

Agenda
City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
Regular Meeting
May 19, 2026 5:30 p.m.
Hybrid Meeting (In-person in Council Chambers and 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 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.

5pm - Pre-meeting

5:30pm - Regular Meeting Begins

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda [or on the Consent Agenda]

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. Any item pulled from the Consent Agenda will be heard prior to items in Section C, and presented as regular agenda items.)

1. **Meeting Minutes:** February 18, 2026 [\[Link to meeting video\]](#)

2. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR # 26-0017

203 Ridge Street; TMP 290022000

Ridge Street ADC District

Owner: City of Charlottesville

Applicant: Scott Hendrix, Capital Development Division

Project: Accessibility project with site alterations

~~C. Deferred Items~~

D. New Items

(5:40) 3. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR # 26-0016

110 3rd Street, NE; TMP 330222000

Downtown ADC District

Owner/Applicant: Steve Barber / Dunbar, Milby & Williams

Project: Window replacements

(6:20) 4. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR # 26-0021

1615 Keith Valley Road; TMP 41A046000

Individually Protected Property

Owner: Luanne Murphy

Applicant: Kelly Trout, Robertson Renovations

Project: New addition, exterior alterations and repairs

E. Pre-Application Conferences [Including continued, preliminary discussions]

(7:00) 5. **Preliminary Discussion** [no action will be taken]
 BAR # 25-0095
 835 West Main Street; Tax Parcel 310183000
 843 West Main Street; Tax Parcel 310175000
 847 West Main Street; Tax Parcel 310174000
 West Main Street ADC District
 Owners: Kim T. & Chris Dabney; Fluvanna Holdings, LLC
 Applicant: Andree Sahakian, LV Collective
 Project: Multi-story housing development

(7:30) 6. **Preliminary Discussion** [no action will be taken]
 BAR # HST26-0002
 528 Valley Road; TMP 110070000 and
 526 Valley Road; TMP 110071000
 Oakhurst Circle-Gildersleeve Wood ADC District
 Owner: Andrew Fossen; AVP 528 Valley LLC
 Applicant: Raymond Gaines, The Gaines Group
 Project: Construction of nine townhomes

F. Other Business [Including work sessions, staff questions/discussion, non-action items]

(8:00) 7. **Staff Questions & Discussion**

- Café Space design guidelines: Construction of decks, creation of enclosed spaces: no active café and/or not a leased space.

G. Adjourn (8:20)

Public Participation & Access

Regarding public comment(s): The BAR values community participation and input and welcomes public comments at meetings. The intent is to allow public input; not initiate a dialogue or debate with the board. Individuals with disabilities who require assistance or special arrangements to participate in the public meeting may call the ADA Coordinator at 434-987-1267 or submit a request via email to ada@charlottesville.gov. The City of Charlottesville requests that you provide a 48-hour notice so that proper arrangements may be made. The Board of Architectural Review’s regular meetings are held in person and online via Zoom webinar which requires advance registration. Access event details and Zoom link under the City of Charlottesville’s event and meetings calendar. Additionally, the webinar is broadcast on all the City’s streaming platforms. For a complete list and direct links, please visit: www.charlottesville.gov/streaming.

2026 Meeting Schedule

Tuesday June 16, 2026	Tuesday October 20, 2026
Tuesday July 21, 2026	Tuesday November 17, 2026
Tuesday August 18, 2026	Tuesday December 15, 2026
Tuesday September 15, 2026	

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

Regular Meeting

February 18, 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: Ron Bailey, James Zehmer, Cheri Lewis, Roger Birle, Katherin Tabony, Carl Schwarz, Jerry Rosenthal

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

Pre-Meeting:

Ms. Lewis had a question about West Main Street window replacement. Ms. Lewis wanted to know what past window replacements have been done. Staff said that it was about the BAR composition. People often say that there is nobody who can repair old windows. Staff said that is generally true. There was a discussion surrounding restoring versus replacing windows on West Main Street.

Ms. Lewis had a question about the County Courthouse, and the BAR had approved for the courthouse windows. Staff did go over what was happening to the windows in the courthouse.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Zehmer at 5:33 PM.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda.

No Comments from the Public

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 – November 18, 2025

Motion to Approve – Mr. Schwarz – Second by Ms. Lewis – Motion passes 7-0.

C. Deferred Items

N/A

D. New Items

2. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR # HST26-0001
701-705 West Main Street; TMP 320157000
West Main Street ADC District
Owner: Rocky Mountain LLC
Applicant: Calder Kegley
Project: Window replacements

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Request CoA for window replacements on the second floor only.

