

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW**

Regular Meeting

January 21, 2026 – 5:00 PM

Hybrid Meeting (In person at City Council Chambers & virtual via Zoom)



Welcome to this Regular Monthly Meeting of the Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review. Staff will introduce each item, followed by the applicant's presentation, which should not exceed ten minutes. The Chair will then ask for questions from the public, followed by questions from the BAR. After questions are closed, the Chair will ask for comments from the public. For each application, members of the public are each allowed three minutes to ask questions and three minutes to offer comments. Speakers shall identify themselves and provide their address. Comments should be limited to the BAR's purview; that is, regarding only the exterior aspects of a project. Following the BAR's discussion and prior to taking action, the applicant will have up to three minutes to respond.

Members Present: Carl Schwarz, Ron Bailey, Roger Birle, James Zehmer, Jerry Rosenthal, Katherine Tabony, Cheri Lewis

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Remy Trail, Jeff Werner, Kate Richardson, Sarah Kim

Pre-Meeting:

There was discussion surrounding the Preliminary Discussion surrounding the proposed project on St. Charles Avenue. Mr. Schwarz did have questions about whether the BAR should be reviewing the project. Members of the BAR were given copies of the BAR bylaws to review. In the old ordinance, there was no pre-application conference for Historic Conservation Districts. The proposed project on St. Charles is in the Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation District. There is one pre-application conference for proposed projects in Historic Conservation Districts and two pre-application conferences for ADC Districts. There was a question regarding snow days and delaying BAR meetings. Mr. Zehmer brought up what could possibly happen if a BAR meeting is canceled due to something out of control of the BAR.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Zehmer at 5:30 PM.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda.

James Snyder (206 5th Street SW) – At one of the last meetings, one of the members mentioned that an option for historic preservation for an area like Fifeville might be a different type of historic preservation overlay, not one that was so specific that it detailed every window, shutter, and paint color. I wonder if we could get some more information about that. Is there a way to nominate houses? There is a house that is 100 years old, that is a unique, stone bungalow on 5th Street that looks like it was built about the same time by the same contractor as Rock House. It has been restored and is in much better shape when it was nominated.

Mr. Werner – Fifeville-Tonsler historic district is on the National Register and Virginia Landmarks Register as a historic district. The building that Mr. Snyder is talking about is contributing. A lot of them already are contributing. There is a National Register District overlay. The BAR only has purview only over what is locally designated. The city has the Architectural Design Control (ADC) Districts. We have 8 of those: West Main, Downtown, North Downtown, Wertland, etc. Those are the more rigid of the historic districts. In the city, we also have Individually Protected Properties (IPPs). For example, we have 2 houses on 7th Street. The reason that we were reviewing that project is because they were IPPs. The work on IPPs follows the more rigid design

review. The city also has 3 Historic Conservation Districts: Woolen Mills, Martha Jefferson, and Rugby Road. Those are a 'historic district light.' We look primarily at what is visible from the right-of-way. The way that I have explained it to people is that the design guidelines for ADC Districts are 150 pages. For historic conservation districts, it is maybe 3 pages. To get nominated as an ADC or Historic Conservation District, a community neighborhood can propose those. It would take overwhelming community support. For Council or staff to even consider taking it to Council, it is not a panacea. Council is very careful about it, given the last time they reviewed one, there was a lot of contention about it. It would take overwhelming support from the neighborhood. They would have to contact me. It would take a zoning text amendment and zoning map amendment to do an ADC district or IPP or historic conservation district. The overlay does not change the underlying zoning. The Board of Architectural Review gets a certain amount of purview. An overlay does not suddenly say that you cannot do something here if it is permitted by zoning. That is what I would offer given that area is already on the National Register.

Mr. Zehmer – Mr. Snyder is referring to the Historic Conservation District that we had talked about. The second question was whether there was a way to list an IPP. It is a good segway into our first new item tonight.

Mr. Werner – There are some additional IPPs in Fifeville. I am not sure if that house on 5th Street is one. I know there are several there that were. I cannot speak about the Fifeville process. My understanding is that when that survey was done and the National Register District was discussed, I don't know why local designation wasn't pursued. I imagine it came up.

