

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

Regular Meeting

October 21, 2025

**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, Kate Tabony, David Timmerman, Jerry Rosenthal, Cheri Lewis

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Kate Richardson, Jeff Wener, Remy Trail

Pre-Meeting:

Staff started the Pre-Meeting with the art mural for CoA application for 207 14th Street Northwest. It is currently on the Consent Agenda. There was a brief discussion surrounding the mural art proposal. The building is a non-contributing building.

Staff brought to the attention a change in the process for BAR applications. The new process is to mainly large-scale project. An applicant must submit a development review plan with the development review team. There are different parts and departments involved with the development plan meeting. It will then go to the BAR for a pre-application conference. They must go through one round of the development review plan. There was a robust discussion surrounding the new process.

Mr. Timmerman called the meeting to order 5:43 PM.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda.

Isis (Green Street) – I wanted to voice my support for Fifeville and for the residents of Westhaven and 10th & Page. None of the residents want their neighborhood gentrified by rich college students. We don't need more housing that most students cannot even afford. We don't need it in a location that would cast a shadow over black and brown communities that the city has a long history of marginalizing. City Council has continued to say that zoning needs to be changed. That should be a priority. In the meantime, anyone with any ability to stop or stall these luxury student housings from being built has a moral obligation to do so.

James Snyder (206b 5th Street SW) – I am here to talk about what is an emergency situation. The zoning ordinance that was put in place, which was supposed to create affordable housing in the neighborhoods has dumped huge by-right set of developments in 2 of the most fragile neighborhoods with no review and very little that anyone can do about it. I recommend that the city, Council, and Planning Commission do an emergency ordinance to protect the Fifeville, 10th & Page, and Westhaven neighborhoods, suspending the ordinance in those areas including the development so we can have 2 years to do planning. Clearly, there was no planning done or discussion with you about what historic properties might be upzoned like our houses, which is the missing

middle. They are zoned for 7 stories. You should not be burdened with bad planning and nobody talking to you about historic properties being rezoned to be redeveloped at ridiculous heights. This does get to the point of acknowledging the history and displacement. There are abilities within the state code to give the city authority to regulate these properties. That is included in this resolution. I have maps of the Fifeville area, which shows the area along West Main Street. If Fifeville, Westhaven, and 10th & Page and the areas in between them are suspended for 2 years so we can do planning and talk to the community, you can do your job and give advice on how properties ought to be zoned. You should not have to be dealing with historic properties of value being zoned to 7 stories or missing middle housing. We need your support, the Planning Commission, and City Council to zone these things back to a reasonable level.

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 – August 19, 2025

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application [Applicant deferral, May 2024]

BAR # 24-0016

207 14th Street, NW; TMP 090070100

Rugby Rd-University Cir-Venable ADC District (non-contributing)

Owner: University Hotel Management LLC

Applicant: Jim Shideler & Bill Chapman

Project: Mural on east elevation

Motion to Approve – Mr. Schwarz – Second by Ms. Lewis – Motion passes 5-0.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find the proposed wall mural at 207 14th Street, NW satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this ADC District, and that the BAR approves the request

C. Deferred Items

NA

D. New Items

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # 25-0103

1409 University Avenue; Tax Parcel 090075000

The Corner ADC District

Owner: Tiger Investments, LLC

Applicant: Christopher Postak

Project: Sign installation

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – CoA request for installation of a two-sided blade sign on the façade above the existing awning.

Chris Postak, Applicant – Applicant was not present.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – Is there any illumination on this sign?

Mr. Werner – No. This sign will be as above. There is a lot of wire and conduit on the façade. All of that will be cleaned up. There is also the sign on the awning front. It is not illuminated. This is allowed by zoning, the sign regulations. It is not recommended per the Design Guidelines.

Ms. Lewis – We are talking about the round blade that would be perpendicular to the building. With the graphic that I am looking at, the blade looks like about half the height that is shown. I don't understand that. Why are we seeing that drawn line above the height of the building?

Mr. Werner – They are showing a center line centered on the side.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Lewis – I would have an issue if it covered up any of the architectural features of this building. I am in favor of it.

Mr. Schwarz – The attachment point should be through the mortar and not through the brick. I did not notice that in the conditions. I would like to add that.

Motion – Mr. Schwarz – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find the proposed blade sign at 1409 University Avenue satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the following conditions:

- Unnecessary wires, conduit, or cables will be removed from the storefront façade.
- Excluding removal, any alterations to the existing signage and/or decorative graphics (per the current photo), including the open sign, will require a new sign permit and/or CoA.
- Attachment points [for mounting the blade sign] will be made in the mortar joints, not in the brick itself.
- The sign will be installed as indicated in the graphic provided.

Second by Ms. Lewis. Motion passes 5-0.

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # 25-0104

1331 West Main Street; Tax Parcel 100006000

West Main Street ADC District

Owner: MKV Property, LLC

Applicant: Joseph Andelic

Project: Painting exterior façade

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – CoA request to paint exterior, including unpainted brick (on building and low wall at sidewalk), metal roof flashing/coping, and metal frames at storefront and entry door. Note: While the

conceptual color schemes show an upper, horizontal muntin in the storefront, no changes are proposed to the existing.

Joseph Andelic, Applicant – The only reason we want to do this is that if you look at the bricks, somebody previously did some kind of whitewash on it. The bricks unit works. We have no issues with that. We are going to fix all those bricks and use proper paint to make it look nice. If you look at the bricks right now, they are not bricks. They are all just polished red. You are going to see a lot of spots around the building. It is not presentable to us. We want to make sure to clean it up nicely, get rid of some of those flowerpots, and come up with something else nicer and make a nice clean look that will even attract more people. You can pass by this building. You are not even going to see it. There is no sign on the brick.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – You have some renderings with the different color schemes on one of these sheets. It looks like someone did a 3D model and was not careful with it. Are you intending to modify the brick? The brick piece to the left of the windows is a lot thicker looking in these renderings. Are you adding brick?

