

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

Regular Meeting

May 19, 2026 – 5:00 PM

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



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

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

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

Pre-Meeting:

Mr. Schwarz did bring up a presentation to the Planning Commission about the Downtown Mall 50th Anniversary. Mr. Schwarz did talk about the removal of trees on the Downtown Mall. There was discussion surrounding the stages of the tree removal on the Downtown Mall.

There was discussion surrounding the project on West Main Street. Staff did go over the bylaws of the BAR and the BAR can change their processes for projects. Staff did go over the bylaws on public comments during preliminary discussions.

Ms. Tabony did have a question about vending machines in front of the Ridge Street project on the Consent Agenda. Mr. Schwarz did ask to pull the Ridge Street project from the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Zehmer called the meeting to order at 5:37 PM.

Motion – Cheri Lewis – On the pre-application discussions for West Main and Valley Road, we are going to limit the discussion with the applicant on the application to 30 minutes total, Matters from the Public will be heard, and each speaker will be limited to two minutes each. It must be germane to what the BAR can do. Our Chair can familiarize you with that. Second by Mr. Bailey. Motion passes 6-1 with an objection from Mr. Schwarz.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda.

Frank Becktor – I just want to thank the Board of Architectural Review for doing its best over the course of a few months to try to adhere to its guidelines. I don't know if there has been any kind of formal change to those guidelines. I suggest and hope that if the guidelines are still as they were or if they have changed, that you will also try now, in any discussion, to adhere to your guidelines to the best that you can as you see them. If a matter needs to come before Council again, it will come before Council again in terms of what

their guidelines are. That is what I think should happen in any kind of consideration of how the Council stands versus what their guidelines are. I hope that you will stick to your guidelines.

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 – February 18, 2026

Mr. Schwarz asked for the Ridge Street project to be pulled from the Consent Agenda for discussion. Motion to Approve – Ms. Lewis – Second by Mr. Bailey – Motion passes 7-0.

C. Deferred Items

N/A

D. New Items

1. 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

Kate Richardson, Staff Report – CoA for site alterations to improve accessibility at the primary entrance to the facility, including new parking spaces, entrance path, ramp, and accompanying small-plant landscaping.

Scott Hendrix, Applicant – The project is a 90 percent ADA project. A lot of sloping needs to be rectified. It is the main route into the building. It needs to be improved. We have added a little landscaping to the plan as well. It truly is an ADA project with curb cuts and replacing sidewalks to get the right slopes and balances.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Jeriah Lofton – I want to ask how this project is going to help our community. Are you going to use people employed from the community? Are you going to call people from outside the community like you have been doing? A lot of our community is not working. I see a lot of people coming from out-of-town working. We are not fluctuating. We are not surviving. We need to be more community attentive.

Mr. Hendrix – That is a great comment. We are bound by the Virginia Code for Procurement. It is a complicated thing. We cannot hire who we want. We must hire the lowest bidder in every job. We don't know who the lowest bidder is until bid day. That is just the state code that we must apply to.

Mr. Zehmer – I appreciate your sentiment and your comment and question. However, that does not really pertain to the Board of Architectural Review's purview, which is just the exterior elements of the design of the project. It is part of the community. It does not fall within our purview. We are here to basically assess the project in terms of the visual and physical aspects of the project, not who is executing the project.

Ms. Lewis – You can follow up with your concerns with Mr. Hendrix.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Tabony – I had a question about the vending machine. It is the first time that I have seen this. It seems like that is a harm reduction vending machine in a drop-box. I thought that maybe a vending machine does not belong on the front façade of a building here. It probably serves its purpose better, being visible to the public in front of the building. I am not going to argue with that. I am curious how it is operated from a safety perspective. I am not sure what is going to be in it. There are a lot of minors passing by that space every day. I am curious about that.

Mr. Hendrix – I cannot give you the details on how that is operated. That is a product that is being provided by UVA to the fire stations. The goal of this fire station is to get it in with this project. I am pretty sure it is an effort that is supported by the City Manager's Office as well to get these kinds of things out there for public consumption when needed.

Mr. Rosenthal – Are you going to be losing parking spaces with this new configuration?

Mr. Hendrix – There are about 4 or 5 parking spaces there now. They have a non-compliant aisleway that is about 3 or 4 feet wide. The wider alley that you see there between the 2 parking spaces is codified for what it must be. We cannot go down. We might lose a parking space. There are still probably 4 or 5 up there in front of that building that are not ADA compliant and some additional spaces off to the right-hand side as you face the front of the building.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Andrea Garnder – I heard something you said. Minors walk that street, doctors walk that street, elderly walk that street, homeless people walk that street, and everybody walks that street. Can we not, as a community or as the BAR, look at minors like they are a problem for a vending machine? Vending machines are all over the place. When you said there were minors that walk the street, it hit me. Everyone walks that street. Would you say protection-wise or is your concern that it would be robbed?

Ms. Tabony – This is the search that I did this afternoon. Narcan is in there. I don't know how it is used. It is safety for the children. Kids are walking by and going to the Music Resource Center. Is there a need for safety or some kind of control on that?

Mr. Zehmer – It is not a candy machine.

Ms. Garnder – That Narcan can save one of those minor lives as well. I was curious about it. Were you trying to pinpoint minors. I was just wondering.

Public Speaker – I want to speak to the harm reduction vending machine and how it usually works. There are certain supplies that people can get from harm reduction vending machines, no matter who they are; Narcan, first aid kits, and things like that. If you are someone who has gone to UVA, has gone to the Emergency Department, has used recreational drugs in any way, you can get a number. It looks like any regular vending machine. You put in your number. You can get sharps and pipes. I don't know what is going to be in this vending machine. I see that there is a drop-off point. People don't want sharps out. The great part of having a harm reduction vending machine next to a sharps container is that people can come and get rid of their used sharps and can get new sharps. It is making it safer for the community. There are not sharps all over the place. Usually, people bring their sharp there. With it being the fire department, there are not enough sharps boxes around town. Having it there so that people can get rid of their old sharps and get new sharps is usually how it works. Everyone can get things like first aid kits from the vending machine.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Lewis – I am glad these ADA upgrades are being made. It is long overdue. I was on the Charlottesville Electoral Board in the mid to late 90s. We had to move this precinct to another location, Tonsler. It is a great rec center. It is a great location. We were forced to move out of this firehouse. A lot of the community wanted to keep that precinct at the firehouse. Historically, it was a precinct that had been used for a long time. We had to move it because of ADA issues. People in wheelchairs could not get into the precinct. People would drop them off and they had to go over the curb. I am amazed that the city has gone this long without making these kinds of improvements for access. It is not just firefighters that access this. Now that we have heard what this vending machine will be used for. We hope that more people will be accessing this building, at least the exterior of it.

Mr. Schwarz – I don't think we can force you to do this. I just want you to consider it. You are tearing up a lot of pavement to do this. It looks like you are regrading a lot of the paving at the parking spaces

Mr. Hendrix – We are looking at demolishing where those new parking spaces are.

Mr. Schwarz – Looking at the site plan, there is a lot of distance between the back of those parking spaces and the curb cut on Ridge Street. It is a long curb cut. It extends the full length of the property on Ridge Street. I am wondering if that needs to be there. It looks like if I scale the PDF, you could have a 25-foot drive aisle behind those ADA parking spaces and still have about a 10-foot planting strip along Ridge Street. That would not interfere with the fire trucks. It would cut that curb cut so long and increase safety on the sidewalk there, potentially allow for street trees, which we don't really have any on Ridge Street, especially for an important corridor coming into town. If there is any way that the city could spend some extra money on this project, could you tear up a little more pavement?

