

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

Regular Meeting

April 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: Ronald Bailey, Roger Birle, Cheri Lewis, James Zehmer, David Timmerman, Katherine Tabony, Jerry Rosenthal

Staff Present: Jeff Werner, Kate Richardson, Remy Trail

Pre-Meeting:

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

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda.

No Public Comments

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. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # 26-0008

320 West Main Street; TMP 290018000

Downtown ADC District

Owner: 320 West Main LLC

Applicant: Terry Hindermann/Mike Stoneking

Project: Padel court

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # HST26-0013

408 Park Street; TMP 530117000

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: RAF 408 LLC

Applicant: Preston Hutter

Project: Removal of exterior stairs at side entrance

Mr. Zehmer (Chair) pulled BAR application #HST26-0012 from the Consent Agenda for discussion. The item was moved to D. New Items on the regular agenda.

Motion: Ms. Lewis moved to approve the Consent Agenda, noting that with approval this only includes application items #1 and #3. Approval of the Consent Agenda results in approval of the following CoA applications: HST26-0012 & HST26-0013.

Second: Mr. Timmerman. Vote 7-0

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find the proposed padel court at 320 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...

- **That both the light poles and lamping meet code per Ch. 34 Div. 4.12.3**
- **Should a change in location, height or specification of the light posts or LED light panels be necessary, the applicant will submit an amendment with the alternative lighting plan for BAR review, if warranted by staff.**

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find the proposed stair removal at 408 Park 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.

C. Deferred Items

N/A

D. New Items

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR # HST26-0012

410 2nd Street NE; TMP 330078000

North Downtown ADC District

Owner: Rachel Lucy & Theodore Cisu, Trustees

Applicant: Annie Mathot, Bluebird Design Company

Project: Entry overhangs and site alterations

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Request CoA for addition of two bracketed door overhangs on the East elevation of recent addition, and the following proposed site work:

- Removal and replacement of front concrete stairs at sidewalk
- Patch and repair existing stone retaining wall at front sidewalk
- Remove portion of broken concrete wall on north property line
- Replacement of concrete entry path with bluestone pavers
- Remove stone and wood bordered planting beds in front and side yards
- Replace concrete stairs at front porch with wooden treads/risers
- Construction of low wooden deck in front yard (SW corner)
- Tree removal at SW corner
- Tree plantings (one in front yard; multiple in rear yard)
- Wood surround for HVAC at south elevation
- New decorative metal fencing in the front and side yards
- New wood privacy fencing in the rear yard

Annie Mathot, Applicant – My portion of this application is minimal with the bracketed overhangs on the rear elevation.

Anna Boeschstein, Applicant – It is a tight site. The owners wanted to maximize their ability to use and enjoy their yard as much as possible. One of the owners grew up in this house. She, her mother, and her husband now live there. She has fond memories of spending a lot of time in the front yard and using the rear yard. They wanted to be able to do that again for the next generation. We are planning on keeping the stone wall on 2nd Street intact and changing the cheek walls to either side of the entry stairs so we can replace the concrete entry stairs with bluestone and the bluestone walkway. The walkway will be dry laid to preserve that large oak tree in the front yard. The owners were interested in having a deck in the front yard, which sits flush on grade with the bluestone and the perpendicular bluestone walk. It acts as a front terrace for them to greet neighbors and hang out because their front porch is narrow. They find that it is not as usable as they would like. To the side, just the circulation and the ability to be able to get from the front to backyard staying on their property and not having to go through the driveway easement. There is a wrought iron fence detail in the back of your packet. It is 36 inches high in the front yard. It transitions to a privacy fence. It will be stained. I included the color options in the packet. It is one of the two darker colors already on the architectural renovation. To the rear, it is mortar bluestone paving with planting beds around those existing landings. There will be a built-in grill and a bluestone pad and raised planters. The bluestone pad is to be a water feature that the owner will be providing.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Lewis – The summary that we received said that the front yard would be enclosed by a 3-foot wrought iron fence.

Ms. Boeschstein – If you go to sheet L.2.00, it is a wrought iron fence.

Ms. Lewis – My question was about the location of the fence. The textual application said it would enclose the front yard. The L.1.00 seemed to show that it will not enclose the whole front yard.