Mr. Andelic – If you look on the right side, you are not going to see it here. There is a flowerpot. If we remove that flowerpot, there are about 7 bricks that are missing. We will have to add those bricks to it or just leave it and keep it.

Mr. Schwarz – I am talking about to the left of the window. There is a vertical piece to the left.

Mr. Andelic – Nothing will be done. Nothing will be added to it. We would basically fix the bricks and make sure that it looks nice when you paint it. We are going to fill everything and make sure it is presentable. We will do proper primer and painting.

Mr. Timmerman – I did not notice the wall change of dimension. I did notice the front wall, the landscape wall. The existing is on 3 levels. You are showing it as one level. Are you planning on rebuilding that at all?

Mr. Werner – I tried to emphasize that these were just conceptual for the color palette. For example, the band across the top that is at an angle, that is the garage to the back. When they did that paint thing on the web page, it captured that. Look at these singularly for color palette only and refer to my other drawing with lots of arrows for what is and will not be painted. Don't get bogged down in the details on these.

Mr. Timmerman – Are you keeping the glass as is?

Mr. Andelic – The glass will be kept. We are going to try to paint if you guys approve the frame of the window. If not, we are going to try replacing it at some point. Painting is going to work. We know it is going to work. The black solid is going to be nice. It is going to be upkeep.

Ms. Lewis – Will the same color of paint wrap the building and go down that side?

Mr. Andelic – It can be. That is a cinder block. We are trying not to put white around. If it looks nice down the road, we can. You usually have a lot of people standing around. It is going to get a little dirtier. It should not be a problem. Those are the only bricks up front that you see. There are no bricks nowhere else.

Ms. Lewis – The entryway is cinder block where you have your sign, the door, the vestibule. That is cinder block.

Mr. Andelic – I think that it is something else. We are using something different. It is a cement.

Mr. Werner – It is a stylized cinder block. It was covered up with a cement board.

Ms. Lewis – With the 3 colors that we were presented with, are we supposed to choose between them? Is that just a palette that you would like? Do you have a preference between the 3?

Mr. Andelic – Right now, we have the right side. The third color would be ideal because the right side is already painted. It is approved and grayish. We would basically do the white bricks to that. We will refresh the gray. It is the same color.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Lewis – I am in favor of this. Three years ago, we had a longer discussion. Other members had some concern about painting the brick. There is not a whole lot of brick on this façade anymore.

Mr. Schwarz – I would be OK with any of the 3 color schemes and letting the applicant work with staff on that.

Motion – Ms. Lewis – **Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find the proposed painting at 1331 West Main Street satisfies the BAR’s criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted with the following conditions:**

- **Brick and mortar be repaired and repointed prior to painting.**
- **The paint be appropriate for application to unpainted masonry.**
- **Prior to painting the metal storefront and entrance door/frame, the metal will be appropriately cleaned and primed to assure a quality finish.**
- **The BAR is supportive of any of the [three submitted] color schemes the applicant ultimately chooses.**

Second by Mr. Timmerman. Motion passes 5-0.

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # 25-0107

530 East Main Street; Tax Parcel 530077A00

Downtown ADC District

Owner: RJD&P, LLC

Applicant: Andrea Nelson

Project: Fencing and gate installation

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – CoA request to install new 42” metal fence above brick walls, replace metal gate, and replace metal handrail at entry walk.

Mr. Schwarz – Are they getting rid of the existing fence that zigzags?

Mr. Werner – I believe that they are. I have not confirmed that. They can remove that if they wish.

Ms. Tabony – This image is what they are proposing.

Mr. Werner – No. That is not to scale. I am just trying to illustrate it. It continues on the right-hand side. That lower wall is in 2 sections. There is another entrance there that it curls around to. It curls along that lower wall.

Ms. Tabony – The red-dashed line is how tall?

Mr. Werner – The fence is 42 and 5/8 inches. When they set the fence, they will level it in the ground. Assume 42 inches. The height of that lower wall is 15 inches. That is at a grade. It is pitched. It is continuous in height above the sidewalk. The upper wall starts at 3 feet. It drops 5 or 6 courses by the time it gets down there. It is 3 feet at that corner.

Andrea Nelson, Applicant – For context, we have been trying to spruce up the building internally and externally. This is part of a bigger project. We are using Stokes of England, a local blacksmith. We are excited about that. We have put in a lot of thought and effort into the design. We think it will add a lot of great value onto the building and to the area in general.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Rosenthal – What is the reason for the fencing?

Ms. Nelson – As it was shown, we already have the gate. We have internal fencing that we are going to rip out. The reasoning is because it is old, and it looks deteriorated. Since we are doing that anyway, we just wanted to continue it. We think that is the best way that it looks. For security measures, we have big windows. Anyone that does not have ill intent, I don't think this would apply to but just for a security standard. If it is a little bit higher, we think that anyone that has ill intent to carve into the building might be deterred.

Mr. Timmerman – Are you replacing the existing gate?

Ms. Nelson – Yes. We are replacing it. There was a picture of the date. I don't know if it was in this presentation. It is already an iron gate. It is really deteriorating, orange, and falling apart, as is the gate. You can see it on the railing at the front.

Ms. Tabony – There is a fence in the planter. Is that going?