Mr. Hendrix – It is an ADA project and funded with ADA funding from specific funding, from the federal government, and from the city to do this kind of work. I don't know if I can add a traffic portion to this project. I don't think we can. With the distance between where we are working, the road is still a good margin. It is probably 30 or 40 feet away from the area you are talking about where the curb is. It would be better to bring this up with public works and see if it can't be a project with the city engineering team, who know much more about roads and curbs than I do. Perhaps that might be a better venue in trying to get this.

Ms. Lewis – It is a long stretch without any shade for anybody who has walked from West Main to anywhere along that corridor. You have that long stretch of asphalt.

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 the proposed site alterations at 203 Ridge 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. Second by Mr. Bailey. Motion passes 7-0.**

2. 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

Kate Richardson, Staff Report – CoA application to replace all upper-level windows.

Steve Barber, Applicant – If you look at the proposed and the existing, our proposal is to match the window light layout exactly to what is existing; just replace the units with a modern, efficient window system, respecting the original masonry opening with no structural changes to the building. The existing windows are failing, have no thermal efficiency, they leak air, half of them don't operate, the cranks and operators have broken and failed, there are no seals, and we have had 3 different contractors come out to look at trying to remediate them. The best proposal that we have gotten is what we are proposing now. It is to replace the units with a more modern assembly.

Ms. Lewis – These would not be casement windows anymore. They would not be operable. We cannot tell from this. It looks like they are stationary.

Mr. Barber – They would be operable. On the front façade, they would be casements with the same light layout as the existing. Those are just examples. In the rendering, that shows what we would propose.

Ms. Lewis – Is there a manufacturer information?

Mr. Barber – It is the Pella Reserve Series. It is an aluminum clad window with square mullions. It has fixed mullions with an insert in between.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Tabony – It looks like the window units on the front façade are double operating. Each unit is double operating. From your rendering, it does not appear to be double operating

Mr. Barber – I think that is correct.

Mr. Zehmer – Looking at the historic window, it seems like the top 2 lights are fixed and the bottom 4 would be the operable relief. Is that the same?

Mr. Barber – In the new one, the entire sash pivots out.

Mr. Zehmer – The middle one looks like they do. They do split in the middle. Though the tops are not fixed, they do split in the middle.

Ms. Lewis – Where are we with aluminum clad windows on facades on historic structures? What do our guidelines say?

Mr. Werner – As long as it is not vinyl or plastic.

Mr. Schwarz – I think aluminum clad is encouraged.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – The easy part for me is the 3 other sides I am Ok with. I have lived in a house with windows just like this. We had storm windows with them. There is no way they will never stop the wind from coming through. These windows are terrible to live with.

Mr. Zehmer – I think these steel windows have a lifespan. At some point, the water gets into them. They start to rust, start to malfunction. The applicant has done a nice job of finding a replacement window that mimics the original light pattern and does not alter the historic opening or fenestration in the building. I can support this application as submitted.

Ms. Tabony – With the detail that you provided, it looks like you are adding 2 jams by material. You are probably going to be increasing the depth of that jam dimension for the window. Is that just on the edge of the brick?

Mr. Hendrix – That is right.

Ms. Tabony – Is that the condition at the head of the sill? We are reducing the visible lights.

Mr. Hendrix – Yes. I think that is correct.

Motion – Mr. Zehmer – 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 110 3rd Street NE satisfy the BAR’s criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the District, and that the BAR approves the application with the clarification that the movable casement windows on the front facade depicted in the rendering provided by the applicant at this meeting are what is approved [and the rendering included in the BAR record]. Second by Ms. Lewis. Motion passes 7-0.

3. 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

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – CoA for construction of new garage (to replace existing), enclose the connecting breezeway, and replace several windows, doors, and a skylight the rear elevation. No alterations are proposed for the original, 18th-century section.

Mr. Zehmer – If we approve the CoA as submitted, does that say that we are approving the zoning violation? Are we supporting the fact that this project would exceed the allowable length by the new zoning code?

Mr. Werner – This is identical to the fence across the street here. You approve it if it meets your guidelines. If you were to say you don’t agree with this garage and want to exclude it, I would say to omit that and not deny. I would not deny anything because this is the first time you have seen it. It would be to omit something, the garage. The option might be to omit the enclosed hallway. That would avoid the zoning question a while but kick it down the road. There are some permutations here. I wanted to make sure that because this is the first time you, as the BAR, can defer something. An applicant can request a deferral. If there is a part of this that you are not comfortable with voting on, and some of the improvements on the back are necessary you would

like to approve, we can approve those and omit the things that are not. The applicant can come back with a separate CoA request later.

Mr. Rosenthal – Did I understand you that they are going to demolish the existing garage all the way down and they will put a new one in with footings?

Mr. Werner – Yes. It is pretty much the same spot and deeper into the yard.

Mr. Rosenthal – We are not required to give a CoA for the demolition.

Mr. Werner – Not in this case. That is not the historic part of this building, the historic reason that this is an IPP.

Ms. Lewis – I thought you said the garage was 1930. It was Marshall Wells. On Marshall Wells 1930, additions around the old structure, we are changing the windows at the back. What else are we doing? Any further modifications to those structures?

Mr. Werner – They are repairing some roofs. The picture there on the bottom right of the page is how they have run the soffit in there. You have these huge stone fireplaces. There are some repairs that need to be done, keep water from the historic building. We are not reviewing those. Those are the only alterations to the 1937 additions. That kitchen and breakfast nook is a later addition. If you felt like the garage was a problem and you wanted to remove it and talk about it, you certainly could. The remainder of the work needs to be done.

Ms. Lewis – When you say the breakfast nook, do you mean the bay window? That is not Marshall Wells 1937.

Mr. Zehmer – The bay window at the front of the house is not being touched.

Mr. Werner – It says later expansion. I suspect it is. When there is a floor plan in 1980s sales brochure and if you look at the floor below, it suggests that kitchen was added. It was a long time ago. I don't believe it was part of the 1937 building. The survey refers to the 1937 alterations and some recent changes after 1937. This house is almost as complicated as the house on Hartmans Mill Road that confounded us.

