



DRAFT ARB ACTION MEMO / MINUTES

Date: January 20, 2026

Time: 1:00 PM

Meeting Room: Lane Auditorium

Members:

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

Staff:

Khris Taggart
Margaret Maliszewski

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

DISCLOSURES: Mr. Stoner disclosed that he would recuse himself from the Flow discussion because his firm is involved with the project.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

CONSENT AGENDA: None.

REGULAR REVIEW ITEMS:

a. SDP-2025-00138 Flow Honda/CDJR – Major Amendment

Location: 960 Hilton Heights Road

Proposal: A site plan amendment to expand the outdoor storage/display/sales area located in front of the Flow Honda/CDJR building at 960 Hilton Heights Road.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart
Representative: Chris Marshall

Khris Taggart summarized the staff report in a Power Point presentation. Mr. Van Der Werf asked if there is an established practice about trees in display lots and asked for clarification regarding whether the interior parking lot tree count is consistent with the guidelines. (The interior count is

not consistent with the guidelines.) Chris Marshall with Shimp Engineering represented the applicant and addressed the ARB. He quickly summarized the project and noted that the proposed landscaping exceeds screening requirements. Mr. Van Der Werf asked him about the interior parking lot trees. Mr. Marshall responded that existing easements limit the possibility of providing more trees. No members of the public wanted to speak about the project. In discussion, ARB members commented that given the utility and easement constraints, the plan appears to be in line with the intent of the guidelines and appreciated the frontage planting.

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved for approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for SDP-2025-00138: Flow Honda/CDJR with the conditions listed in the staff report, as follows:

1. Revise the calculations table on the lighting plan to note the correct maximum footcandles.
2. Revise the color temperature specified in the catalog number of the proposed fixtures to 3000K.
3. Revise the lighting plan to note the finish of the freestanding poles. The finish must match the existing poles on site.
4. Revise the note to confirm that the 20' height includes the base.
5. Revise the site plan to include tree protection fencing around the trees that will remain throughout the site plan set.

Mr. Matsuno seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 3:0. (Stoner recused; Henningsen absent)

b. SDP-2025-00127 Rivanna Futures Land Bay 82 Initial Site Plan

Location: 4852 Watts Passage

Proposal: To undertake tree clearing necessary to make land available for development.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representative: Emily Kilroy, Economic Development Director, and Blake Abplanalp, Rivanna Futures Program Manager

Emily Kilroy and Blake Abplanalp explained the Rivanna Futures project to the ARB in a Power Point presentation. ARB members asked about the property leases (Astra Zeneca will take full ownership; timing relates to the grant schedules) and how the ARB fits into the picture (the ARB will review future site plans.)

Margaret Maliszewski summarized the staff report for the initial site plan in a Power Point presentation. ARB members asked when architectural designs will be reviewed (more will be known about the timing of the architectural submittals after the charrettes that are scheduled for late January/early February) and if the road design was complete (no). Ms. Kilroy added that the limits of clearing shown on the initial plan is the maximum furthest extent – the actual limits will be less than what is shown. No members of the public wanted to speak about the project. In discussion, the ARB agreed that the project is an exciting one, thanked staff for the information, were encouraged by the trees to remain, and noted that the architectural designs would be reviewed at a later date.

Motion: Mr. Matsuno moved to forward the recommendations outlined in the staff report 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:
 - Prior to Initial Plan approval the following items shall be resolved to the satisfaction of the ARB: None.
- 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.
- Regarding the final site plan submittal: None at this time; additional initial site plan submittals are required.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0. (Henningsen absent)

WORK SESSION:

a. Solar Ordinance – Rooftop Solar Criteria for a New Category of Countywide Certificate of Appropriateness

Proposal: To establish design criteria for rooftop solar installations in the Entrance Corridor Overlay District to be used by staff in the review of Countywide Certificate of Appropriateness applications.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Ms. Maliszewski reviewed the proposed criteria in a Power Point presentation. ARB members commented and recommended changes to various criteria, as follows:

1. Add “orderly and coordinated appearance” to pitched #1.
2. Don’t add “greatest extent possible” to pitched #1.
3. Don’t include “multiple roofs” in pitched #1.
4. Is the 6” clearance in pitched #6 sufficient to be workable with current and future technologies?
5. Don’t include “whenever possible” in pitched #7.
6. Add a criterion for pitched roofs stating that frames must not extend beyond the panels.
7. Add “if not visible from the EC” for flat #1.
8. The panel arrangement may not need to adhere to the roof shape if it is otherwise organized. Adding “coordinated and orderly appearance that is consistent with the architecture” might be an option.
9. How do panels over parking spaces fit into this?
10. What about solar shingles?
11. Arrays that are not visible or that comply with prescriptive guidelines of how they relate to the roof plane are the ones that should be eligible for countywide certificates. Once the array becomes more open it is more difficult to see as a countywide.
12. “Existing” should be deleted from Goal #2.

Action: The ARB commented on the draft criteria and asked for revisions to be reviewed at the next meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. Minutes Approval:

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved for approval of the minutes from the January 5, 2026, ARB meeting.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0. (Henningsen absent)

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

c. Next ARB Meeting: Monday, February 2, 2026, 1:00 PM – Lane Auditorium

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:37 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Monday, February 2, 2026, at 1:00 p.m.