Ms. Nelson – Yes. It is because it is degrading and old.

Mr. Timmerman – With this front section, did you think about adding shrubs or other landscape instead of the 42-inch-high fence?

Ms. Nelson – We haven't.

Mr. Rosenthal – Is the landscaping going to stay behind the fence?

Ms. Nelson – Yes.

Mr. Schwarz – Are you getting rid of the trees?

Ms. Nelson – No. We are not planning on changing the landscaping.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Lewis – The applicant has been very nice not to mention this. We know the reason that this is being done. There are trespassers who are not necessarily trying to break into the building. They are using these planted areas to urinate and defecate and possibly even sleep there. It not just happens at night or during non-business hours. There probably could be other solutions. Another solution is to build out to this building volume or increase that brick wall. You could not see through it. It would also achieve the ends. It would not be as appealing as it is. This is a good solution. There are difficulties with running a business in any business district, particularly the Downtown Mall. I would support this application.

Ms. Tabony – It is too high. In particular, the corner condition where you have this lower wall meeting the higher wall and the jump in scale of the fence sets up a precarious condition. If it could come down a foot in front, I would be happy to see that. It would need to be a couple feet on the yellow side. It is hard for me to understand that elevation in the drawings in total. Bringing down that yellow section as shown in here would be a positive change.

Mr. Schwarz – The gate portion is fine. What is marked in red, I would not support that. It would be odd to put a fence on top of that low wall. I apologize that you have a problem that you would need to fence off that grassy portion. It is too tall. Our guidelines say, ‘don’t add fences in areas where fences don’t exist.’ I know this building has fences. Downtown does not have fences. It is odd to have this fenced off area on The Mall. I would not support that lower portion. If you absolutely must have the fence, maybe you keep it to the upper wall, so that it turns back towards the building where the yellow ends and cuts back there as opposed to blocking off the lower planter. Does that make sense?

The handrail does look nice. I don’t think it meets code. I would check into that. Handrails need to be graspable. There are specific requirements for that. Since we don’t want to see this again after it goes to the building/building permit office, that does comply with code.

Mr. Timmerman – The addition of the fences is a bit unfortunate based on the overall existing design. The overall existing design looks and works well. Adding railing is going to ‘fussy’ up that corridor. There already is a railing on the other side. I would be in support of it based on the needs that you are expressing. Have you considered shrubs or some sort of landscaping in place of that that could act in the same way that creates a barrier/an area that would not allow people to walk through? That would be a more appropriate way of handling this. With the design itself, you could put up any kind of fence. This is a nice fence from a good crafts person. That is a plus as well. While I think there is a better of handling the front, I would be in support of it.

Ms. Nelson – I want to talk about the railing. That was put together. We had staff do the gist for the design’s sake. That was very preliminary. It would look like that if it meets code. We have not gotten through all that for the railing.

Mr. Werner – It was just a standard cap at the appropriate height. I had also asked Ms. Nelson about that corner where it turns on the lower wall and to make sure that where the red and yellow came together and is engaged in the drawings. I think they have accomplished that.

Mr. Schwarz – The handrail would not get through the permit office.

Mr. Werner – That is correct. We have learned more about fences. This must go to Council. I cannot make any predictions on that. If you are OK with the yellow, that does not require Council.

Ms. Tabony – I like Mr. Schwarz's suggestion of pushing the fence back to the second wall. Would that require approval?

Mr. Werner – No. I raised that. That would solve the question at least on this side. As you proceed to the right of this picture, there is a large picture window and offices there. I don't think that the applicant wanted to concede something along the front that served a purpose. This brick wall that you see, where I have the 3-foot dimension, that brick wall continues back. The shadow hides it a little bit. One remedy would be to just turn the corner there with the upper wall fence. They could do that. Council does not need to be involved.

Ms. Tabony – I think Mr. Timmerman's recommendation for a planting would be a deterrent for people occupying that space. It would be very appropriate for that location.

Mr. Schwarz – Has everybody up here looked at this? I was surprised how small the space is. It seems to me putting a fence on that lower wall feels awkward to me and even more awkward on the triangular piece that is to the right of this picture. That would feel strange to me, out of place, and out of character.

Mr. Werner – You can take this from a continuing discussion we had earlier. What is the design element here? How is it looking at it through the lens of the guidelines? There are fences and railings at other places nearby. It is not unusual to have that here. We have an iron fence there. We have the iron gate. It is to suspend disbelief for what may or may not be the intent of this.

Mr. Schwarz – You said that there are fences and gates. As you go further east around The Pavillion, there are fences. There are none elsewhere on The Mall.

Mr. Werner – There are no yard fences, but there are railings. There are certainly railings already existing in this courtyard. You have a 42-inch railing there. We know that because it is pitched. We have railings and barriers around the café spaces. This is not totally unheard of. The design isn't perfect. If they had come in with something bought at Lowes and put in there, I would have a problem. This is an elegant design. From my recommendation to you, the height, if reduced, would fit in nicely here.

Ms. Lewis – How tall is the lower one?

Mr. Werner – 42 inches.

Mr. Timmerman – That is a good picture to talk about the fact that there is going to be a lot of fencing there now when you have the other one along the building.

Mr. Werner – If you were to walk along The Mall, you will see that soldier course along the front wall. Our assumption is that is usually the property line. It may well be the face of the wall. I would assume that, given that they were allowed to build this wall in the 80s, that is on their property. That would be part of the building permit review. The sidewalk is a public walk.

Ms. Tabony – Do we have a sense for what the slope of that sidewalk is?