Kelly Trout, Applicant – We are working with an engineer out of Pennsylvania who is helping us with this project. I don't have much more to add to the presentation. We are trying to preserve what is there. We have no interest in fundamentally changing what is there. At the same time, we would like to be able to bring it to modern usability. The spaces are small. The living spaces are very generous for the bedrooms. There are currently 2 bedrooms and 2 bathrooms. It is part of the effort to add the window well in the basement to try to bring a third and connect the garage. The garage is in terrible condition. It will eventually demolish itself. It has no foundation and no footing. The existing HVAC and plumbing runs exposed inside the garage to the upstairs area. It is poorly constructed. It needs to be replaced. Our only request is to replace that existing garage in largely the same footprint except for a little bit of extension towards the back, which does raise the ridge line to maintain the existing pitch of the roof and then connect the 2 buildings with a mid-room that allows the rooms over the garage to become part of the living space. We are aware of the zoning issues and the fact that we are stuck in this project. There is no practical way to build a second story on what exists. It is structurally not viable even if we were to somehow convince the BAR that putting 2 stories on the back of that cabin made any kind of sense in respecting the cabin. There is nowhere else to expand in this property. It is a large parcel. The house that exists there is not utilizing this giant parcel. Our client would like to have a couple of extra bedrooms and that connection. One change from what is in your drawings is on the front façade. What is currently shown to the right of the furthest right chimney, instead of being brick façade there, we are

proposing to go back with siding so that it does feel like an enclosure of that existing breezeway, keep all those lines the same, keep the overhang so that it delineates the new from the old. I know that is important to the BAR. We know that we have some zoning hurdles ahead of us. With the BAR, we would appreciate approval of the project in its totality.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

David Heller – We are the next-door neighbors. I have a question about the fact that the property is exceeding the maximum length if you add that breezeway. Does that length limitation consider the fact that the property is 2.5 acres and a very wide property? If you look at the existing structure, the new structure proposal sounds like it is going to be about the same width as the current one from the street. It does not overwhelm the site. It sits comfortably within the large site it is on. It struck me that there are not a lot of sites in the city that are this wide that are residential. I am not sure whether that should affect your assessment of what the maximum width is.

Mr. Schwarz – The zoning does not differentiate between lot sizes. It is just a fixed number in the zoning code.

Mr. Werner – The applicant can probably tell us the options better than I can explain them. It is a result of the zoning. You all cannot overcome that. The massing and scale have not significantly changed given the context of this site. You are not violating zoning by making a recommendation. A CoA cannot supersede that zoning.

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Rosenthal – Where is the low-pitched roof that you are going to put a different material on?

Ms. Trout – It is on the back, the enclosure of what we believe was at once a patio. It has a lovely slate floor inside of it. It seems like that exterior courtyard was enclosed. The roof up there is failing. The skylight is failing. There is a lot of rot and water. That would be the only section where I foresee membrane roofing.

Mr. Rosenthal – What membrane are you proposing?

Ms. Trout – We would propose EPDM. We are open to whatever.

Mr. Timmerman – What is the length limit? How far over are you?

Ms. Trout – The length limit according to zoning is 60 feet. I believe the entire structure end-to-end, if you include the garage, is 114 feet. The main house alone exceeds 60 feet. There is no way to add to either side of the existing home. The existing home is about 2700 square feet. We are also approaching the problem of the 3,000-square-foot maximum per building on a site. There are several places where we get pinched by the zoning code and being limited here. 114 feet is the answer to the question. It is exactly what exists now. We do not propose any additional length. The only change would be to infill that small piece between the existing garage and the existing home. That infill is behind the existing breezeway. You cannot even see the breezeway. They have a massive holly tree there. You cannot see the massing of the addition. It would be like what the holly tree is showing us. It is behind the holly and behind the breezeway there. There is that little section of breezeway that is masked there.

Mr. Zehmer – How far back is the façade of the garage from the front façade of the house?

Ms. Trout – I think that I gave that number at 1.23. It is not 50 feet that the zoning would like us to have.

Mr. Timmerman – It is in the footprint of the original.

Ms. Trout – It is the exact same footprint except for 6 additional feet to the rear.

Mr. Timmerman – With that bay on the front of the original house, does anybody know where that came from? Was that original? I guess that was the front door at some point.

Ms. Trout – It was maybe 2 connected pavilions.

Mr. Werner – It was 2 additions that were extended. Even in the City Assessor's file, we cannot quite piece it together. Some of the best information is in this old sales brochure. I was hoping to find where the architect's drawings might be on record somewhere. I could not find them.

Mr. Rosenthal – It appears that the height that you are putting on the new garage is identical than all the way across.

Ms. Trout – It will be 4 feet higher than the existing garage.

Mr. Zehmer – Does it have to be higher?

Ms. Trout – It does to get to a head height that meets the code.

Mr. Zehmer – It seems like there is an apartment already there. I guess it does not meet the code.

Mr. Rosenthal – The chimneys are not operable.

Ms. Trout – I don't believe any of them are currently functional.

James Robertson, Contractor – They are not functional. That is a good point. That is one of the main problems. The gap between the house and the chimney and the way it is framed, all the water sheds off straight down the foundation causing major issues on the foundation. Trying to fix that, keeping this place whole, and standing; it should have happened a long time ago.

Ms. Trout – It is by the kitchen window. That water runs off under the kitchen, right under the front porch.

Mr. Robertson – It is going into the basement.

Mr. Timmerman – This addition is alleviating that.

Mr. Robertson – It is keeping the house from falling. That would be one of the kind of alterations that we are making to try to remedy that.

Ms. Trout – Rebuild those foundation walls where they are bowing. They were inadequate when they were built and have not been helped by water infiltration over the years.

Mr. Werner – It is a flashing detail where they are directing the water. That is not on our agenda tonight.

Mr. Rosenthal – What is the exterior of the new garage going to be?

Ms. Trout – It will be hardy plank siding like what can be seen on some of the gables. There is a list of the materials.

Mr. Werner – It is outlined and listed in the staff report. Any reference to the siding in lieu of the brick is listed.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Jeriah Lofton – I have been doing this work for 35+ years. I am 55 years old. From what I am hearing, the place is not structurally sound. It is on unsolid ground. If it is not perked, you will continue to have the same situation or worse. How are you going to deal with the foundation before you deal with the structure? That is what we need to know.

Ms. Trout – The plan is to excavate around all the existing foundation, drain tile waterproofing, current code for foundation drains and maintaining what is there, rebuild what needs to be rebuilt in the foundation walls.

David Heller – We are fully supportive of all the work that is being proposed here. The house does need work. They are nice people. The house has not had a lot of TLC in the 15 years we have lived here. This does sound great. The garage is a dump right now. It is great that they are going to replace it and put something in that is not sagging. The neighbors support this activity.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Lewis – I am glad that the 1937 additions by Marshall Wells are significant. You cannot say they are the most important part of the house because the log cabin certainly is. They are important. There are significant properties in Albemarle County where people have fought to maintain Marshall Wells's structures. I don't agree with staff saying that those are not important additions. They are just as important as the original structure. Thank you for preserving what you can in those additions. It has perpetuated the use of the house. This house would not have been used for the last century as a log cabin unfortunately on this street and with the current usage. It allowed the house to be lived in.

Mr. Werner – I want to be clear. We did not discount the importance of the wings. I am just trying to get the chronology of when things occurred. I do disregard the garage.

Ms. Lewis – I am supportive of whatever motion you are going to make.

Mr. Zehmer – This elevation view does not have the depth in it. I do feel the ridgeline of the garage being higher than the roof is regrettable. The fact that it is pushed back from the house helps mitigate that. I do support the project.

Mr. Timmerman – I have no problem with the zoning issue. You are doing what you need to do. You are maintaining the same footprint. You are not increasing the size in any way. You are obviously putting a lot of money into the resources into the project to save an interesting house. I fully support it.

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 rehabilitations, alterations, and new garage at 1615 Keith Valley Road satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this Individually Protected Property, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with the following conditions:

- Per the design guidelines, doors and windows with insulated glass and simulated divided lights will have internal spacer bars.
- New gutters will be half-round and downspout will be full-round.
- In addition, the BAR notes that approval of a CoA for the new garage is for the design review only and does authorize any work requiring a building permit, nor does it supersede the City's Code of Development, which the proposed work must comply with.