Calder Kegley, Applicant – I am here representing the owner of 701-705 West Main Street. Since buying this building, almost 10 months ago, we have been faced with many challenges and have gotten plenty of surprises. After bringing Mitchell Matthews Architects, we began to formulate a plan to heavily renovate and revive the 5 apartment units that are upstairs. With the help of Martin Quarles, who has a long history of building and renovating both commercial and residential properties in Charlottesville, we investigated the necessities to help preserve the building for at least another 100 years. It was evident early on that to improve the thermal barriers of the units; the windows had to be examined. With Mr. Quarles' help and Mark Wingers from Gaston & Wyatt, we were able to find and inspect the Marvin Ultimate Series inserts that fit nicely into space. Best of all, they do not come with storm windows. By using these inserts, we will be able to satisfy the thermal needs while also presenting an unrecognizable exterior façade. During this process, all the exterior trim will be repainted. The rest of the rust-crated seals will be repaired and preserved. There will be no storm windows. Any damage that those incurred to the original frames will be repaired. With all the brick work, we are planning on repointing and replacing the existing brick that is not repairable and going around the entire exterior. With all the previous and upcoming high-rise construction that is happening on West Main Street, we hope that we can be recognized for our effort in not only preserving but creating space that is inviting within a historic building inside a historic district. Perhaps by example, others will take this path rather than building anew.

Charles Quarles – As mentioned earlier, the building was renovated in the early 70s. I am certain the sash on the streetscape is not original. They represent that and they do not perform well.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – Did you say that the window air conditioner units are going away?

Mr. Kegley – That is correct. I did not mention that. When we acquired this building, there was an air conditioner unit just about every other window around West Main Street and 7th Street. What led us to taking them out was all the tenants left around the end of December. We had a big cold snap. To prevent any water from freezing, all the AC units came out. We put sealed plastic around the entire interior. That made an incredible difference in the heating capabilities of that space. Every piece of plastic was blowing in like a sail on a boat.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – The windows there are simple, easily replaceable. We are not losing any historic fabric that represents any handicraft. I recognize staff's comment about finding a sash on another elevation building. There are none. If there was one, it would be piecemeal. There are no sashes that match these. I am in support of this.

Mr. Zehmer – It seems like there are no sashes that date to the original construction either if this assessment is correct. My biggest thing is making sure that the Marvin Windows match as closely as they can to the one-over-one and proportions of the existing windows. The existing windows are a replication of what was originally there most likely. I don't have any objection to the application.

Ms. Tabony – The cumulative benefit of new windows in the overall preservation of the building is a net positive for the user benefit, comfort, and general appreciation of the building. I do support this.

Ms. Lewis – I think Mr. Kegley did a window-by-window survey. I appreciated that. It allowed me to see all the different conditions, not just the front but the back windows. Some of them were poor and irreparable. Some were okay. I appreciated that work that was done on behalf of the owner.

Motion – Mr. Schwarz – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the City's ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed window replacements at 701-705 West Main Street satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in this ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted noting the following conditions:

- Preference for wood, metal or metal-clad windows.
- For the 6 over 6 you may use insulated glass with applied grills, provided there is an internal spacer bar.
- Insert frames must fit relatively tight into the opening and retain the existing exterior trim or at least have something new that is similar.

Second by Mr. Bailey. Motion passes 7-0.

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # HST26-xxxx [TBD]

Historic Downtown Pedestrian Mall

Downtown ADC District

Owner/Applicant: City of Charlottesville

Project: Downtown Mall trashcan replacement plan

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – CoA request for proposed litter receptacles to be installed on the Downtown Mall. Existing cans, which are not original to the Mall, are no longer available. The currently used cans did not replicate the original cans designed by Lawrence Halprin & Associates for the initial phase of the Mall, in fact, they are entirely different. Therefore, the only reason for selecting a type/style that is similar to the current trash cans is for continuity of design, and not to reflect on or represent an original element. No immediate replacements are planned; however, this review is necessary to establish the new type that will be used moving forward, when necessary. (See the Appendix for staff correspondence with the applicant.)

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Lewis – I see that the new ones have a hinge lid. That is how they would empty them. How are the current ones emptied if they are hanging?

Mr. Werner – It is very difficult. I did not get into it. It seems like they swing and remove the bag.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – Does it really matter that the new one matches the old one so precisely? Does it matter that it is just black and round? We have 6 replacement receptacles and 25 base covers. For \$19,500, that is a lot of money for 6 trash cans. There are a lot of them out there. We are going to be replacing these trash cans over time. Are we stuck with the same manufacturer? I am just throwing that out to Parks & Recreation. Does the BAR care that this trash can looks exactly like the one that showed up sometime in the early 2000s? Do we care that it fits in with all the other trash cans that are out there?