Mr. Zehmer – If someone wanted to pursue creating an IPP for a property, they can do that. There is an avenue to do it. We have one on our agenda tonight. Does the owner have to be the person?

Mr. Werner – We won't consider an IPP unless it comes from the owner. We had a small conservation district proposed a couple years ago. It is somewhat still pending, the CH Brown HC District on 12th and Rosser. It is only 6 buildings. One is already an IPP. I needed to hear from the 5 other property owners that they supported that designation. That has not occurred. I cannot move that forward

Ms. Lewis – Didn't we also have a potential IPP in the Greenbrier District?

Mr. Werner – It was recently listed on the National Register. That has not been brought forward. It would take the owner.

Genevieve Keller – I attended City Council meeting last night. There was a lot of discussion or at least an introduction of a topic of architectural review control for what they are calling the core neighborhoods, RNA neighborhoods. I did make some comments. I supported using a conservation district, which I thought would be more appropriate. If that was to proceed, it would need to be handled in a different and more sensitive manner and still meet the state requirements for a historic district. I spoke about it. There was a lot of discussion last night. It is something Preservation Piedmont consistently recommended through the code revision and possibly in the Comp Plan, one of the parts of a solution for what they were initially calling sensitive neighborhoods. Since Mr. Werner was talking about National Register nominations, there is a bill being introduced in the General Assembly this session that would reduce the notification requirements for National Register nominations. I don't know if you are aware of that. It is not something immediately of interest to the city, but down the pipe, it might be. What it is doing is removing the requirement that adjacent owners be notified by mail of a pending National Register nomination. DHR (Department of Historic Resources) is supporting that. It will make the notification requirements less onerous for them and for jurisdictions like Charlottesville. It contributes to a misunderstanding now. There is no role for adjacent property owners to play when something is nominated to the National Register. It would be if they were in a district. It is something that would streamline the process. It will also create a better understanding. People are notified and they think that they have a role.

They don't have any role. If it was to go to court, they would not have any standing. It might be something that the department would want to send letter saying we are in support of this.

B. Consent Agenda (Note: Any consent agenda item may be pulled and moved to the regular agenda if a BAR member wishes to discuss it, or if any member of the public is present to comment on it. Pulled applications will be discussed at the beginning of the meeting.)

1. Meeting Minutes – December 16, 2025

Motion to Approve – Ms. Lewis – Second by Mr. Bailey – Motion passes 6-0 with 1 abstention (Mr. Schwarz)

C. Deferred Items

N/A

D. New Items

2. **Recommendation to City Council – IPP Designation**

Application for ZMA/ZTA pending

801 West Street; TMP 310042000

Owner/ Applicant: Richard H. Hunt, Jr.

Project: Zoning amendment to designate property an IPP

Kate Richardson, Staff Report – The BAR is asked to make a recommendation to City Council on the owner's request to designate as an Individually Protected Property (IPP) an approximately 0.3-acre parcel located at the NW corner of West Street and 8th Street, NW, within the 10th & Page Neighborhood. On December 9, 2025, in response to a request from the property owner, the Planning Commission voted to initiate the necessary review to amend City Code Chapter 34, Section 2.9.3.B. to designate this parcel an IPP, and, per City Code Chapter 34, Section 5.2.5, amend the City Zoning Map to identify this parcel as having an IPP overlay. Designation of an IPP follows the process for an amendment to the City's zoning ordinance and zoning map, including a public hearing and notification.

Ms. Lewis – Can staff summarize or address the emails that were exchanged this week about further work that was done on the property that are not represented in the pictures and the description?

Ms. Richardson – This house was constructed around 1905. In 1905 and later in 1913, there was a dependency or garage at the rear of the property. That was demolished prior to the early 1960s. In some of these pictures, there has been some alteration of enclosing this porch area. I believe that Mr. Schwarz provided some documentation yesterday. These images are from the Virginia Department of Historic Resources survey in 2021. In our efforts, we would document the known changes and sequence as best we could. With what is there, there already have been some modifications in the 20th century, the addition of stucco and replacement windows. We would put that into our full summary of the structure.