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

4. 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

Kate Richardson, Staff Report – Preliminary discussion. Construction of multi-story apartment building on two vacant parcels. Note: Per code section 5.2.7.B. a pre-application conference was held with the BAR in August 2025. Due to modifications to the initial design, this will be preliminary discussion only and no action will be taken.

Mr. Werner – I would advise and counsel to use the notes under the discussion. Some of it is the boilerplate things that you will see in the middle of Chapter 3 or Page 3. In the discussion if you can work through/use it as a framework for your questions. There is a section on Page 3 about the additional comments that I have added that are more specific than the generic. That is my suggestion that you go through those comments, use that as a checklist. That is the type of information you are looking for. Does it have elevations you want to see? Are there any details you want to see? Are there any sections you want to see? I have some specific things that I have noted that I had advised the applicant might be likely additional information that you all would request. There is no need for them to provide that if you don't think it needs to be provided. We did an analysis about height, massing, and spacing. This is on West Main Street. Everything is up on the street. We have an interesting sub-area that has few old buildings.

The Meeting was recessed for 5 minutes so that the applicant could get their presentation ready.

The Meeting was called back to order at 7:00 PM.

Britanny Sanders, Applicant – I thought it was important for me to come up here and speak as the lead developer on this project and set the tone for the presentation. I was at the last BAR meeting. I was not in a project lead role at the time. I was here and heard feedback firsthand. I heard the community's feedback firsthand. What you are going to see today is a thoughtful and direct response to both levels of the feedback, specifically around the height, with it coming down from 11 stories to 8 and 6. We did not just step it. We ripped the 'band-aid' off to try to be respectful of the feedback. The walkway was something else that was important. We now have direct access to Westhaven's Walkway that is there. We are also proposing to carry that across Main Street in the form of a pedestrian and enlarged celebrated pedestrian connection. There are still ongoing conversations with the community. Not everybody's concerns have been met, nor do I think they will be met. LV Collective is at the table. I think we have made some productive progress. We hope to continue that progress by the time we come back in a month.

Mohammed Mohsen, Applicant – I was here last August when we presented this project and got a lot of feedback from the community and from the Board. I am excited to run through some of the updates that took place over the last few months.

When we met in August, there were 3 main things that a lot of the conversation centered around. One was the overall height, the number of stories, and the scale of building in general. Two was the pedestrian connection from Westhaven to West Main. Three was some input and feedback on the overall architectural direction that we have received.

Next Slide

These building sections here at the top tell the story better than any other type of drawing. On the left side there is what we presented back in August. The right side is what we have done after the reduction of 3 stories. We are now at a total of 8 stories. It is no longer a high-rise building. In terms of code compliance, we are under 75 feet to the top residential level. We are type 3 construction. We are wood on the top 5 levels, concrete on the bottom 3 levels. The overall building height from average grade to top of roof will need to remain below 85 feet in total. The section below cuts north-south. With the proposed development on the left, West Main is on the left. It cuts all the way through future development for Westhaven to show the stepping and how the scale has become more natural in terms of height progression.

Next Slides

I am going to scroll through a few slides that show the before and after. Left is before and right is after. Westhaven's proposed development is highlighted in green. You can see the scale difference between what we presented in August versus what we are presenting today.

These are a couple of high-level views looking along West Main Street from the east and west. The bottom is the proposed.

The next thing we talked about was the connection. You can see in the current development, this is zoomed out with the overall context.

You can see that what we presented back in August had the connection running right to the middle of our block, coming around the building on the east side, coming all the way down against the parking edge, and back along the sidewalk due to some grade challenges, and then to West Main Street about midblock. What we are now showing is a 'sweet' connection. We worked with the community and Westhaven. There were a lot of discussions. We have now aligned the pedestrian connection or a pedestrian promenade from Westhaven all the way to West Main Street. It aligns along the west end of the building. That secondary line there is still a pedestrian connection that exists. It also takes you to West Main Street right by the bridge intersection on the southeast corner of our development.

Next Slides

These slides are some landscape and hardscape studies. It starts to talk about the precedent imagery that we are looking at in terms of the screening along the west edge, the type of material used at the walkway, the planters, the furniture, a lot of the pavement, as we work through the portion of the pedestrian connection that we will need to connect vehicular access into the parking deck versus what is there only for service and maintenance, for the cell tower, and potentially the transformers if there is ever service required. The connection here is 22 feet wide vehicular connection, 8 feet wide pedestrian connection, and 3 feet of landscape buffer in a screen. Once we get past the entries to the parking lot, you can see through the pavement pattern. It starts to celebrate the pedestrian connection. With the furniture along the plaza, we have a plaza proposal along West Main Street. You can see the type of furniture and the type of lighting that is proposed and the overall character and imagery.

I understand that Water Street Studios will be brought in to continue the ongoing discussion and continue the collaboration with the neighbors.

Next Slide

Looking at the building plans, this is the ground level frontage along West Main Street, an entirely active use. This café area is green with amenities and leasing on the right with parking behind it. This is the mezzanine level. There are some additional amenities on the first level above ground. We then start to pick up residential.

Next Slide

This is the perspective view at the middle of West Main where the signage is our front door. The left side of this image is receding associated with the café. You can see a lot of attention to that public realm and the detailing at the street level, whether it is the materiality, the brick material, the coursing, the stepping, or the corbelling at that band above the building base, the amount of transparency and glazing and the use of landscape and pavement patterns to activate the streets.

Next Slide

This is the typical residential level. Above level 6, we have a step back. You can see levels 7 and 8 on the right side. You see there is a big step back there. That is what we saw in the section in the beginning. On level 8, we also pick up an amenity and a terrace at the bottom right corner of the plan.

Next Slide

This is the front elevation along West Main Street. We have heard encouragement to use more masonry along the frontage and along the edges as we turn the corner. We have a mix of masonry, fiber cement with different colors with some glazing at the base.

Next Slide

This is a zoomed in picture. It shows the detailing, the articulation, and the focus on the public realm elements that are key and important to this development.

Next Slides

Here are a couple of renderings. This is a view looking over the bridge looking at the overall development. We know this development is right by the rail. There are going to be a lot of open views on West Main heading towards our building. We have rearranged and reconfigured the overall massing simplified. It brought more masonry to that site here. With the skill reduction, the overall proportions improved considerably.

I know when we met last time there was feedback related to how tall and how heavy and bland that corner felt when we intended to celebrate it. You can see the progress from the last meeting to now.

This is a closeup at the bridge intersection. Here is what we had before.

This is the west facing façade. This is facing The Standard. That is basically the pedestrian promenade elevation.

This is the perspective view looking at where that pedestrian connection ties to West Main Street. That crossing here is shown a little more west. We would like to work with the city and the community to be able to get that to line up with pedestrian access.

That is what we showed in the last round.

This is the north elevation.

This is the east elevation facing the rail and a couple of the enlarged views should we need to reference those in terms of the overall context.

Next Slide

The materials are brick veneer, that beige color, and 3 colors of fiber cement panel.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Zehmer – There are a lot of feelings around this project. I know that a lot of you were in the room with me a few weeks ago at the City Council meeting. We were discussing another large project. I think the tenor of the City Council from that meeting is supportive of growth and adding more buildings in the city. Ultimately, something is going to be built here. The goal is that we all work together to try and find something that the city can be proud of and in the various communities within the city can be proud of. If we can try and stick to our guidelines and review this based on what we see in front of us as best, we can do the best we can.