Mr. Werner – It is just over 2 percent. It is almost imperceptible. I intentionally took that picture. I talked with Ms. Nelson. When they build this fence, are they going to fabricate it at a rate? Is it going to be segmented? That slope is so imperceptible. It is there.

Ms. Tabony – Having a handrail there would not necessarily make sense. Is there a way you could make an offering to the public instead of a deterrent? With a handrail, it could also do the same thing. I don't know if that is a reasonable request.

Ms. Nelson – Can you expand on a handrail or where that would be?

Ms. Tabony – Rather than adding a fence that is clearly articulated as a fence of don't go here. That is an architectural language that says, 'keep out' to me. A handrail may structurally act in the same way but be more inviting. I am not articulating this well. It structurally like creating a barrier. It could be an offering rather than a deterrent.

Mr. Werner – As currently drawn, at that sloped walk here, that has the less adorned segment of fence that will have a handrail on top of it. You are almost suggesting that railing replicate along here as a handrail. It is then a physical deterrent. It could still go under. It does create a barrier.

Ms. Tabony, you are essentially saying something of a lower height. It does not necessarily have to be 42 inches.

Ms. Tabony – You could attach the handle to the face of it. It is just an idea to consider.

Ms. Nelson – It has already been mentioned. I will bring it up. My staff are having to pick up feces on that brick wall and that area. It is not something that they should have to handle or try to prevent as it is happening in broad daylight. I understand the hope to transition to something like landscaping. We have landscaping. That does not prevent them from even that back area. We have had unfavorable symbols carved into our building. I understand what you are saying. We aren't doing a huge fence at the front. We still do want to be inviting. We want to make it look good. We want to add value. We also want to make sure that we are doing something that also helps us and helps the people that work in that building on a day-to-day basis.

Mr. Schwarz – If somebody is in favor of this, they should make a motion. We will see if it flies. There is a bigger issue at play that I think Council needs to address with a more general solution to The Mall.

Ms. Tabony – Having this go to Council, would that be a positive discussion to have again? Is that a forum in which this could be a larger discussion? If we were to approve this, it must go to Council?

Mr. Werner – You need to realize that your conversation is going to serve as the record. I understand from the applicant that this is what they wish to take to Council. There was a hesitation to say, 'we could throw in some alternatives.' The first response from Council might be, 'do the alternatives instead.' If you felt it was a strong design reason to do that, I think it is reasonable. It is that fine line of deciding of whether we are trying to find a solution that is acceptable to Council or find a design solution that is acceptable for the guidelines. I am frequently contacted. People are concerned that things that the BAR has or should have looked at serve as impediments to the unhoused on The Mall. That is the distinction. This is private property. This is looking at this as a private property. They have every right to ask that. I know that Council will be asked about that. That is a pervasive question. If I was advising the applicant, it is an ideal one. It creates the barrier that has a separation. It is a design solution. Continuing the fence around the corner on the upper wall would allow them to construct that. It would not be going to Council. You are welcome, in your recommendation, acknowledgement of the situation. It is not in the BAR purview to disagree with them for wanting to install a fence. We don't have to agree. When

Council gets this, I don't think they will view it as time for a broader discussion. It may come up. I would stay in 'your box.'

Mr. Schwarz – If we vote to approve it, then it goes to Council. Council is going to look at that as, 'we recommended that they should approve it. I don't think the discussion will happen.

Mr. Werner – It would go to Council as a recommendation for them to not allow the special exception permitting that fence on the lower wall.

Mr. Schwarz – That might dig up more of a discussion about the reasons for the fence.

Mr. Werner – They are going to come up no matter what. If you want to start talking about that, you are exceeding your purview.

Mr. Schwarz – We cannot use that as a reason.

Ms. Lewis – Our purview does not cover zoning. There is a portion of approval for this that is out of our hands. That has to do with zoning. This body does not deal with zoning. With the next item on the agenda, the public's concerns are more with zoning than they are with our purview, which is limited. I also support this because there are extreme circumstances facing this property owner. Weighing the guidelines against those circumstances and wanting for businesses, without businesses the Downtown Mall shutters. There would be nothing there. It does not pervade every decision I make. The comfort of the people that come to this place every day. It is a large employer. None of them should be asked to clean up somebody's feces. That is a shame. They are not being bad neighbors by doing this. They are protecting their property. I don't think that what we have in the guidelines, or the zoning objection outweighs my support for this.

Motion – Ms. Lewis – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find the proposed fence, gate, and rail installation at 530 East Main Street satisfies the BAR's criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the height as shown. Second by Mr. Rosenthal. Motion passes 3-2.

Comments following the Motion

Ms. Lewis – I can sit here and come up with other solutions of how this could be done that might have achieved some of the goals. I am not the applicant. We cannot second judge and cannot design for the applicant. We must take a vote on what is before us. That is what my motion is about.

E. Other Business

6. Discussion

No formal action will be taken

BAR # 25-0084

Tax Map 29 Parcels 71,73,74,75,76

202, 204, 208 & 214 7th Street SW & 613 Delevan Street 204 & 208 7th Street SW –

Individually Protected Properties

Owners:

- 202:Monticello Media LLC
- 204:William Lynch & 204-7 LLC
- 208:Michael J. Christian