Ms. Lewis – Is the widow's walk original?

Mr. Werner – To our knowledge, yes.

Ms. Lewis – Is there roof access up there?

Mr. Werner – I don't know. I don't know if that is a decorative feature or not. The gentleman that built the house was a well-known builder and craftsman. When you see the pictures of the interior, you certainly see the attention to detail. This section of 10th & Page, this northeast corner was originally the white section of 10th & Page. You see the ownership changing over in the 1930s and 1940s. That is when Mr. Hunt's family acquired the home. They have lived in it and owned it ever since. The consultant identified it as one of the older homes in 10th & Page. We think that there are several 1880-era homes down near the Old Cox's Row that was associated with the railroad. It is one of the older homes. To the best that we can determine, it is in pretty good condition from when it was constructed.

Mr. Rosenthal – What was the original siding before the stucco?

Mr. Werner – We assume that with a lot of houses that it was siding. Stucco in Charlottesville is like the aluminum siding that you saw all over Baltimore in the 1950s. Stucco was a thing that was added in the early 20th century to a lot of homes around here. Presumably, it was a wood siding. It is probably still there.

Ms. Lewis – What are the oldest pictures that we have? Does the owner have any early pictures?

Ms. Richardson – I am looking for that. Mr. Hunt, the owner, shared the interior pictures that you see and some additional ones. This might be a good question for him. We are looking through our archives. I have 10th & Page pictures from the 1970s and 1980s.

Mr. Werner – Anything we have would not go back further than the 1970s.

With the zoning text amendment and zoning map amendments, the best way to do something like this is to ask the Planning Commission to initiate it. That takes some of the burden off the applicant. That takes some of the burden off the applicant for something like this. Mr. Hunt approached me last summer with the idea. We have been talking about it. He is officially the requestor of this.

Richard Hunt, Applicant – I am a son of Charlottesville I was born in the University of Virginia hospital. My grandparents are from Charlottesville. My grandmother taught at Jefferson School for 40 years. Much of my heart and soul and a lot of my money has gone into preserving the home that my grandparents purchased during the war. It stands there because I love Charlottesville. It is a monument to them and to my mother, who passed it down to me. I want to make sure that it is there for as long as it is standing and as an example to the community of the respect that the city would confer on the people of 10th & Page. For the things that we went through, for the things that we have developed, for our contributions to the city's culture, to our contributions to the city's economy, it is a beautiful house. I hope that you will come by and look. To answer a previous question, I do have a picture of my grandfather holding me when I was 2 years old in front of that house. It looks exactly like it does now. It does answer the question in part about when the stucco was on. It has been there as long as I have been there. That makes it about 69 years and counting.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

No Questions from the Board

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

James Snyder – I want to congratulate Mr. Hunt. It is a beautiful house. Your family has been a great steward for it. It is houses like this that are kept up by the families and been there that make a community. That whole

neighborhood could use your help if we can help preserve it and help it be enhanced and survive all the development that is going on around it. I live in an older neighborhood and appreciate older homes.

Mr. Werner – Mr. Hunt and I have communicated back and forth on email. We have recently talked on the phone. We have had some email issues that we have hopefully resolved. The backstory of these places is what is always so amazing to me about Charlottesville and the connections that exist. This is a small town. When you piece together the names, I know the story of Mr. Hunt’s mother. I did not know the connection to Mr. Martin. I see these stories woven through this ‘quilt’ that is this town. It is amazing. In the HRC meetings, we talk about places in the city that are places that is important for a certain thing or certain event.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – We have the item, the association of the building structure site with historic person or event. Is there a way to add to this?

Mr. Werner – As this moves forward, I gave it as much. I was able to piece together from the census and from the directory some information. The evolution of this story is something we can work on as it moves forward to the Planning Commission and City Council.

Mr. Schwarz – If there is some future owner and they want to do something; the text is there for that.

Mr. Werner – One of the things we would have to in the GIS layer is the ability to show sites in this town that associated with these stories. In the future, we can at least connect that story to it that somebody may not know.

Mr. Bailey – If this gets designated, does that mean it is preserved as it currently stands?