I appreciate the reduction in height that you have done. Some of the brick details that you have done on the corbelling at the top of the base of the building. It is handsome. I would like to see something similar at the top of the building like a cornice feature, maybe not on every single portion of the building, but the corner that is closest to the bridge and the train tracks. It seems like that could have a cornice there that would give that some prominence.

Mr. Schwarz – I am going to focus on some of the things that I think are working on this. The West Main Street façade is much more successful than what you had before. The massing of it and the way you have broken it down into 3 to 3.5 chunks versus some of the other projects that have been a repetitive system of breaking down. It ends up being a big, long building. Your massing nicely breaks it down into recognizable pieces. It seems to work better. The brick base is great. With fiber cement, I am always nervous about it. It does not age well. I don't know if you are using the James Hardy stuff or if you are going to find some other type of fiber cement with a better finish on it. Something that might last longer and age better would be much preferable, especially since it seems like everything facing Westhaven is going to be this fiber cement material. In terms of other massing, I appreciate the fact that on the back, it is not a flat wall. There are insets. It is broken down a lot, and it steps back. Moves like that are helping. You have trees back there on the site plan that appear to be small shrubs and tiny trees according to the label. I don't know what type of utilities you have back there. If there is a way to get some larger trees, that will help with providing some additional buffer between your building and the neighborhood. Your renderings show a lot of depth. You mentioned faux brick veneer. I am assuming it is thin brick. There is a lot of depth happening. Are we going to get that depth? Is this just pretty pictures that we are looking at? It would be great if you guys could provide that. With what you end up with, it looks like the renderings. That would be very successful. You need to screen the parking lot lights. You are aware of that. I appreciate the alignment. It looks like Westhaven's plan changed their alignment of this walkway. However, that coordination is happening, I appreciate how that works out. It seems like it could potentially become a good link between Westhaven, West Main, and 10th & Page in tying all 3 together. I am not sure how Westhaven feels about having 10th & Page using that walkway to get to West Main Street. It seems to be working very well in plan. No vinyl windows or convince us that they are good. It is going to be a steep road. Rooftop screening is required by zoning. I saw your note on the roof plan. You need to provide something.

Mr. Bailey – It is a much-improved design. I agree with what Mr. Schwarz said. I appreciate the fact that they have reduced the height and they are trying to respond to the community's concerns about that. To the extent that we are supposed to consider whether it fits in its context, the fact of the matter is it is on West Main Street. West Main Street is designated for buildings of this size or larger. I think it fits the context. We should take that into consideration. At one point, we were supposed to maintain Charlottesville's automotive heritage

because there were a lot of garages along that street. This will fit in with that context. In agreement with the City Council's ruling, I think that ultimately more housing leads to lower prices for other people's housing. If you restrict the amount of housing, there is nothing to do but go up or move to Greene County. That is not what we want people to do. We want people to stay here in town.

Mr. Timmerman – I want to second what everyone has said so far. The design has been improved significantly from a massing standpoint, from the different perspectives that you showed. Much more attention has been paid to how to activate the street. I am encouraged that, after our one meeting, those comments have been heard and responded to in some way, shape, or form. I am interested in the Memory Walk. It is a big opportunity. There has been a lot of communication about it tonight. If we had the opportunity to ask questions, I would be interested in hearing what the process of community engagement is moving forward. From what you have communicated and what you have expressed, that is a serious interest. Everyone should be encouraged by. There was an improvement from the previous plans, the straight connection out to Main Street. I share some of the concerns with numbers of people's comments. Is this going to feel too much like a canyon? Where is the memory in this walk? That could come with a substantial conversation that your group is suggesting. That is a positive place to be here in the beginning. A lot of us have not even seen any of these plans. This is a preliminary meeting. I hope that the fact we are having a preliminary meeting and everyone can hear what is going on. It will be a good springboard for future conversations and ability to make this better. I tend to agree with Mr. Schwarz on the materiality. No vinyl windows. This is a big building. I agree with the cement board. I always think of cement board as appropriate for 2, 3, and maybe 4-story buildings, but this is a big building. If you look at the history of our civic architecture, you get to a big building, let's be proud of it and try to use substantial materials that are not going to age in 20 years. With the height, I tend to agree with Mr. Bailey. If there is a place to build density, that is an obvious place to do it. We might differ as we move back certain blocks. That is an obvious corridor. The comparison to the scale of what has been going there is similar. It is harder for us as a group that is comparing scales of building given to us by the city zoning to say that this is out scale. On the other hand, we have also heard concerns about darkness and what height creates. The biggest thing is the lack of sun in the surrounding neighborhood. I would like to see some intensive sun studies and solar studies, not only how these different heights and masses are affecting what is happening behind it. How is it also affecting the potential location and the size of the walk and the access for the residents.

Ms. Tabony – The sun study was at the top of my list. I think sharing that with the residents would be beneficial to help people understand how shadows will move across the site. I commend you for having brought down the height of the building significantly. The design is better. That is great to see. Looking at your plan, I am noting that you have given yourself a big challenge. There is vehicular movement around 4 sides of your building and pedestrian movement around 4 sides of your building. This comes down to The Memory Walk and the doubling of pedestrians and vehicular movement on that space feels a little inappropriate or difficult. Is it possible to shift vehicular movement to the east side of the building?

Ms. Sanders – One of the reasons why the Memory Walk is on the other side to begin with. There is a lot of topography. There is about 6 feet of grade change as you go towards the bridge. City staff will not allow another curb-cut there at the bridge. You cannot enter vehicles on that side. Part of the reasons why we struggled coming back here, why it took so long, is because I did not want to present that to the community. Once they had to move over, if you want it aligned, there is nowhere else for cars to get into the building. It is an impossible design challenge. I am with you, the community. I don't want cars right there. City staff can tell you. We already had a call with them to try and figure out the logistics of how to make this work. The minute we saw Westhaven's plan with it, relocated over there. It is a design challenge. Vehicles only enter on that one side. They don't travel all the way around. The driveway is for access to the cell tower. That must remain there. It is not used on a daily basis.

Ms. Tabony – I understand that design challenge. That is difficult. Something to maybe consider. Is there a way to expand the Memory Walk to front of the building as well?

Ms. Sanders – That is what the plaza is meant to be. I intentionally, right or wrong, did not put any markers or anything in those renderings. If you do, it is not the right marker. If you don't, it suggests that it is not public space. On the record, my intent is the whole reason for setting that back is to give prominence to the walkway so that you can also increase the prominence of the Drewary Bridge sign that is there as well. Right now, it is just a small plaque. My intent is to work with the community so that we can get that to an appropriate scale within the plaza that we are creating.

Ms. Tabony – That would be great to see an expanded Memory Walk. It is not just about access but something that wraps, extends, and connects the bridge.

Ms. Sanders – That is the goal. I don't want to say what it looks like. That is not evading. That is trying to be open to your feedback and the community's feedback and what it needs to look like.

Ms. Tabony – Maybe when we see it next time, there could be a diagram showing the extent of that future designed community.

Ms. Sanders – We can make meaningful progress. The community has been very open. I will get them the drawings. We can have a working session to identify areas and concepts for the time we come back.

Ms. Tabony – Speaking to the community about the 8-story building chasm, a space like that could be very dramatic, interesting, and beautiful if it is designed well. I am open and excited to see what you come back with.