Mr. Zehmer – It sounds like they are trying to do a phased rollout. I do see value in them matching the older ones so that you have a consistent look on The Mall even if it takes 10 years to roll out. You start back at replacing the ones we started with. I take your point. Is there a cheaper option that still achieves the goal? I do see value in consistency and appearance.

Mr. Schwarz – My other concern is that if you look at those little attachments to the pavers, some of them are really rusted out. The city throws down way too much salt every winter. I wish we could discuss that. It is destroying the buildings and all The Mall furniture. This new trash can is made of steel that has been powder coated. When it is sitting directly on the ground, are the bottoms going to rust out in a short amount of time? Has it been considered?

Ms. Lewis – Maybe that is why the current ones were hung.

Mr. Schwarz – I am wondering if that might have been part of the reason for that. I noticed on this manufacturer's website, I did not see if they had any trash cans that were hung. I don't know if that is just something people don't do anymore. I am curious about the longevity of these trash cans sitting in so much salt every winter, especially if they are just made of plain steel. Do those steel hangers provide any protection? The big cast iron planters don't get busted up, but other people's planters do. I am wondering if once we take these trash cans out from their protective ballard areas, are they going to be subject to being kicked over and busted up? If the BAR thinks that these trash cans should match exactly minus the ballards, I guess the conversation does not matter. If we are less concerned about that, I am wondering if it would be worth shopping around more.

Mr. Zehmer – The ballards could be modified to have a hanger that holds the new trash can. Leave the ballards in place. You could have it where it has a padlock.

Mr. Schwarz – We are then modifying every trash can to fit that.

Ms. Tabony – The replacement has a hinged lid. That might not be optimal

Mr. Schwarz – If this is not time sensitive, I don't want to stand in the way of us approving a trash can that is perfectly acceptable. If Parks and Recreation wanted to consider some of these questions, I don't know if that would hurt.

Ms. Tabony – I think the cost is an interesting question. Is that the trash cans or is that the masonry repair of the granite? Is that going to be happening regardless?

Mr. Schwarz – I think the \$19,500 was for preemptively buying 6 trash cans for when some of these fail in the future. They could just put a new one in place. The cost of the granite would be something extra. Is that correct?

Mr. Werner – I don't know. I know what you just said is correct. These were no longer available. They got what they could. My answer to Cliff was what the BAR would be concerned about is consistency. While we recognize that we will not remake these, there is consistency in that intent. They are round, black, and located in similar locations. The fact that there was visibly similar made it easier. I certainly could ask if there were other options that they wanted to consider. It is possible that they selected this. There is a lot. I am still tamping this down all the time. You do see other departments responding to this fear. The BAR did this or did that. 99 percent of the time it is not true.

Mr. Schwarz – I am worried that they chose this because someone decided that the existing trash cans that aren't original.

Mr. Werner – It is possible. I am working with Cliff on a couple things. This is not imminent. It would be helpful to approve it. They may not need to buy one of these for a couple of years. I can have a conversation with him about it.

Mr. Rosenthal – These trash cans have already been purchased?

Mr. Werner – They have some that match. That is what is there now. They have not purchased anything beyond those trash cans.

Mr. Schwarz – They knew that these were being discontinued. They spent \$20,000 to buy six. They have them ready to replace. They are of the old style. They will still have 6 more trash cans that can fail that they can replace before they move onto the new ones.

Mr. Werner – Since I came on, I have been pushing for a long-term maintenance plan and management plan for The Mall; short-term, mid-term, and long-term. You can see the condition of The Mall. I walked it today looking at some things. It is in rough shape. We need a plan. We can't wake up one day and realize that the bricks need to be replaced. We should not be surprised by those things. This is trying to get ahead of that. There is a lot happening out there. I am trying to keep you involved with The Mall as much as possible. To what extent do I bring things to you. I am glad that they are asking about this. If you think there is something that would be more suitable or if you think there is something a design part or an aesthetic, I think Parks and Recreation would be more than happy to hear some ideas if you have any. We are going to talk about that at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Schwarz – I want to make sure that my comments are framed more as not this is unacceptable, and we want to cause more work for you. It is more of if you had the opportunity to choose something else, would you? If you didn't think that you had to match it exactly, would there be a better option out there?

Mr. Zehmer – These are good questions. They do have a CoA before us.

