



County of Albemarle
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT/PLANNING

Architectural Review Board

mmaliszewski@albemarle.org

434-296-5832 ext. 3276

FINAL ARB ACTION MEMO / MINUTES

Date: August 18, 2025

Time: 1:00 PM

Meeting Room: Lane Auditorium

Members:

Chris Henningsen, Chair: Present
Frank Hancock, Vice-Chair: Present
Frank Stoner: Present
Dade Van Der Werf: Present
Taro Matsuno: Present

Staff:

Margaret Maliszewski
Khris Taggart

CALL TO ORDER: Mr. Henningsen called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

DISCLOSURES: Mr. Stoner and Mr. Matsuno stated that they would recuse themselves from the Barnes Lumber item because their firms are involved in the project.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

CONSENT AGENDA:

a. **SDP-2025-00083: C'ville Community Church Initial Site Plan**

Location: 26 Pebble Drive

Proposal: To construct a new church campus in two phases.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representative: Chuck Rapp, Collins Engineering

Mr. Henningsen asked if any ARB member wanted to move the item off the consent agenda for discussion. No one did.

Motion: Mr. Henningsen moved to approve the consent agenda and forward the recommendations outlined in the staff report for the Initial Site Plan to the Agent for the Site Review Committee, as follows:

- Regarding requirements to satisfy the design guidelines as per § 18-30.6.4c(2), (3) and (5) and recommended conditions of initial plan approval:
 - The ARB recommends approval of the initial site plan with the following conditions:
 1. Revise the note on sheet 2 to clarify that the initial site plan is for both phases.
 2. Revise the site plan to clearly distinguish between the proposed improvements in Phases I and II.

3. Revise the site plan to label the required landscape buffer along the frontage.
- Regarding recommendations on the plan as it relates to the guidelines: None.
 - Regarding conditions to be satisfied prior to issuance of a grading permit: None
 - Architectural plans are required with the ARB final site plan submittal. Depending on the proposal, the ARB may require more than one review of the architectural design. Applicants are encouraged to take this into consideration when choosing when to submit the ARB final site plan application. ARB approval (a Certificate of Appropriateness) is required prior to final site plan approval.
 - Regarding the final site plan submittal:
A Certificate of Appropriateness is required prior to final site plan approval. The following items and all items on the ARB Final Site Plan Checklist must be addressed:
 1. Provide architectural drawings with the next submittal. The east elevation must be designed with suitable forms, detailing, and materials to ensure that it provides an appropriate front to the EC.
 2. Provide the specifications for the proposed window glass on the architectural drawings.
 3. Include the standard window glass note in the architectural drawings: Visible light transmittance (VLT) shall not drop below 40%. Visible light reflectance (VLR) shall not exceed 30%. Specifications on the proposed window glass should be submitted with the application for final review.
 4. If proposed, show the location of mechanical equipment (building- and ground-mounted) on the site and architectural plans, and show how it will be screened from the EC.
 5. Revise the site plan to specify whether fencing is proposed for the outdoor recreational area. Note that chain link fencing is not an acceptable type of fence.
 6. Include the standard mechanical equipment note on the site and architectural plans: Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated.
 7. Provide a complete lighting plan with the next submission showing all proposed lighting. Limit fixtures to full cutoff styles.
 8. If lighting is proposed for the outdoor ball courts, show how it will have an appropriate appearance for the Entrance Corridor.
 9. Include the standard lighting note on the lighting plan: Each outdoor luminaire equipped with a lamp that emits 3,000 or more initial lumens shall be a full cutoff luminaire and shall be arranged or shielded to reflect light away from adjoining residential districts and away from adjacent roads. The spillover of lighting from luminaires onto public roads and property in residential or rural areas zoning districts shall not exceed one half footcandle.
 10. Revise the landscape plan to provide a coordinated and more robust planting arrangement that better integrates the stormwater facility, recreational areas, and the lawn east of the ball courts into the EC.
 11. Revise the landscape plan to provide trees along the southern side of Pebble Drive from the site entrance to the overflow parking area.
 12. Provide site sections that clearly illustrate the visibility of the proposed structures from the EC.
 13. Provide a complete landscape plan with the next submittal.
 14. Revise the site plan to include the standard landscaping note: All site plantings of trees and shrubs shall be allowed to reach, and be maintained at, mature height; the topping of trees is prohibited. Shrubs and trees shall be pruned minimally and only to support the overall health of the plant.
 15. Revise the landscape plan to show plantings that help integrate the proposed grading between the ball courts and the EC into the surrounding context.

16. Show the tree protection fencing for the wooded area that is to remain throughout the site plan set.
17. Revise the landscape plan to provide additional landscaping that includes evergreens along the frontage between the stormwater facility and the EC.
18. Revise the landscape plan to continue the planting arrangement within the 12-foot landscape buffer along the northern property line, extending it to the shared-use path.

Mr. Van Der Werf seconded the motion.
The motion was carried by a vote of 5:0.

