County of Albemarle
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT/PLANNING

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

DRAFT ARB ACTION MEMO / MINUTES

Date: November 9, 2026
Time: 1:00 PM
Meeting Room: Lane Auditorium
Members:

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

Staff:

Khris Taggart
Margaret Maliszewski
Carolyn Shaffer

CALL TO ORDER: Mr. Henningsen called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. and established a quorum.

DISCLOSURES: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Neil Williamson, representing the Free Enterprise Forum, asked the ARB for a progress report on the Entrance Corridor Guidelines Addenda. Staff reported that the goal is for completion by the end of the year.

CONSENT AGENDA:

a. Approval of Minutes: October 19, 2026

Motion: Mr. Henningsen moved for approval of the Consent Agenda with the minutes from the October 19, 2025, ARB meeting.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0. (Mr. Van Der Werf absent)

REGULAR REVIEW ITEMS: None.

WORK SESSION:

a. **TA-2025-00003: Ordinance Amendment to Permit Outdoor Storage, Display, & Sales By-right instead of by Special Use Permit**

Location: Countywide
Proposal: To make outdoor sales, storage and display in the Entrance Corridor Overlay District by-right instead of by Special Use Permit.
Staff: Khris Taggart

Khris Taggart summarized staff's approach to the text amendment in a Power Point presentation. Regarding the non-vehicle display, Mr. Henningsen supported the approach. Mr. Hancock asked if an SP isn't required for "everything else" will it still get ARB review. Staff recommended that standards should be established. He said an SP review can be very involved. Given the few applications of that type, it does make sense. Mr. Stoner suggested that it is still problematic because we need to make a decision based on something. We don't want to put people through a lengthy process for display that doesn't have a big visual impact. He suggested that standards might require that the display must be movable, not permanent, and a set distance from the corridor. Mr. Matsuno said that some display items are not objectionable, for example, pumpkins. Others, like sheds and manufactured homes and boom trucks are a different category. Is there a way to draw a line around palleted goods or consumer goods? Screening would make sense for, say, 100 ATVs. Staff suggested a limit on square footage and/or distance from the street may be factors to consider. Mr. Matsuno said it is the scale of the item, something a person can lift as opposed to a forklift. Root it in standards of scale; the scale relates to the building. It doesn't make sense to screen plants for sale. Manufactured homes are a different category. The question on scale is good. Maybe it is in the drawings. Every submission clearly defines the limit of outdoor display and a narrative about what goes in there and the scale of it relates to the building and the scale parameters are in the guidelines already. Members discussed the possibility of eliminating the SP requirement and just requiring ARB review.

Regarding vehicle display, Mr. Henningsen liked the idea of establishing a minimum distance from the EC for larger vehicles and the option for a Special Exception. Mr. Hancock agreed. Mr. Stoner noted that the taller vehicles were in the back in the example. He suggested using the same logic for "everything else". Staff clarified that motor vehicles are those that can be driven on the highway, leaving out heavy machinery and construction equipment. Members wondered how setting a distance would affect smaller sites. Staff said that a Special Exception would be available for those situations. Mr. Matsuno said he didn't want to set the distance too far. He said he was comfortable with 150' for the larger vehicles. Mr. Stoner said 100' was adequate. Members recommended keeping all vehicles together in the vehicle category. Mr. Stoner asked if height requirements could apply to everything else. Staff said they would look into it. Mr. Matsuno clarified that motor vehicles – regular cars – would be regulated like regular parking, those 7'6" or taller will be a minimum distance from the street, and construction and heavy equipment would be regulated like everything else. Mr. Stoner said that all vehicles should be kept together – none included in the "everything else" category. Mr. Stoner said outdoor display of everything else, other than the largest items, should not require an SP. Mr. Matsuno said that distance alone may not be enough to mitigate the largest vehicles. Mr. Stoner said the counterargument is driving through a retail district you are driving or going to a store. Rt. 29 is a retail district where display is expected. Some areas of 250W are different. Mr. Henningsen said it would be good to have some kind of review for ambiguous, case by case displays, but less onerous than an SP.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. **Other items from staff or ARB members:**
Rooftop Solar Design Criteria
After a brief presentation by staff, the ARB commented on two rooftop solar installation issues. Regarding the stair stepping of panels on pitched roofs, ARB members said that stair stepping in and of itself was not a problem and the requirement could be deleted. Members agreed that the stair-step examples all looked acceptable, that stair stepping is expected and when not done well it falls into "disjointed arrangements". They noted that designers will want to maximize the number of panels.

Regarding the coordinated appearance on flat roofs, ARB members thought the examples all looked coordinated and did not appear too disjointed. Members suggested that panels need not be aligned with the roof edge, that consistent panel orientation is not required, and that consolidation of panels was desired but would happen anyway. They recommended using a grid system to the greatest degree possible as the means for achieving the orderly and coordinated appearance, confirmed "aligning with the roof edge" could be deleted or replaced with "coordinated with" or "related to," and that "consistent with the architecture" is not needed.

Mr. Hancock left the meeting at 2:09 PM.

b. **Next ARB Meeting: Monday, November 30, 2025**, 1:00 PM – Lane Auditorium
The three members present said they planned to attend the November 30 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned at 2:13 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Monday, November 30, 2025, at 1:00 p.m.