County of Albemarle
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT/PLANNING

Architectural Review Board
mmaliszewski@albemarle.org
434-296-5832 ext. 3276

DRAFT ARB ACTION MEMO / MNUTES

Date: October 19, 2026
Time: 1:00 PM
Meeting Room: Lane Auditorium
Members:

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

Staff:

Margaret Maliszewski
Carolyn Shaffer

CALL TO ORDER: Mr. Henningsen called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. and established a quorum.

DISCLOSURES: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

CONSENT AGENDA:

a. **Approval of Minutes: October 5, 2026**

Motion: Mr. Henningsen moved for approval of the minutes from the October 5, 2025, ARB meeting.

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.
The motion was carried by a vote of 3:0. (Stoner abstained; Matsuno absent)

REGULAR REVIEW ITEMS:

a. ZMA-2026-00010 Westminster Canterbury of the Blue Ridge Rezoning
Location: 250 Pantops Mountain Road
Proposal: To rezone the existing campus and expansion areas to Neighborhood Model District zoning to accommodate a long-term phased redevelopment and expansion.
Staff: Margaret Maliszewiski
Representative: Valerie Long, Brandon Dilla

Margaret Maliszewski summarized the staff report in a Power Point presentation. ARB members had questions about building height, the number of stories, and distances from the street. Valerie Long, with Williams Mullen, represented the applicant and addressed the ARB, giving an overview of the project and its location, noting land use and zoning categories, maximum building height (6 stories), block descriptions, steep slopes, and internal roads. Brandon Dilla, with Perkins Eastman architects, addressed the ARB, describing the phases of the project, proposed buildings and how they will work with the topography. He noted that the Phase 2 twelve-story building is 1500' from the street and its curved shape works with the topography. He said that the Phase 3 building is the health center and is 210' away from Rt. 250 and also steps up the slope. He said the stormwater facility would be an amenity and that Phase 5 has hybrid homes with all units being corner units. He noted the site sections and said they are trying to avoid steep slopes as much as possible and noted the images illustrating views of the buildings from the street. He said building materials would help the buildings blend into the hillside. ARB members asked about the maximum floor-to-floor height (12' for a total height of 144' for the Phase 2 building) and the two buildings closest to Rt. 250 (cottages approved with two earlier rezonings). No members of the public commented on the project.

In discussion, Mr. Hancock noted the complexity of the application and the ARB's advisory role, said there was sufficient information to get a good idea of what the development will look like, that distance was key, that the Phase 2 building is distant from the EC, that it fits with the topography and its form is varied, so it won't have a huge presence and he wasn't as concerned with it being at a high point. He said the siting of the Phase 3 building diminishes its impact and maintaining the parallel road is important. He said the amount of green space is good and the height is a more economical way of getting density.

Mr. Van Der Werf said he was not persuaded that there is enough information provided to assess the perception of the Phase 2 building from the corridor, that the submitted views are from points closer to the entrance and potentially lower so they benefit from screening by the landscape, that it will be important to understand how it will be observed from higher points on Rt. 250. He acknowledged the distance from the EC but remembered the unexpected visibility of the apartment buildings near Martha Jefferson Hospital and said the podium garage will make forested screening difficult. He said the building is tall enough to have impact from 1500' away. He said the building silhouette breaks the skyline and exceeds the height of the ridge line and in that regard is entirely outside the architectural precedents of the county; this is a jump in scale and should be considered quite carefully. He said the Phase 5 buildings are reasonably set into the landscape and the siting of the Phase 3 building reasonably mitigates scale.

Mr. Stoner said he would echo a lot of what Mr. Hancock said. He said it is hard to argue with the sensibility of the rezoning relative to what is there now. It is in the growth area and there is more green space than there would be otherwise; there is a vegetated buffer available to mitigate Phases 2 and 3; if we didn't approve a 12-story building the footprint would just get bigger or there is another building. Weighing the benefits and costs of reducing scale, he said the overall plan makes sense, and he was in support of it.

Mr. Henningsen said he was in support of the rezoning but shared the concern about the height of the Phase 2 building. He said he would like to see more views of potential impacts. He agreed that reduced height would mean a bigger footprint but it is hard to say which is better. He said more views about the impact on the corridor would be helpful.

ARB members discussed the recommendations in the staff report, discussing again the need for additional views from the corridor and the potential visual impacts. The members confirmed that if the rezoning is approved, they would see the buildings again as part of the site development plan process. They questioned how their recommendations fit into the process and debated acknowledging that the scale is inconsistent while height itself isn't bad. The applicant said that many of the existing buildings are one and two stories tall, though some are six stories but not currently visible from the corridor. They revisited the building height, scale and mass issues, and Mr. Van Der Werf explained that at 12 stories breaking above the trees and the ridge line, this is a significant departure from the existing character. Mr. Hancock said he thought the height is appropriate here. The applicant clarified that efficiencies, topography, and maintaining green space and steep slopes are driving the building height; that final plans are not available for the interior road design, but the road will be widened to meet VDOT requirements and there is focus on limiting impacts to steep slopes. The applicant clarified that a work session with the Planning Commission is planned for November, asked for further clarification on the recommendations, and regarding the connector road, said there is a stream they are trying to avoid.

Motion: Mr. Stoner moved to provide the applicant with the comments and recommendations listed in the staff report, amended as follows:

1. Regarding general visual impacts:
    a. Indicate the full extent of visibility of the proposed buildings along the Entrance Corridor.
    b. Additional views of the proposed development from more distant vantage points along the Rt. 250 Entrance Corridor and from I64 to Rolkin Road would be useful to determine impacts.
    c. Viewshed studies are recommended to clarify the full extent of visibility of the proposed development.
2. Regarding site layout; building height, mass and scale:
    a. Based on the information provided, the proposed Phase 2 development is not expected to be consistent with the scale or general appearance of the surrounding area.
    b. Consider revising the Phase 2 proposal to reduce building height.
    c. Consider reducing visual impacts by:
        i. Using multiple smaller buildings more integrated with the landscape instead of fewer taller, more massive buildings.
        ii. Dividing the Phase 3 parking lot into multiple lots, most of which are located behind and to the sides of the Phase 3 building as viewed from the EC.
        iii. Reducing building heights as viewed from the EC.
        iv. Maintaining wooded and mountain backdrops for buildings as viewed from the EC.
        v. Reducing the use of retaining walls and shaping the terrain with rounded land forms that blend more with the existing terrain.
    d. Revise the submittal to indicate that Entrance Corridor landscaping requirements will be met, including interior roads and parking lots.
3. As development of the architectural design progresses:
    a. Note that window glass in the Entrance Corridors should not be highly tinted or highly reflective; VLT must not drop below 40% and VLR must not exceed 30%.
    b. Ensure that visibility of all accessory structures and equipment from the Entrance Corridor will be eliminated.
    c. Limit all ground- and building-mounted light fixtures to full cutoff styles.

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

WORK SESSION: None.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. **Other items from staff or ARB members:** None.

b. **Next ARB Meeting: Monday, November 2, 2026**, 1:00 PM – Lane Auditorium
Staff clarified that the October 26 meeting was canceled. Mr. Van Der Werf and Mr. Hancock said they could not attend the November 2 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned at 2:32 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Monday, November 2, 2026, at 1:00 p.m.