Ms. Sanders – There is an interesting space that is created between The Standard, our building, and the 2 Westhaven buildings that is meant to be a gathering space. It is open. It is right outside of the community center or the women's health center. I could be wrong. The idea is dedicating that space as a stopping point, not just the end and a moment of visual interest from that widened sidewalk connection across Main Street as well. I think Mr. Molsen mentioned that was slightly off to the right. That is because there is already a curb-cut there to get to The Standard. My goal is to widen that by about 50 feet. Even as cars are coming in, you still have a striped pedestrian lane, hopefully signalized and raised. We must work through the Fire Department with that. That is the next step after this, assuming that everybody is on board with those concepts. Let's figure out if we can make them a reality.

Ms. Tabony – I am concerned about the trash door, utility door, and garage door. That façade is concerning.

The window details look a little flat if you could recess the windows a few inches. Right now, it appears that the windows and the fiber cement are co-planar. We would like to see more relief there.

Ms. Sanders – That is something we can look at. One clarifying question as I think about everything together. I have heard the depth conversation. I agree with that. I have heard the vinyl window, the hardy. All these things are contributing to the viability of the project. I would like to ask if we could consider everything when we come back. Everybody gives comments now. We welcome them. If we could consider everything as a whole specifically on the vinyl windows. Is that on Westhaven façade? Is that a dealbreaker to go around the whole building? It is the same thing on the fiber cement. I would just ask that you would try to think about the entire project inclusive of what I am hoping you will hear in terms of the community benefits agreement in June in terms of financial viability of the project.

Mr. Rosenthal – I appreciate you taking the effort to meet with the community and work that way. I appreciate the reduction in the height and the setbacks. That is all great. I commend the other BAR members for their thoughtful appropriate comments. I would like to second it and hope that you can come back and work with the community and come back with something that the community and you are happy with. We can work as a BAR to get you a successful project.

Mr. Werner – These questions come back to me. I want to be clear. The Memory Walk is a community project that they will be working on. You wish to see where they are establishing an area that will be for that. I told them not to plan to bring back a design. Is that understood?

Ms. Tabony – Yes.

Mr. Werner – I want to make sure we are clear on that.

Mr. Bailey – Water Street Studio could not prepare it.

Mr. Werner – It is a community driven design.

Mr. Bailey – What is the timeline?

Mr. Werner – I don't know. They are not going to have a project. I want to make sure that when it comes back and if they turn something around and want us to review something in June and you are not asking them for the design of the Memorial. That is a process that they are going to go through with the community.

Mr. Zehmer – The challenge is how can we separate the Memory Walk out from the building.

Mr. Werner – I want to make sure I understand that before they leave tonight.

Ms. Tabony – They could define an area in the plan and in the elevation on the building where that will take place.

Mr. Werner – You go and engage with the community and say we are going to design, let's take Court Square Park. Someday, it will happen. There will be a robust community input of the design of that park. It would be strange for the BAR to say, 'we don't like what the community has come up with as the design of that park.' That is why I am trying to, to the benefit of the community and the applicant, manage some expectations here. For example, they are talking with the City Manager's Office about somehow shifting the crossing in West Main and doing some things there. That is not our purview. I said to leave that out. I don't want you in June and July when you are looking at a design to be asked to referee their relationship with the neighborhood on a promised design for a memorial space. That is what I am trying to tease apart here. I know you had said only so many minutes on this tonight. Because of what I must do with this next, I want to clearly understand you all. I heard appreciation for the height. I did not hear a request to lower the building further. I wanted to make sure I am clear on that. With materiality, I agree. I shared with them the concern of vinyl windows. Mr. Schwarz, you have raised questions. The shade study is something that we should request to see more often.

Ms. Tabony – My last question with applicants seemed to suggest that the entire landscape was fair game for the Memory Walk, the front side and back of the building

Mr. Werner – It is possible.

Ms. Tabony – We are not reviewing the landscape at that point.

Mr. Werner – They cannot come in and say it cannot be white on the map and say something will happen here in the future. It must be a complete building. If it is a walkway with some plantings along it and it is a driveway that meets our guidelines for a paved surface, that might be appropriate. It is on them to fill that space with additional things for Memory Walk.

Mr. Zehmer – The content of the Memory Walk is not under our purview.

Mr. Schwarz – Nothing would stop them from having a placeholder design that they revise by CoA if they must. They will have to clearly mark on the drawing, so the public does not get upset that this is a placeholder to be reviewed. We need to approve something in case that review never happens. We want to make sure something goes in that is Ok for a couple years.

Mr. Werner – I would much rather it be that this thing has a paved surface, some bushes, some sight lighting, a bench or two. We don't talk about a Memorial Walk. If you say it is a placeholder, a CoA has approved it. You cannot say that this design is going to come back and change. If they come in with a conceptual design and you approve it as the CoA, then they by every right can construct that. I would rather this memory walk, whatever is presented, be the minimum that it needs to be to complete the drawing and to complete our review of it and embellishment of it later. We can figure out how we treat it later. It would allow them to continue to move forward with their project.

Ms. Lewis – I thought that is what Mr. Schwarz just said. I think he said exactly what you are describing. He used the word 'placeholder,' which you did not. The concept was similar in your comments.

Mr. Schwarz – It needs to be something that if they never finish the communication with the neighborhood and it is built; it needs to be Ok. I don't want to end up with a grass lot like we have next to The Doyle right now.

Mr. Werner – I am just concerned. You guys want to go home. This is the situation that we must deal with. I will have to figure out how to come back and communicate with you all. We are doing that tonight.

Mr. Rosenthal – Are you expecting them to come back with another pre-application? When they come back, will it be for a CoA?

Mr. Werner – That is my expectation. I want to make sure that you all, the Board of Architectural Review, are not putting yourselves in a position where this community is counting on you to create this Memorial Walk, to enforce this Memorial Walk. You heard reference tonight to this community benefits agreement. I know about it. It is not under my purview or yours.

Ms. Lewis – We understand that. We understand the community benefits agreement has nothing to do with this application. We are bright enough to know that. Everybody on this Board knows that.

Mr. Werner – With a large-scale project where there was a lot of neighborhood input, it went to City Council on appeal. I am trying to keep you all in the BAR lane.

Ms. Lewis – We are staying in our lane.

Mr. Zehmer – The easy answer is for them to bring us a design that meets our guidelines that we can approve. If they want to amend it with whatever the memory walk looks like later and if the design changes, they need to bring it back to us.

Mr. Werner – What I heard tonight was I want to hear what the process is for your memory walk.

Mr. Timmerman – I am interested in seeing what comes back to us. This is a pre-application meeting. There are no decisions being made. The applicant made the statement that their intention is to go work with the community. I am looking forward to seeing what the design is.

Mr. Rosenthal – If they came back and said that they wanted the vinyl windows and it is a CoA and we say no, are we going to deny the whole application?

Mr. Zehmer – That can be a condition of our CoA, approving it without the vinyl windows. We can alter that.