- 214:7th St LLC
- 613 Delevan St: Mattie L. Hall

Applicant: Mitchell-Matthews Architects

Project: New multi-story, mixed-use building

- Staff presented the proposed project for this preliminary discussion to get feedback and advice on how to make the proposed project better.
- This project does not sit in an ADC District. The only reason that the BAR is seeing this proposed project is because of the IPP nature of the 2 historic houses.
- The primary focus for this project is the preservation of the 2 historic houses.
- The 2 historic houses and neighborhood do sit on a national register district. The neighborhood does not have a local designation.
- The BAR does not review the maintenance of the 2 historic houses that are currently there.
- The applicant presented for the third time in a preliminary discussion.
- The applicant is asking to make the 2 buildings non-contributing and to build behind those 2 IPP properties.
- The applicant is proposing to rehabilitate, repair, and preserve those 2 historic buildings.
- The applicant is proposing a pocket park behind the 2 historic buildings.
- The applicant did go over how they have addressed the comments from the BAR in the previous meeting.
- The applicant is attempting to follow the design guidelines and the guidelines from the Department of the Interior.
- The 2 historic IPP buildings will probably be amenity spaces such as study areas/rooms, coffee shops, etc.
- The applicant did provide the history of the 2 IPP buildings. That history will be available to read in the pocket park.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Lorna Fecho – I have mixed feelings about a development. As a chief nurse, I liked to hire nurses from town. They make good nurses and can arrive at a moment's notice. I was worried about faculty not having a space to live in town. From a perspective of what they want to build, I have mixed feelings. On a personal level, they would be building in my backyard. I live at the end of Walker Square. If I walk through my doorway, I will hit the lovely pictures of my neighbor's garage. The thought of building a 7-story building that would destroy the texture of Fifeville. I attend the Fifeville meeting every month trying to understand the history of Fifeville. Seven stories is silly to me. The height is not the issue. It is where the height is. The Baptist Church would be adversely affected. You could not see that church. I drove today on Delevan and up & down the neighborhoods. There is not as much as space there as I was thinking based on the pictures. Other than the garage that is sitting at the end of Delevan, what is going to be torn down? What possibly could they put that building on that space? I don't know where this goes. This is not the place for a 7-story luxury dormitory.

Stephanie Watson (7 ½ Street SW) – I bought my house in Fifeville in 2001. I have lived in that neighborhood ever since. I watched Walker Square be built. I remember the 'hoops' that Walker Square had to go through. I am all for using the land that we have in Fifeville to have extra housing. I am 100 percent behind that. Do I like the type of housing that is being proposed? No. My objection to this thing and the BAR can help with is that I do not feel that the building we are putting in that is being proposed does not protect the scale and character of the Fifeville neighborhood. It does not suit an actual neighborhood where you have children, a lot of families, single-family homes, duplexes, and you have people that lived in that community. I noticed the comments from the man there about what people have done or not done in the past. I don't think that is at play. You have a community that is slowly becoming educated on how they need to take action and what they can do. The building does not fit the scale of the neighborhood.

Carmelita Wood – I am the current president of the Fifeville Neighborhood Association. I come before you to talk about this project on 7 ½ Street. Years ago, this neighborhood and the streets were not built for luxury cars, big & tall buildings. It is a small-scale neighborhood. I also ask that you scale down on that project that is coming down. If you come down Main Street, at one time, you could look over and see the sun going any direction. You could see the mountains going any direction. With all the tall buildings coming up now, it feels like you are in a dungeon. If you are going up the street, there is no sun coming in. How would you like to be in your home with a 7-story building being built? Your kids are getting dressed for bed or school. Some of those tall buildings are looming over your yard. That is not good. We ask that, if this project goes through, that it be scaled back to a minimum of 4 to 5 stories. I want to ask that you think about the impact and the quality of life the elderly would have with this project coming into this neighborhood. Some of the elderly people there cannot get around. You have added more cars coming in, more people coming in. With Walker Square on one side and this project on the other side, it is not good quality of life for the residents in this neighborhood. It does not fit into this neighborhood. We ask that you think seriously about this project and what it will do to the neighborhood.

Hannah Strauss (Belmont) – I ask that you listen to the residents of who already live in this neighborhood and the fact that they regularly have said not to build tall buildings in our neighborhood, so that we can have light and have mobility. A lot of these streets are one-way. You cannot build something this tall and expect it to have the same feeling of the neighborhood that it does now. This is like the other building, the other luxury apartment building that is going up. We don't need luxury apartment buildings in town. We need affordable housing. I know that you have a lot of talk about purview and what this board can do. I ask that you listen to Ms. Wood of scaling it back or putting pressure on them. I ask that you think about the fact that a lot of residents in these black neighborhoods have been pushed out of other neighborhoods. I cannot imagine who could have made those decisions about razing Vinegar Hill or about destroying black homes and black businesses. You are in the position of power right now to push back on that. I know that you would say that it must go to City Council. You can make them waste their time and waste that money. They should not be able to build something like this and block out people's light. That should be illegal. We should not let that happen. There are things that need to happen in Fifeville. There needs to be access to food, food systems, more bus routes, and access to equitable transportation. There does not need to be luxury apartment buildings that are here to further support gentrification of a small neighborhood in Charlottesville. Please think about the fact that you do have power in this and should use that power to benefit people who live here and have lived here for generations. There are generational homes that need to be protected.

Todd Hill (Cedar Court Condos) – I am not going to stand here and say that I am in support of the building or not in support of the building. We have jumped the 'shark' in Charlottesville. Regardless of if anyone likes it or not, for better or worse, we are gentrifying. We have become denser. If you look at the whole Main Street corridor, at this point, any sense of small community, small town, history is gone. It has been gone for a while. What I like about this building in the brief presentation that the architectural firm put on is the fact that they went above and beyond to consider where it is going and what is already there. The fact is that they are taking so much consideration of the 2 historic buildings there. If you are going to put something there, they are presenting a good option. If you look back at some other situations in town, across The Omni between Water and South Street, a large high-rise was put up there and attached to one of the original buildings that was considered historic. My guess is that none of you were on the BAR at the time. Whoever thought of that idea, if you look at it from the back, it heinous and hideous. It ruined South Street. I am not saying yay or nay on the building. If it went through, I was impressed by what this architectural firm has done.