Mr. Werner – That means that it is like any other house in a historic district. Alterations to the exterior, demolition, and new construction would require BAR review.

Mr. Zehmer – Mr. Schwarz, your point is well taken that potentially a historic person associated at the local level would be a prominent educator lived in this house.

Motion – Mr. Schwarz – Having reviewed the criteria for designation of Individually Protected Properties per City Code Chapter 34, Section 2.9.3., I move the BAR recommend that City Council approve the request to designate 801 West Street (Parcel 31-42) an Individually Protected Property. We request that staff supplement the record of this with current pictures and the history of those who have lived there and documentation of recent modifications. Second by Ms. Lewis. Motion passes 7-0.

E. Other Business

3. Preliminary Discussion

BAR # HST25-0119

705 St. Charles Ave, TMP 520155001

Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation District

Owner: Kimberly and Galen Suppes

Applicant: Marcelino Arroyo / Nola Builds

Project: New residence on vacant parcel

- Staff introduced this proposed project and new construction to the BAR.
- With conservation districts when compared to ADC districts, it is a much lighter touch and fewer guidelines.

- The guidance for materials in conservation districts to be typical. Staff do not find the proposed materials to meet that standard.
- Staff does feel strongly about the proposed materials.
- With the proposed design, there are some code issues that do need to be resolved with this proposed new construction.
- If the overlay were to be removed, it would go to the Planning Commission and eventually to City Council. It would be publicly noticed.
- Ms. Tabony had questions about the sight lines from St. Charles.
- The parcel has been split, and the address has been assigned to the parcel.
- With historic conservation districts, there are fewer guidelines as compared to ADC districts guidelines.
- The applicant presented that it will not have vinyl siding and will use cement lap siding, dimensional shingles.
- The applicant will not be putting metal on the roof. There will be no vinyl rails on the porches and there will be black metal.
- The biggest part of this proposed house is the garage requirement. Garages in this neighborhood tend to be either in the rear or on the side.
- The biggest issues for most members of the BAR were around the materiality of the project. The applicant was able to address those issues and answer those questions.
- Members of the BAR were pleased with the answers to the questions.

4. Work Session

- Review draft of changes and revisions to BAR bylaws
 - (4.3) Once a motion has been made, there is nothing about future conversation with the applicant.
 - There was a robust discussion surrounding having questions and comments from the public and whether there should be one opportunity for the public to ask questions and make comments.
 - Staff believe that the process of having separate questions and comments from the public, as it currently is.
 - Mr. Schwarz mentioned asking a member of the public could be a privacy issue. Staff are going to investigate whether members of the public need to provide their address when providing public comments.
 - Mr. Schwarz did bring up finding a solution to snow days and a lack of quorum for meetings.
 - The code does allow an appeal if a project is approved due to the lack of a BAR meeting.
 - Staff did go over the public notification process, timeline, and rules of the BAR regarding applications and other actionable items.
 - (2.2) Staff will no longer be handing the notices of BAR meetings as stated in the bylaws to the members.
 - The quorum requirement for BAR meetings to occur is a majority of the appointed members. With the current number of 8 members, a quorum is 5.
 - There was discussion surrounding items pulled from the Consent Agenda and the place in the meetings for those pulled items.
 - Staff did go over recusal from items. Unless a member stands to lose or make money based on a BAR decision, members do not need to recuse themselves.
 - It is each member's decision on whether to recuse themselves voluntarily from an item on the agenda.
 - If a member recuses themselves for an item, they do need to leave the room for the deliberation on the item. Staff will bring member back into the room.

The meeting was recessed for 5 minutes. The meeting was called back to order following a 5-minute recess.

- Minor Historic Reviews – Scenario planning
 - Staff will no longer use the term ‘administrative approval’ going forward.
 - Staff did go over with the BAR the different types of minor development projects that staff receive on a regular basis.
 - Staff did present examples of the different kinds of minor projects that have been submitted.
 - There was discussion between staff and the BAR regarding the different projects that have been reviewed by staff.
 - With tree removal, staff does need to see a tree removal permit

5. Staff questions/discussion

- BAR awards
- Landscape Architect vacancy on the BAR

F. Adjourn

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:36 PM.