Mr. Werner – It is the content of their application. I want to make sure that was the goal and we are 99 percent there. It is just the thing about the Memory Walk that has me concerned. My recommendation is that you be careful that we separate these things that are going to be going on with the community that the applicant is going to do and what you all will be looking at as far as the design that is reviewable for a CoA.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Brandon Collins – I have lived in Charlottesville my whole life. My children have lived here their whole lives. I have had the serious honor and privilege to work with residents of Westhaven on the planning for their future redevelopment. From our end, it has been meaningful, not without challenges and not without a whole lot of hard work. Some of those residents are here today. I do work for CRHA. These are my own observations in dealing with our resident planners. With our resident planners and most of the community, in general, this is our first look at a new revision to their plan. The plans that we have been going off are the plans in August. I know there have been some conversations about what LC Collective may or may not be willing to do and tweak. Our resident planners at Westhaven, of which there are about 30 steady participants and overall, about 70 with over 90 percent of the community participating in our process, have not had a chance to evaluate this at all. We have a lot of work to do. Our assumption all along has been that when LV Collective is ready to make some commitments, they would sit down with the community and with our residents and evaluate any proposed changes. I can see that they have tried to work with what some of what they have heard. It is important for the BAR to understand that. At 8 stories, the height, scale, and mass are still an adverse impact on the neighborhood. Part of that is that they are set down on a hill. It was done on purpose to separate the community. That is something we must work with. No matter what happens, the proposed changes, at 8 stories, even on West Main, there is going to be opposition to this. One of the things to mitigate that is to work with LC Collective on a community benefits agreement.

Earl Hicks – I am a Westhaven planner and Westhaven resident. I still don't like the building. We did not see proposals changed before the agreement was posted. Design changes needed to be made, but without a significant reduction in height. It would still have a negative impact on our neighborhood. Other steps needed to be taken. Work with residents for our approval of design changes, residents to have full control over the planning of the Memory Wall to Westhaven to West Main Street. As I stand here as a resident and resident planner, I still propose the building is still too big, even at 8 stories. I have seen the additions. When you come into somebody's neighborhood, you need to sit at the table with them and let them know and be a partner with them. Don't come through the back door. It does not work in my book like that.

Angela Carr – I am a resident of Charlottesville. I was a resident of Westhaven. That was the first core neighborhood that I first lived in when I first moved to Charlottesville. I feel that it is inconsiderate to come into a neighborhood and take full control and not have any consideration for the people that live in the neighborhood or how they would feel or how that would affect their daily lives or how the building would

affect how they normally get to Main Street to get to stores. You are now proposing a huge building. What are you going to do for the neighborhood that you are proposing the building to be in front of? This is my first time seeing you guys. I have never had any communication with you guys. I have never seen you guys at any meeting. I have never seen you guys at any table ever. I have never seen them. This was a surprise when they stood up today. It was really a surprise. When you say that you have worked with the community, that is a fib. You have not worked with the community. If you have worked with the community, we would have seen you walking through Westhaven. You are not on the cameras. I know that they are not working with the community. I would urge the BAR to dismiss the application until they come back with more information from the community themselves that this is going to affect. With the Memorial Wall, how can you make a choice with a wall. Do you know the history behind it? How can you take full control of something? It is not fair and right. That is like somebody coming into your home and walking past you and not speaking but taking their shoes off and getting comfortable. You address the people that live there. That is how you do it respectfully. That is how you gain respect and gain the community's trust. You gain the community's trust by having a listening ear when someone is talking.

Jeriah Lofton – I have spent 17 years building here in Charlottesville, restoring the Jefferson Building, working with the YMCA, and working with every company out there. I have worked with Rainbow Restoration in Fishersville and Charlottesville for UVA. Highly experienced in every part of a house from the ground and up. I see a lot of bars around here. What I don't see is that many shelters. I don't see places where these people can go to get off our corners so that these people can enjoy their walks. We need to apply ourselves to something other than bars. We have enough bars and cafes here. Most of the poorer people cannot even afford to in half of them. We are not communicating with each other. Other than me pulling a shift and serving you guys, I don't even get to talk to you guys. I do a lot of work myself. I try to collect donations. I have 3 projects that I am working on for senior citizens to get them to and from their buildings instead of them having to walk to the bus lines. I am working on one for the poor children to get to the outings and set places where they cannot experience the experiences of the other kids. I have a low economy bus that I have with care packages for the low economy areas. I hear you talking about the places that are already established, making money, and doing things. I don't hear you talking about the places that are not established. That still needs help.

Joy Johnson – When we first come and heard about the project, the height was always an issue. The height is still an issue. They went from 11 stories to 8 stories. If you look at the remnants back there, it is still maybe a little bit higher than The Standard. The Standard is still a negative effect for us in Westhaven and 10th & Page. Ms. Sanders has reached out. We have had a couple of meetings. Some questions were not asked. There has been some conversation lately about what a community benefit could look like. We talked about a lot of things, about preserving the community, preserving the neighborhood, and services to the neighborhood. The one thing that they could not commit to is lowering the height to 6-5 stories. What they are saying is that at 6-5, they would not make any money. What we are asking and what we are saying is that the presentation shown today, I wish we had that also to be able to talk about. We have not seen this. What you saw tonight is the first time we are seeing it. The height is still too much for us. Ms. Sanders said the other day, if we walk away, whoever owns that lot is going to go find somebody else.' The difference is that if they walk away, the person who owned that land now knows you must do this better. You must stay with the community. You must get with the community, so we can build something that all the communities with the developer are satisfied. You won't have us pushing back where we are coming here with a collective voice. No to the 8 stories. Please make sure we get a copy of what you presented here today. We did not have that.

Frank Becktor – There is a point that is raised at these meetings that pertains to what has already been discussed in this presentation. Your purview concerns the external appearance. I know that there are guidelines that often reference the cultural, historical, and architectural character of the building. I have always wondered how those 2 statements, only the appearance on the external side and cultural character, how the Board views

the linkage or non-linkage of those. I think that they are linked. The applicant did present and is emphasizing the public area. That presumably involves the people who would use that public area. I would want you to be able, under your guidelines and your considerations, to consider who is there. The people using the public walkway, the Memory Walk as part of the external appearance so you don't have any feelings that you cannot consider, the kinds of people who are there. It will obviously be the residents. Perhaps the applicant is trying to make room for the residents of Westhaven. That would be a good thing. That is a technical concern that I hope you can resolve in that way.

Wendy Gau – I am a community member here to support the residents of Westhaven and 10th & Page. As people have already said, this building is currently sitting at 8 stories right now. That is the reduction. We cannot have historical amnesia. Eight stories is the size of The Standard. The Standard was already a giant stain on Charlottesville's continued inability to grapple with the history of violence, white supremacy, and dispossession of black people. If we cannot even remember the mistake that was The Standard, how can we even attempt to begin grappling with more violence with Vinegar Hill, with enslavement? LC Collective is up here talking about a Memory Walk for Vinegar Hill and Urban Renewal when they are enacting the same violence that Vinegar Hill and Gospel Hill enacted. Residents have repeatedly said that they want their Memory Walk to be celebrated, in the open, and to be remembered. They want the public to actively be grappling and sitting with this history. They don't want it in an alley. LV Collective's current proposal puts the Westhaven Memory Walk between 2 8-story buildings and a road for maintenance, trash, and service vehicles. I can tell you that remembrance of Vinegar Hill will not be found in any meaningful way amid the rumble of maintenance service vehicles, students buying \$11 lattes from a café that no resident can afford, or between 2 buildings that cement Charlottesville's legacy of white supremacy. With this discussion about community engagement, the community gets to dictate what counts as that. LV Collective does not get to come up here and say that they are sitting at the table or that they are talking to residents when people here have said that this is the first time the residents have seen this plan. That should not be the case. Residents need to get the plan before you all. The fact that is not the case means that these people do not understand what community engagement looks like. If they are just talking to a select group of people, that also means that there are likely tokenization and not real engagement with the residents of Westhaven.