Ms. Boeschstein – The wrought iron fence meets the privacy fence. The transition point is just before the bay window of the addition to the south.

Ms. Lewis – I was looking at the front. Mr. Zehmer just pointed out to me that I was looking at the wrong thing. With the wrought iron fence gate, is that just across the steps? What is the rest of that hatched black line that joins the feature that is pointed out as a wrought iron gate.

Ms. Boeschstein – I believe the wrought iron gate returns on the house on the front north corner.

Mr. Zehmer – There is a dashed line on the plan.

Ms. Boeschstein – That is the setback.

Ms. Lewis – The wrought iron gate there at the top of the first set of stairs for privacy.

Ms. Boeschenstein – Do you see on the northwest corner of the front porch? There is a note that says bluestone steppers. There is a gate. The wrought iron gate is right there.

Ms. Lewis – I was referring to the one on the front steps.

Ms. Boeschenstein – That is a gate to match. It is just that the wrought iron fence company does not make that size standard. We must custom make those 2 panels to match for it to work on that path.

Ms. Lewis – How is that gate grounded?

Ms. Boeschenstein – It meets those 2 posts in the ground. That will be installed.

Mr. Zehmer – What is the purpose of removing the dogwood?

Ms. Boeschenstein – We could not get enough seating space for the family in that front yard without removing the tree. That meant taking out the dogwood and replacing it with a similar tree.

Ms. Lewis – I did not see any plan to remove that. It is not in the planting.

Ms. Boeschenstein – If you go to 0.02, that is the demolition plan. The tree is on that.

Mr. Timmerman – Everything that is coded in red is being demolished.

Ms. Lewis – It is not a big tree, and it is on the property line. It is near the retaining wall.

Ms. Boeschenstein – It is more the north-south orientation than the east-west orientation.

Mr. Zehmer – What are the materials for the decking you are proposing for the front yard?

Ms. Boeschenstein – We are looking at a cedar. If you go to the submission packet with existing conditions photos, on the first page center top photo has that dogwood.

Mr. Zehmer – It seems like it is not that much different location-wise of where the proposed redbud is going. For the decking, were you guys going to put that on deck plugs? It sounded like you are putting it straight on grade to be adjacent to the bluestone walkway.

Ms. Boeschenstein – We are raising the grade on that side only by a few inches. It looks like the grade has settled over there. For the most part, it is sitting on grade to the east. It is about 7 inches off grade as you go to the west side, the 2nd Street side.

Ms. Tabony – Does the grading of the front deck impact the dogwood?

Ms. Boeschenstein – I don't think so. Let me confirm that.

Mr. Zehmer – Part of the reason we are asking these questions is that our guidelines lean towards not removing a tree if it is not necessary. That is where some of these questions come from. In general, I think your landscape plan is very nice. I am not going to try and get too hung up.

Ms. Lewis – it seems like you are not replacing it with a smaller species. You are replacing it with something that is larger. I don't understand the justification for the removal. You clearly show a canopy on redbud at

some point in its mature state. That is much larger than the dogwood is right now. The dogwood cannot be any further to the south on this property.

Ms. Tabony – A redbud tree is a fast-growing tree. It is going to mature quickly, probably in 5 years. There is something nice about occupying the front yard or creating space for the family. I don't have a problem with removing the dogwood.

Mr. Zehmer – I would not 'fall on my sword' for it. I just wanted to ask the question.

Ms. Boeschenstein – The dogwood is 3 feet further than where we are placing the redbud. That 3 feet made a difference in the occupiable space.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Zehmer – I wanted to pull this from the Consent Agenda to ask about that. I agree with Ms. Tabony that benefits of having more occupiable space in the front yard outweigh it. The redbud will be nice. It is a fast grower. It will provide shade quickly. I don't have any objections to the application.

Motion – Mr. Zehmer – **Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed rear door overhangs and site modifications at 410 2nd Street NE 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. Second by Mr. Bailey. Motion passes 7-0.**

E. Other Business

4. Staff questions/discussion

- DT Mall updates (vehicular crossings, fountains, lights)
- Staff went over The Mark appeal to City Council. The Board of Zoning Appeals upheld the zoning determination by the Zoning Administrator for The Mark.
- Design Guidelines revisions – update & discussion

F. Adjourn

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:26 PM.