Matthew Simon (Dice Street) – I think the presentation is fine. It does not match with what the actual realization is. You look at a lot of green that is happening in those pictures. There is Walker Square on the other side of 7th Street. Nobody is going to look in on that view of the courtyard. I think it is gorgeous. I don't think it really fits. That is what my plea to you all. Maybe consider a little bit more. When we were walking over here from our house, we were looking at all the other houses. Our house was built in the early 1920s. The house next to our

house was built earlier than that. It all looks old. It looks like a neighborhood. I grew up in Willoughby where all the houses look the same. We have a little of that. At the same time, it has a definition. It has a character. You may not like The Code Building. At least, it is brick that matches all the other brick that is on the Downtown Mall. I don't think that this matches. I do not like the façade. There is that brick on that first level there. As you go up, that is not what it looks like. That is not what our neighborhood looks like. It does not fit on so many levels. I know that we do not have time to go into the traffic calming and the parking. What is currently happening in Fifeville on those streets are traffic calming initiatives. They have been happening 1.5 years. Nobody has been talking to these guys about that. There is no way that this structure is going to be able to sustain what they have going on right now. The neighborhood is moving and hopefully getting a coop. There is a lot of energy in this neighborhood. This does not fit it.

Sarah Malpass (626 Bailey Rd.) – I am the Vice-President of the Fifeville Neighborhood Association. You have had a lot of community members and neighbors, who have spoken tonight about the fit, the sense of the conflict of the history of the community. I want to affirm what is being said from those residents. As you think about community fit and the historic nature of this community, history is not just about buildings. It is about the people who built them. As you think about the impacts on the neighborhood, you are thinking about, not just the impacts on the architecture, but the people and the communities that created that architecture and the people in the communities that continue to steward that architecture going into the future. I am going to point back to the Cherry Avenue Small Area Plan, which came from residents and has been adopted into city code. It reflects the vision our residents have. As you are thinking about community impacts, please keep these items from the Cherry Avenue Small Area Plan in mind. “Cherry Avenue and the surrounding areas will be a vibrant mixed-use community that supports a diverse, thriving Fifeville community. Development will respect and preserve the history and culture of the Fifeville neighborhood. New development and investment on Cherry Avenue and throughout the neighborhood will build a sense of community between longtime and newer residents and be accessible and welcoming to residents at the most vulnerable end of the socioeconomic scale.” This building does not do that. It contributes to displacement in our community, something that our residents have been working hard to fight the past several years. We need your help. There are a lot of goals in Cherry Avenue Small Area Plan. “Ensure low-income residents, people of color, and generational residents are able to remain in Fifeville and benefit from the neighborhood investments.”

Sophia Marrero (Beach Crest Court) – I am here to speak in opposition to this Fifeville building. I am here to ask what we define as a right to a home. It is something that has become something of a human right. It is something that is up for discussion. When we talk about a home, we just don't mean a building, a house, or walls. That does not make it enough for people to live and survive. When we think about the impact that this building is going to have on these homes, it is about the quality of life that people experience and the quality of life that will be interrupted if this building is built. I want to echo that and echo what everybody else has said and to protect black neighborhoods. We are gentrifying the city. We must do something about it. I understand that the BAR is limited in their purview. Whatever you can do, please do it.

Andrew Knighting (Rio District) – I am bringing in some of the worker perspective from UVA. On my end of town, we have a luxury apartment that looks like some of the plans that were presented tonight. I can let you know that the people that are in my range of income cannot afford things like this. If we want to have people that we want to work in our town, we must have buildings and housing access to them that they can afford. There was some apartment buildings put up. We are concerned about how this is going to be raising our rent in our area. A studio apartment that is 550 square feet is going to be \$1800 a month, which is close to what we are paying for our 3-bedroom apartment right now. I want you to consider that as you are coming to your decision about whether this is going to represent the community that it is going to be built in.

Marina Simon (599 Dice Street) – I see all these renderings. Living in Charlottesville since 1992, I don't have faith in it. I have seen The Standard go up. I have seen all these buildings go with all the promises of what it is

going to look like. I remember when the amphitheater was going to be a movable park that could come in and out. That was crap. I don't have faith in these drawings because I don't know that somebody who isn't from our town and our neighborhood is speaking from our voices is going to believe in it the way that these people do. It is your job to make sure that happens. I know it was not you on these committees at those times. You still represent that. Your track record is a low bar. We must hold you accountable. I hope you hold yourselves accountable for what you are doing.

Andy James (223 5th St. SW) – Last year, we got this notice in the mail from a traffic calming study with Woodard. I was excited. I thought we might get a grocery store. The Piedmont Housing Alliance is talking about this space on Cherry Avenue. I immediately signed up. Today was the first time I have seen the traffic calming study. I saw an article in the newspaper in June about this building. I have been in this house 10 years. A vacant house across the street owned by some people that have a nice farm in North Garden. It took me 3 years to call Public Works to get the pigeons cleaned out of the house. It is an IPP. We have people like the Simons who are great neighbors, who live 2 doors down from me. This is happening. You might want to be careful with the building a community zone for third way and amenities. The people in the neighborhood see through some of that language. I need to get out of this neighborhood. I can see how the city is treating this neighborhood. I know what is going to happen.