Zyhanna Bryant – I share the concerns that the residents have about the height. Just because we are talking about community engagement. Ms. Sanders has been trying to engage with the 10th & Page Neighborhood Association. The conversation that we had yesterday lasted about 2 hours. We discussed a lot of things during that conversation. One of the main things that the neighborhood, just to be transparent, is having to sit with and think through is if the height does not decrease, what are the benefits to the neighborhood as far as that density goes? Though this is technically beyond your purview, it is important to think about whether City Council is pursuing this agenda of wanting higher density and wanting taller buildings with the idea of creating more affordable housing. They believe in trickledown economics. People have different opinions about that. In this context, we must think about what those benefits will be to the community. It is a hard job to be able to have this conversation in the way that you are expected to without thinking about all those things. If it is taller, how much added affordability will be included in that building? That is outside of your scope. I think that should be a question that is presented in this space and maybe discussed a little bit when you talk with the applicant. I can confidently say that though everyone does not agree with the height, Ms. Sanders has been trying to bring some sort of benefit to the 10th & Page Neighborhood. It does expand beyond Westhaven. There is the Rose Hill Neighborhood Association that was at the table. There was the 10th & Page Neighborhood Association. There are a lot of homeowners in that space too who will have their taxes increased because of this building. I hope we can have a more comprehensive conversation and give LV Collective more time to work out some of those benefits that they can provide along with this project.

Ms. Sanders – I don't want to get into the specifics of the community benefits agreement. I respect the community. I want to have those conversations offline. I only want to talk through the one thing that does

relate to your purview. That is the Memorial Walk. I have really struggled with that. When Mr. Werner reached out and said, 'you need to have materials on this.' I said, 'Do you understand what that does to my ability to communicate to community that they should design this?' I am caught between 2 processes. My goal is to have the community design that. The reason I set the building back is to create a public plaza so that it isn't between 2 buildings. The reason I gave up more density than I could afford to give and allow that connection to go around both sides of the building. It is to give the history what it deserves, which is visibility. Do I know what that history is? I know what I have read. I have not lived it. I need the people that have lived it to design it.

Mr. Werner – When I spoke with Ms. Sanders, I will tip my hat to the work that Ms. Sanders has put into reaching out to me and asking me questions about this. One of the things that I advised was that this Memorial Walk appears to be a design intent that will be developed in time over time with the people in Westhaven. I asked the question: Should they want to come forward this summer for a design review of this building, the architecture of the building, and this space to the side? Are they bringing a finished design for that public space. My suggestion was whatever it is that you have set it aside. You must finish it. It is a paved access point. I think they have some permeable paving. They might have some furniture in there. As far as putting memorialization there and to whatever extent that the community recommends, if they are going to go through a process, you all (BAR) cannot review a design until it is completed later. I am trying to separate those two. It also falls when a community has input on the design of a public space or park, should that come to the BAR? You don't want to have a space that has been created with community input. It is like the Belmont Bridge. The community came up with a design. Does the BAR say that they don't like the design? I am trying to separate the Memorial Walk out of this a little bit. It allows the neighborhood the freedom to work with the applicant and the applicant the freedom to treat that space as a blank canvas at this point to the extent that you have something that you can review and allow the project to go forward. If we are suspending everything until the Memorial Walk design is done. I don't know how we will get there from here. With the community benefits agreement, that is something that they have been working with through the City Manager's Office. I admire the work they are putting into that. I am trying to keep that somewhat separate. It is outside of your purview as the BAR. We want to see it happen. I am trying to contain what comes to you as an application later this summer into something that you can act on and to take anything that might be aspirational and separate that out. I was not saying ignore that space or don't talk about the materials there. I was saying that if there are things that are going to go in there later, it will be addressed later.

Ms. Sanders – I completely agree with that. The goal of today and the reason that I was supportive of not having a vote is because just as much as the community's feedback is important, your feedback is also important. It is not one or the other. I need to have feedback from everybody so that I can figure out where to go from here. That is what today hopefully is. It is to get feedback from everyone. I recognize that feedback is going to continue from the community. I know their position on the height. I encourage them to continue to speak on it. Let's have a healthy dialogue in this. I think that is possible moving forward.

Carmelita Wood – I wanted to speak on Vinegar Hill monument or walk. I live that history. Most of those people are dead and gone. Half of their children don't live in Charlottesville. They don't know what Vinegar Hill was like. They don't know the history of Vinegar Hill. You are going to put a walk there for people that don't know the history of Vinegar Hill. I think you need to put a room/space inside that building so people can come, sit, and talk about the history or learn the history. Put a classroom or books in there that have that history of Vinegar Hill. Go out and talk to the people and find out what they would like to see in the building. Nobody is going to walk up and down a memory walk. Stop and look around.

Public Speaker #1 – I cannot understand if they have been studying this from the numbers that I have seen since the late part of the 20s, but before now. It has been some years since they have been studying this. When you look at the height that we have already been put down. What would make you want to have a building that

high over the top of the people. Even though I understand that they might not know the true history. When you are coming to a place and you are willing to build, you are already supposed to know these things in place before you get to where you are at. The disrespectfulness of how the presentations, the communication, and whatever LC Collective has brought to us as residents in Charlottesville at Westhaven has been disrespectful. They told us that they are going to tell us that we had the audacity to say, ‘you all are lucky that we are even giving you plans.’ You wait until we have the master plan. For you to wait until the master plan comes in, all a sudden you are opposing this big building. It feels like we are down at the bottom. We have this high extremity over top, overshadow. The shadowing makes it dark. The Standard is already shadowing Westhaven. We don’t have too much sunlight. That plays a big part. We are already deep down. Even though they are fixing it, it is a lot of water drain. It is a lot of stuff that is down in that bottom that people haven’t seen. We are just now as a community after being built in 1950, we are just now getting into redevelopment. I felt it was harmful for them to bring this plan after our master plan goes in.

5. 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

- Staff presented this proposed project to the BAR. The position of Building 1 needs to be addressed.
- Building 1 does not meet the guidelines with regards to setbacks and being out of character with the building on 528.
- Staff did suggest separating these into 2 different projects because they are on 2 different parcels.
- Staff did go over the guidelines regarding setbacks and why the proposed building on 528 is out of character.
- Staff also went over the guidelines on the width of the proposed buildings. In staff’s opinion, building 1 is not consistent with the Design Guidelines.
- Applicant did try to break down the massing of Building 1.
- Applicant did revise the aesthetic goals of the proposed buildings.
- Mr. Zehmer did like the shutters and how they fit within the neighborhood and community.
- Members of the BAR provided feedback on the proposed buildings.
- Ms. Lewis did not have any objections to 526 and did the improvements and changes made to 526.
- Members of the BAR do want to see the proposed project in 3D and not just in the site plan.
- There was consensus among the members of the BAR on the improvements that the applicant has made in the proposed project since the last meeting.
- There was concern about the crowding of building 1 on 526.

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

6. Staff questions/discussion

- Café Space design guidelines: Construction of decks, creation of enclosed spaces: no active café and/or not a leased space.
- Businesses on The Mall have asked about using leased spaces on the Downtown Mall.

3. Adjourn

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:18 PM.