called to order by Mrs. Wadlington. The minutes of the February 21, 1979, meeting were read and approved by a 6 to 0 vote of the Board. Mr. Lay abstained from voting. With regard to paragraphs 6 and 7 on Page 3 of the minutes, Mr. Lay wanted the Board to understand that he had not asked the Board to delay a decision (on Queen Charlotte Square) until it heard his comments.

Mrs. Wadlington opened the discussion of Queen Charlotte Square by referring to her memo (dated March 6, 1979) that was sent to each Board Member. She reviewed the options that were presented in her memo. Mrs. Wadlington announced that she had received written comments from two Board Members, Mrs. Smith and Mr. Van Groll. These comments, she said, would be entered into the minutes of the meeting.

Mrs. Wadlington asked the Architect, Mr. Norris, if there was additional information to be presented to the Board in this case. Mr. Norris said that the new information had been available in his office. Several Board members indicated that they had seen the new material in Mr. Norris' office.

Mrs. Wadlington asked Mrs. Smith to read her comments to the Board.

Mrs. Wadlington expressed her appreciation for the excellent presentation by Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. Wadlington then read Mr. Van Groll's comments to the Board and for the record.

Mr. Farmer addressed the Board with the following comments.

"Referring to the Board of Architectural Review's memo to the Planning Commission, dated January 5, 1979, (which is the format for the comments by Mrs. Smith and Mr. Van Groll) I am still troubled by concept #3 on Page 1. I find that the design, while much improved, is still lacking in the area of Architectural Concept, especially as it relates to its environment. By and large, it does not have a feeling similar to its surrounding neighbors.

"For a case in point, one can look at the Towers Medical Building - a seven story building near the University Virginia Hospital - and in the same view see the 2½ or 3 story, older brick buildings housing antique shops and the like, across the Street on West Main. These buildings (the new and the old) bear no relationship to each other. I'm afraid that the results will be quite the same if Queen Charlotte Square (as currently designed) is built in the Historic District.

"Specifically, with reference to the 16 Savannah Criteria, I find the building (Queen Charlotte Square) acceptable as regards criteria #7, #8, #9, #13 and #14, but deficient in the other 11 categories.

"While I strongly support the use of this property for living units and shops (or offices) in combination, I do not think that the building presented to us tonight is appropriate in the Historic District. It is my intention, therefore, to vote against it."

Following Mr. Farmer's comments, Mr. Lay addressed the Board.

Mr. Martin reminded the Board of his position in this case. He felt that Queen Charlotte Square is appropriate, and was confident that more details would be forthcoming for the Board's consideration. Mr. Martin said that he liked the differences in scale on the various facades, and that he liked the way the building changed as "you go around it". He felt that the architect had given "a good deal of thought to the concept." I can't find much wrong with it, he said.

Mrs. Ramsey made a motion to grant the Certificate of Appropriateness, subject to working out the brick and bonding details for approval. Mr. Martin seconded the motion.

Mrs. Wadlington said that the brick detailing along with the size and mass of the structure, particularly as viewed from High Street, were her main concerns. She worried about the building's effect on High Street, one of the major Streets in the Historic District.

There was no further discussion. The Board voted on Mrs. Ramsey's motion as follows:

In Favor: Mrs. Ramsey, Mr. Martin.
Against: Mrs. Smith, Mr. Farmer, Mr. Lay, Mr. Van Groll.
Abstain: Mrs. Wadlington.

Mrs. Smith made a motion to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Van Groll offered a second to the motion. There was no discussion. The Board voted on Mrs. Smith's motion as follows:

In Favor: Mrs. Smith, Mr. Farmer, Mr. Lay, Mr. Van Groll.
Against: Mrs. Ramsey, Mr. Martin.
Abstain: Mrs. Wadlington.

The Board of Architectural Review denied the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Queen Charlotte Square.

The Board set March 21, 1979 as its next meeting date.

There was some general discussion about possible changes to the Zoning Ordinance as regards set backs in the Historic District. Possible extension of the Historic District at some future date was discussed also.