Cheri Lynn Batel (325 7 ½ Street SW) – I have lived in this neighborhood for 10 years. We bought the home from our family friends. He and his family have lived there for 35 years. I have been honored to learn about our neighborhood. I want to echo a few pieces of what has already been said. In terms of scale and scope, what is being proposed will dwarf the things around it. We are not going to protect those 2 IPPs. We are going to envelop them with this. They are not going to become part of the fabric of the neighborhood. They are going to be cleaved off. They are not going to be rehabilitated for the community. Another concern that I have is about how those 2 spaces connect to the rest of the neighborhood. The neighborhood is not just a block here and there. Those spaces are part of the way that people walk back and forth. When I walk through my neighborhood, I walk through those spaces. They are spaces that are connected to other spaces. When I am in my home, I hear First Baptist Church. When this building goes in, it is going to cleave off that historic church from our neighborhood. It is part of our neighborhood. It is part of the sound of our neighborhood, part of the way people walk and move through our neighborhood. It is not just these chunks. It is not about protecting this little chunk and wrapping it with a big building. It is about preserving the way that these pieces work together. When we talk about scale, scope, fit, and protecting, we are not protecting that for the community. We are protecting that for the development. That development is not there to promote community in Fifeville. Tonsler Park and building on Cherry Avenue and bringing up ideas about community and how we are supposed to serve each other, that protects our community. Putting in 2 buildings that might be storage or a café for the residents is not going to do that.

Lakshmi Fjord (7 ½ Street) – I want to echo the previous commenter's statements about the atmosphere, the sense of movement, sense of belonging. I have only lived there a year. My family and extended family live on Nall. I was enticed to this neighborhood because it is so knit. The people are so friendly. I have a huge concern about the scale and what this will do. This is a walking neighborhood. People are using the term 'scale.' It is so many stories up. Those residents, in a symbolic way, will be looking down on Fifeville. It is not necessarily that they are looking down in a classist or racist way. They are literally going to be looking down. They will have taken over those 2 streets. I wanted to point to this notion of precedent, which I believe in. We depend on precedence in the legal sense. The Blue Moon Diner is engulfed. It does not have any place there. It seems ridiculous. That is faux history. That is not real in place holding onto history. These are zoo buildings. It is not a preservation of history.

Wendy Gau – I wanted to thank you for listening to the residents of Westhaven and 10th & Page at the August BAR meeting. I urge you to listen to the Fifeville residents today and think how this huge building will further gentrify and tower over this historically black neighborhood. I understand the BAR's purview is supposed to be

limited. The reality is that you have been tasked with the duty that you did not anticipate because of blind spots and oversights in the zoning code. That is hard for you to sit with or grapple with. The residents of Fifeville are facing a gigantic concrete wall and students in their neighborhood that none of them anticipated having to live in their backyard. You are the last and only city body between historically black and low-income communities and these profit-seeking by-right buildings that will always be for students. The city's economic analysis has said that at the heights of 7 and 8 stories, student housing leased by the bedroom is the only kind of housing with enough rent per square foot that will make a profit. I realize that this is a zoning issue. Community members and residents have been working and organizing and showing up to every city meeting to make noise about these massive mistakes in the ordinance. Their homes and lives are at stake. Until we get a change, we need the BAR to help us by using all the power and tools you have to recommend maximum design improvements. When the time comes, deny CoAs to developments that have real material negative architectural and design impacts on communities below them and the 2 small houses in this case. The decision we are asking you to make is in line with the BAR's purview. Several of you did vote for the current zoning ordinance. You have publicly admitted remorse for doing so. I would argue that it is your moral responsibility to go above what your current authority on the BAR allows you to do. You are responsible partially for all the threats to this neighborhood that these people voicing to you.

Ms. Joy Johnson wanted to voice her solidarity with Fifeville. She has been looking and waiting for BAR member Cheri Lewis to join us at City Council to fix the zoning code.

Paul Reda (211 5th St. SW) – My property backs onto the luxury student housing development that is being proposed on 7th Street. My home will be less than 15 feet from the back wall of this designed building. I have submitted comments in advance to the BAR on this development. You have heard from my neighbors on this. We are united in our opposition to this travesty of a building. I am suggesting that there is a way within your purview for you to hold this development up. I don't know whether it will hold it up permanently or temporarily. All of you have an obligation to try to protect the historic black neighborhoods of Charlottesville. This building is inappropriate in its scale, location, and usage. You earlier heard from the architects, who have applied their 'lipstick' to this building. The building is still a 'pig.' The architects suggested and discussed in their written presentation the importance of honoring and respecting the Hawkins built cottages. Honor and respect are given freely, not in service to the almighty dollar. The proposed development will dwarf and diminish these cottages. The architects have tempted you to focus on the trees, the benches, the paving, or the nice windows. I urge you to focus on the forest. Per the approval process guidelines, you are required to look at the height, scale, and mass of the proposal and to judge whether it is visually and architecturally compatible with the Hawkins cottages. The Hawkins properties are typical of the historic neighborhood in which they sit. They are small, modest homes in a walkable neighborhood. No building is an island. The cottages should be viewed in the context of their neighborhood. Viewed from that perspective, the proposal is incompatible with 'historic, cultural, and architectural character of what is a national historic district' of Fifeville. The core question is whether the development is appropriate for these historic properties and this historic neighborhood. There are many reasons why this is a terrible development. I acknowledge that some of those reasons are beyond your purview. Within your purview, you have a specific reason to decline to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Frank Rector (304 6 ½ St. SW) – A Certificate of Appropriateness is an interesting phrase. I would think that is a good thing to need. I wonder what you all personally think. It might not be in your purview. A Certificate of Appropriateness might have nothing to do with whether some architectural proposal is at all appropriate to the space in which it is going to be put in a neighborhood that has been described. Appropriate has an interesting, related word: appropriation. It is as if you are discussing a certificate of appropriation. That area is in Fifeville. It is not next to it. It is not going to be given to Fifeville residents. Fifeville residents have said that we need affordable housing. That is the mandate that the city took on about 7 or 8 years ago. It is a difficult mandate to accomplish. We are all evolving. This board and the community of Charlottesville might be evolving as is the community of Fifeville. We meet monthly. I have not heard a single Fifeville resident say anything in favor of this development. A Certificate of Appropriateness must have to do with the code, to the zoning. Is it appropriate