REGULAR REVIEW ITEMS:

a. ARB2025-17: Northside Industrial

Location: Southwest corner of Seminole Trail (Route 29) and Northside Drive

Proposal: To construct a 72,000-sf warehouse in addition to associated site improvements.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representative: Keith Lancaster, Charlie Armstrong, Matt Godfrey

Khris Taggart summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members asked about the texture of the panels (referred to the applicant) and if the images of the exterior were new (yes). Keith Lancaster, Charlie Armstrong and Matt Godfrey (virtual) addressed the ARB, noting the increase in wall projection to 2' and the grading plan. ARB members asked the applicants if there were other areas available to further articulate the plane and scale of the building (efforts focused on east elevation and landscaping), the changes in panel width (construction coordination and grading/utilities), relationship of the longboard to the projection (2" projection has an extruded edge and butts the 2' projection), wall sign locations (not yet determined), window sizes (18" x 4' and 3' x 5'). In discussion, ARB members noted that the designs distributed at the meeting were more developed, the repetition of the modules in the design, the need for consistent or different module sizes, the site constraints, the revised colors, the design of the northeast corner, the additional use of the longboard panels.

Motion: Mr. Hancock moved for approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for ARB-2025-17: Northside Industrial with the conditions listed in the staff report, amended as follows:

1. Increase the depth of the wall projections to 2' for greater visual impact.
2. Include a note on the elevation drawings identifying the location and depth of the wall projections.
3. Revise the architectural drawings to show the proposed fixture locations.
4. Revise the site plan to include a grading plan.
5. Make the tower widths consistent on the north, east and south elevations.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.
The motion was carried by a vote of 5:0.

WORK SESSION:

a. ARB-2023-107: Barnes Lumber

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Applicant: Kurt Keesecker, BRW Architects

The ARB held a work session on the applicant's proposal for murals in the Barnes Lumber development, as part of the Countywide Certificate criteria.

Margaret Maliszewski summarized the mural issue in a PowerPoint presentation, asking the ARB if there was agreement on the applicant's proposal that murals can be exempt from ARB review in the development and, if so, was the proposed 20% of the façade appropriate. Mr. Van Der Werf asked what the longest façade length could be. Kurt Keesecker, representing the applicant, responded that blocks are a maximum of 400' long. Members confirmed that building articulation would be required regardless of murals, and asked if the ARB would have criteria to review murals. Ms. Maliszewski said that additional mural criteria could be established, noting that content is not to be reviewed, but criteria could address things like impacts to the architectural design. Members asked if murals are subject to any review at this time. Staff responded that in the ECs, if a building has a previous ARB approval, a mural couldn't be added without ARB approval, because the mural would make the design inconsistent with the ARB approval. Mr. Van Der Werf suggested that the sign guidelines might be a template to follow regarding mural area, colors, etc., without reviewing content. Mr. Henningsen said the ARB could focus on where the mural is, how big it is, and how it relate to other permitted elements of the building. Mr. Van Der Werf said that if they weren't comfortable saying the ARB is required to review murals, it might be better to say that murals up to x% of facades are permitted, and ask for a future work item for staff to develop criteria for murals. Mr. Taggart suggested that architectural detailing will limit available space for a mural. Staff said that painting over a window might be an example of a guideline that would apply. Staff asked if "ARB review required" should be replaced with "guidelines (to be determined) apply". Mr. Henningsen confirmed that the discussion applies only to Barnes Lumber, but the ARB would likely need to address the issue on a broader scale in the future. Mr. Keesecker suggested that enforcement might be easier if no murals are on the EC facing facades, but murals would be allowed on side elevations without regulation. There was general agreement among ARB members on that change. Mr. Hancock asked if any building could be painted with a mural without review/approval at this time. Staff said that if a building has a previous ARB approval, a mural couldn't be added without ARB approval, because the mural would make the design inconsistent with the ARB approval. There was a suggestion that what defines a mural should be specified and that the 20% criteria was confusing. Staff showed a draft of the criteria summary for the Barnes Lumber Countywide Certificate and explained that it would be used as a checklist to review incoming applications in the development. The applicant noted that staff always has the ability to bring proposals to the ARB if the proposal is particularly complicated. Mr. Van Der Werf summarized that the text of the criteria would be updated to say "not facing an Entrance Corridor".

Motion: Mr. Henningsen moved for approval of the mural criteria, amended as follows:

Murals on facades that do not face the Entrance Corridor street are exempt from ARB review.

Mr. Van Der Werf seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 3:0 (Stoner and Matsuno abstained).

a. Minutes Approval:

Motion: Mr. Henningsen moved for approval of the minutes from the August 4, 2025, ARB meeting.

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 5:0.

b. Other items from staff or ARB members: None.

c. Next ARB Meeting: TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 2025, 1:00 PM – Lane Auditorium

Mr. Stoner said that he would not be able to attend the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:27 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Tuesday, September 2, 2025, at 1:00 p.m.