Mr. Lay reported on his work with the Landmarks Commission.

Mrs. Wadlington commended the Board for its hard work in the Queen Charlotte Square case.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 P. M.

Respectfully submitted,

John B. Farmer, Jr.
Secretary

* See attached Comments on Plans for Queen Charlotte Square by Ashlin W. Smith, Theo van Groll and K. Edward Lay.

THE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW WAS HELD IN THE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS AT CITY HALL ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 1979 AT 7:30 P. M.

Present: Mrs. Wadlington, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Farmer, Mr. Van Groll

Absent: Mrs. Ramsey, Mr. Lay, Mr. Martin

City Officials Present: None

The meeting was called to order by Mrs. Wadlington. Consideration of the minutes of the previous meeting was deferred until the April meeting.

Mr. Van Groll asked the Board to consider placing a moratorium on all BAR decisions pending a discussion with City Council. He noted that the Board's recent decision on Queen Charlotte Square had been overridden by Council on the basis of economics rather than aesthetics. In light of these events he felt that City Council should meet with the BAR to discuss the future of the Historic District and the Board's role in it.

Mrs. Wadlington and Mrs. Smith discussed the differences and the similarities among the various City Boards and Commissions.

Mr. Van Groll reminded the BAR that it, unlike other Boards, deals with aesthetics as its major function.

Mr. Farmer said that City Council and the Board of Architectural Review would both benefit by a joint meeting. He felt that the role of the BAR should be discussed frankly and in detail.

Mrs. Smith reviewed the specified make-up of the Board. She felt that the BAR has a rather specialized area of concern, requiring some knowledge of the visual arts. The ordinance calls on the Board to "advise" the City in this field, she said.

Mr. Van Groll expressed the opinion that the Ordinance needs additional strength. He suggested that Board members work up questions and recommendations for use in the proposed meeting with the Council. He asked if City Council agrees with our use of the Savannah Criteria.

Mr. Farmer commented on the often heard statement: "I don't know much about art and architecture, but I know what I like." He said too often people think of these matters in terms of taste and opinion.

Mrs. Smith reminded the Board that, in the arts, there are basic things that apply universally. Otherwise, she said, why do people study in the art schools?

Mr. Van Groll referred to the many historic towns and cities in Europe, and to a lesser extent in the United States, that are tightly controlled. Why do people travel great distances to see these places? he asked. Because people are interested in the past, and in a quality of life that is too often missing in the cities of today, he said.

Mrs. Wadlington asked to hear the Board's pleasure with regard to a meeting with City Council.

Mr. Van Groll made a motion to have the BAR make no further decisions pending clarification of the Board's role in the preservation of the Historic District. Mrs. Smith seconded the motion. Discussion followed. The motion was amended to read: The Board of Architectural Review requests a meeting with City Council to discuss the future of the Historic District. It is hesitant to make further decisions in light of its uncertainty as to the role of the BAR in the preservation of the Historic District.

The motion, as amended, passed on a 3 to 1 vote of the Board. Mrs. Smith, Mr. Farmer and Mr. Van Groll voted for the motion. Mrs. Wadlington voted against it.

Mrs. Wadlington announced that she would write a letter to the Mayor.

Mrs. Wadlington presented a sign application from Mr. Frank Buck. Before considering the sign, the Board stated that more information with regard to the letters, materials and color was needed. Mrs. Smith observed that some advance notification of sign applications was essential to proper consideration of the application.

There was no further business to come before the Board. The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

John B. Farmer, Jr.
Secretary

Minutes

Board of Architectural Review
~~Basement Conference Room~~ City Council
Chambers
March 21, 1979
7:30 p.m.

Present: Mrs. Wadlington, Mrs. Smith,
Mr. Farmer, Mr. Van Groll

Absent: Mrs. Ramsey, Mr. Lay, Mr.
Martin

City Officials Present: NONE

The meeting was called to order by Mrs. Wadlington. Consideration of the minutes of the previous meeting was deferred until the April meeting.