to the zoning and appropriate to some narrow questions that were specified by the city staff? It is odd that it does not have to do with the appropriateness of the proposal to a neighborhood. Most people have objected to the finished building. A little was mentioned about building the thing. Is it appropriate in the neighborhood of Fifeville? At every entrance into Fifeville, there is a 'No Trucks' sign that was put there by the city. Trucks cannot make certain turns. Those signs were put up 6 or 7 months ago.

Miles Hingley – I have lived in Fifeville for a long time. I have lived in Charlottesville for nearly 50 years. It is not true that everyone in Fifeville opposes this building. It is not true that the people that live in this building are going to look down over Fifeville and be racist and dislike the residents. It is not true that you should not issue the appropriate certificates for these guys to build this building. As developers, they have spent a lot of money. Those slides that we looked at were not cheap. The idea that they want to come in with outside capital into our neighborhood and invest in our neighborhood is a good thing. We are not going to be able to rely on private development if every time a developer tries to build something in this town, you put a huge roadblock in the way. Does anybody know what they just did to the Violet Crown? That was going to be a huge development with income taxes, people activating The Mall. If I owned a business on The Mall, I would want those people there. The developer pulled out of it. What happened to the development on Tarleton Oak? Is that happening? They probably pulled out of it. Are they developing it? Those are citywide issues. Nobody is complaining about a 7-story Salvation Army building in our neighborhood. Not a word has been said about the height, the massing, and the tree being cut down. Nobody is upset about that building. That is 7 stories and \$3 million of city money. That is city taxpayer money. What we need to do is encourage people with outside capital to come to our city, to our neighborhood, invest hundreds of millions of dollars in building things where people can live. I live in Fifeville. I rent places in Fifeville. If you are a landlord in Fifeville, you don't want this building. First-year medical students and people working in the hospital are going to rent building in Fifeville for a lot of money. I know people in Fifeville that rent basements for \$1500/\$1600 to medical students. Those people can afford this building. If we don't build it, this historic neighborhood is going to be filled with doctors and first-year medical students. This is a place where we need housing.

Jenny Rysdale (300 7th St. SW) – This is in my yard that it is happening in. I do not mean for it to be just about me. I could move. We have been there 24 years and raised our kids there. I feel that this destroys the neighborhood. I have loved this neighborhood since we moved in 24 years ago. It has been an amazing place. It is overwhelming and too much. If it was 3 or 4 stories, it would be manageable. I get the reason for density in Charlottesville. We need to increase density. This is overwhelming, too luxury, and too much. It is more than this neighborhood can handle. It destroys the fabric of this neighborhood.

Earl Hicks – I walk through the Fifeville neighborhood all the time. It is a wonderful neighborhood. There is a lot of history and historic houses. For developers to come and build what they want to build in somebody's backyard, that is an invasion of privacy. You must respect people's yard. It is the same thing that is trying to go on in my backyard with LV Collective. They are trying to come in our backyard and try to build behind us. They are trying to shut us down, shut Westhaven down. We are all family. We are part of the same neighborhood. I am from Charlottesville. I was born and raised here. To see this happening is disgusting. I am disgusted with it. It should not be happening at all. We need affordable housing, but not in this way. We need to think about families, communities, and generations. When you don't think about those things, you are wiping out whole families and whole generations. It is not right.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

- The applicant was given an opportunity to respond to the comments made by the public.
- The applicant did address the argument of those comments made by members of the public in opposition of this project.
- The applicant did bring up the cost of rehabilitation of the 2 IPP buildings.

- The owners of the properties do want to activate the street in front of these 2 IPP buildings.
- Each member of the BAR did provide suggestions, feedback, and advice for the proposed project.
- Staff did go over the process for this project going forward with the BAR and other opportunities to publicly speak on this proposed project.
- Staff did go over what guides the decisions that the BAR makes when it comes to approving or denying a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- Decisions by the BAR are guided by the Secretary of Interior Guidelines and ADC Guidelines. ADC Guidelines are approved by City Council.
- The reason the BAR is looking at this proposed project is the 2 IPP buildings on the project site.
- There was a robust discussion regarding this proposed project.
- Staff did go over the process for applying for a Certificate of Appropriateness application, approval or denial of a CoA, and possible appeal to City Council of any aggrieved party or person.
- Members of the BAR did provide suggestions and feedback for the applicant regarding this proposed project.
- Ms. Lewis did have concerns about the scale, mass, and height of the building blocking out the sun and the impact on First Baptist Church.
- Mr. Schwarz did check to see if there was support for this proposed project if it was brought back to the BAR in the coming months. Some of the feedback centered around a reduction in the massing.

The BAR meeting was recessed for 5 minutes.

7. Staff Discussion

- 1301 Wertland Street – review of Council action Sept 2, 2025
- CLG Training requirements.
- On Board for City Boards & Commissions; attendance tracking.
- Lights: 303 West Main Street (Rapture) Art panels.
- There was discussion surrounding updating the Design Guidelines.

F. Adjourn

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 PM.