Mr. Schwarz – We can vote to approve this. I am fine with that if those questions get answered. They can always come back to us later and ask, 'Is this different trash can, okay?' I doubt the city is charging themselves a fee to apply for a CoA.

Mr. Birle – I went out there at lunch time. I did not see any problems with the trash cans that I saw. I did not do an extensive search. This trash can is perfectly fine. This is the least of the concerns of the Downtown Mall right now. Why don't we have recycling cans that are obvious?

Mr. Werner – Some services are single stream. You throw it all in one bin and they sort it out. I don't know if that is the case. I do have a reminder to ask.

Ms. Lewis – I am only finding one guideline which is what we are supposed to talk about that pertains to trash containers. It is in Section G of Chapter 6-Public Improvements. Trash containers should be metal and should match other street furniture. We have encouraged black furniture on The Mall. I would say that it meets that. There is number 3 criteria that says, 'attempt to make street furniture compatible in design, color, materials with existing elements.' To the extent that there is any benefit, I think there are two benefits. The new ones are the same manufacturer and generally match the existing. There is a user component here. I don't even have to think that these are trash cans. I am used to the trash cans on The Mall. If we change to another shape, I wonder how that would compete. We must consider the application before us. It meets the guidelines.

Motion – Ms. Lewis – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the City's ADC District Design Guidelines [specifically Ch. 6, sect. G], I move to find that the proposed replacement trashcans for the Downtown Mall satisfies the BAR's criteria and are compatible with the Downtown Mall and this ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the following condition:

- **That the damaged granite pavers [where tube frames are removed] will be replaced in-kind [and not simply repaired or patched].**

Second by Mr. Birle. Motion passes 7-0.

We would encourage a holistic look at recycling containers on The Mall and how they might be located next to the trash containers to efficiently get recycled items collected.

E. Other Business

4. Pre-Application Conference

BAR # HST26-0002

528 Valley Road; TMP

Oakhurst Circle-Gildersleeve Wood ADC District

Owner: Andrew Fossen; AVP 528 Valley LLC

Applicant: Raymond Gaines, The Gaines Group

Project: Construction of nine townhomes

- The BAR will review the project under New Construction criteria [and not as an addition to the site]. See ADC Districts Design Guidelines, Ch.3
- The BAR compliments and thanks the team for saving and respecting the original house (528 Valley Road).
- The scale and massing of building #1 (situated at the street) is more of a challenge [for this review] than buildings #2 and #3 (at rear of parcel).
- Perhaps reduce the size of Building #1 and use dormers to achieve the third floor.
- Consider flipping the floorplan around to reduce the façade of building #1 along the street-facing side. This might conflict with zoning.
- Switch from a horizontal to a vertical emphasis to help break down the façades; embrace the verticality of the buildings.
- For the roofline, the BAR suggests picking a style- noting that the current design does not feel either contemporary, modern or traditional.
- Give more consideration to the entrances and windows.
- The BAR questions how close building #2 is to the original house (528 Valley Road).
- The new structures should complement the (neighboring) historic assets and the district.

- Consider materiality and other elements of design: the BAR asks the applicant to explore brick, dormer windows, the Cape Cod style and avoid vinyl.

5. Pre-Application Conference

BAR # HST26-0003

714-716 Lexington Avenue; TMP 520152000

Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation District

Owner: David T. & Cristine S. Gardner

Applicant: Bridget Ridenour, Alloy Architecture + Construction

Project: Construct single-family home

- The project is within a Historic Conservation district therefore the BAR will have a lighter touch [on review]; focus will primarily be on what can be viewed from the street.
- The proposed dwelling is sympathetic to the neighboring house and fits into the district well.
- There is some support [from the BAR] for the carport; it is definitely a better option than a garage.
- Breakdown of the carport's side elevation, either through additional columns, screening, or low wall to give some visual separation for the neighboring property.
- Consider the carport and driveway materiality- concrete is preferable to asphalt for both the parking surface and driveway and should be continuous to the street.
- For exterior siding brick is preferred. The alternate of Hardie plank is acceptable.
- Explore breaking down the house as it progresses to the rear of the lot to perhaps mirror the additions of the neighboring house [at 716 Lexington Ave.], including roofline changes which could be cost effective to allow for the use of brick at the front porch [and façade].
- The two walls of the interior carport should match the exterior of the house.
- The BAR will act on this project at a future meeting. [In lieu of a staff administrative approval which is allowable within HC districts.]

6. Staff questions/discussion

- Lighting on the Downtown Mall.
- Exploring design options – Removing barriers for the Downtown Mall Fountains.

F. Adjourn

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 PM.