Mr. van Groll asked the Board to consider placing a moratorium on all BAR decisions pending a discussion with City Council. He noted that the Board's recent decision on Queen Charlotte Square had been overridden by Council on the basis of economics rather than aesthetics. ~~The BAR and City Council need to discuss~~ In light of these events, he felt that City Council should

meet with the BAR to discuss the future of the Historic District and the Board's role in it.

Mrs. Wadlington and Mrs. Smith discussed the differences and the similarities among the various City Boards and Commissions.

Mr. van Groot reminded the ~~Board~~ BAR that it, unlike other Boards, deals with aesthetics as its major function.

Mr. Farmer said that City Council and the Board of Architectural Review would both benefit by a joint meeting. He felt that the role of the BAR should be discussed frankly and in detail.

Mrs. Smith reviewed the specified make-up of the Board. She felt that the BAR has a rather specialized area of concern, requiring some knowledge of the visual arts. The ordinance ~~states~~ the Board to

"advise" the City in this field, she said.

Mr. van Gool expressed the opinion that the Ordinance needs additional strength. He suggested that Board members ~~should~~ work up questions and recommendations for use in the ~~prop~~ proposed meeting with the Council. He asked if City Council agrees with ~~our~~ our use of the Savannah criteria.

Mr. Farmer commented on the often heard statement: "I don't know much about art and architecture, but I know what I like." He said ~~that~~ too often people think of these matters in terms of taste and opinion.

Mrs. Smith reminded the Board that, in the arts, there are ~~basically~~ basic things that apply universally. Otherwise, she said, why do people study ~~art~~ ~~and~~ in the art schools?

Mr. van Groll referred to the many historic towns and cities in Europe, and to a lesser extent in the United States, that are tightly controlled. Why do people travel great distances to see these places? he asked. Because people are interested ~~and concerned~~ in the past, and in a quality of life that is too often missing in the cities of today, he said.

Mrs. Wadlington asked to hear the Board's pleasure with regard to a meeting with City Council.

Mr. van Groll made a motion to have the BAR make no further decisions ~~until~~ pending clarification of the Board's role in the preservation of the Historic District. Mrs. Smith seconded the motion. Discussion followed. The motion was amended to read: The Board of Architectural Review requests a meeting with City Council to discuss the future of the Historic District. It is hesitant

To make further decisions in light of ~~the~~^{its} uncertainty as to the role of the BAR in ^{the} preservation of the Historic District.

The motion, as amended, passed on a 3 to 1 vote of the Board. Mrs. Smith, Mr. Farmer and Mr. vanBroll voted for the motion. Mrs. Wadlington voted against it.

Mrs. Wadlington announced that she would write a letter to the mayor.

Mrs. Wadlington presented a sign application from Mr. Frank Buck. Before considering the sign, the Board stated that more information with regard to ^{the} letters, materials and color was needed. Mrs. Smith ~~said that~~ ~~reminded~~ observed that some advance notification of sign applications was essential to proper consideration of the application.

BOD page 6

There was no further business to come before the Board. The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

John B. Farmer, Sr
Secretary

Mr. Van Groll made a motion to have the BAR make no further decisions pending clarification of the Board's role in the preservation of the Historic District. Mrs. Smith seconded the motion. Discussion followed. The motion was amended to read: The Board of Architectural Review requests a meeting with City Council to discuss the future of the Historic District. It is hesitant to make further decisions in light of its uncertainty as to the role of the BAR in the preservation of the Historic District.

The motion, as amended, passed on a 3 to 1 vote of the Board. Mrs. Smith, Mr. Farmer and Mr. Van Groll voted for the motion. Mrs. Wadlington voted against it.

Mrs. Wadlington announced that she would write a letter to the Mayor.

Mrs. Wadlington presented a sign application from Mr. Frank Buck. Before considering the sign, the Board stated that more information with regard to the letters, materials and color was needed. Mrs. Smith observed that some advance notification of sign applications was essential to proper consideration of the application.

There was no further business to come before the Board. The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

John B. Farmer, Jr.
Secretary