



COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
Department of Community Development
401 McIntire Road, North Wing
Charlottesville, Virginia 22902-4596
(434) 296 - 5823
Fax (434) 972 - 4012

FINAL ARB ACTION MEMO/MINUTES

Date: January 21, 2020

Time: 1:00 PM

Meeting Room: Auditorium

Members:

Frank Stoner: Present
Frank Hancock: Present
Fred Missel: Present
Stan Binsted, Chair: Present
Dade Van Der Werf, Vice-Chair: Present

Staff:

Margaret Maliszewski
Khris Taggart
Paty Saternye
Carolyn Shaffer

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Binsted called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

DISCLOSURES

None.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Neil Williamson with the Free Enterprise Forum asked the ARB to consider issues related to an optional form-based code overlay for the Rio29 area, including phasing over a single parcel and market readiness.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Binsted recommended that the 2415 Ivy Road application be moved to the consent agenda because it was an Initial Site Plan without an architectural proposal. The other members did not object.

a. ARB-2019-123: 2415 Ivy Road

Location: 2415 Ivy Road near the intersection of Canterbury Road

Proposal: To renovate an existing building along Ivy Road to include a 2,500 sf restaurant, a 2,000 sf commercial grocery store, 21,180 sf of commercial office space, 3,280 sf of manufacturing/processing/assembly/fabrication space, access roads, parking lots, and associated site improvements on approximately 3.89 acres. No alterations are proposed to a second existing 17,425 sf building within the site.

Staff Contact: Paty Saternye

Representative for Project: Scott Collins

Motion:

Mr. Stoner moved to forward the recommendations outlined in the staff report to the Agent for the Site Review Committee, as follows.

- Regarding requirements to satisfy the design guidelines as per § 18-30.6.4c(2), (3) and (5) recommended conditions of initial plan approval:
None
- Regarding recommendations on the plan as it relates to the guidelines:
None
- Regarding conditions to be satisfied prior to issuance of a grading permit:
 1. Provide the conservation checklist in the site plan.
 2. Provide a tree protection fencing detail in the site plan and show the tree protection fencing in the Grading and Draining Plan sheet.
- Regarding the Final Site Plan
A Certificate of Appropriateness is required prior to final site plan approval. The following items must be addressed, in addition to all items on the Final Site Plan Checklist.
 1. Confirm that the dumpster location is workable. If it will be visible from the EC include details for the dumpster enclosure in the site plan and identify screen type, material, manufacturer and color.
 2. Show all mechanical equipment on the site plan. Show how visibility of all mechanical equipment will be eliminated from the EC.
 3. Provide the mechanical equipment visibility note: Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated.
 4. Show the locations of the proposed gas meter and water utility box, and ensure that they are not visible from the EC.
 5. Revise the plan to provide the required ornamental trees.
 6. Revise the plan to show utility easements and ensure that there are no conflicts between the utilities and the proposed landscaping.
 7. Revise the large street trees to a species with a narrower spread to minimize utility conflicts.
 8. Provide two additional large shade trees, 2½" caliper at planting, spaced 40 feet on center, along the west side of the accessway.
 9. Provide the standard perimeter and interior parking lot landscaping in all parking areas where improvements (other than paint striping) are proposed: Large trees

should align the perimeter of parking areas, located 40 feet on center. Trees should be planted in the interior of parking areas at the rate of one tree for every 10 parking spaces provided and should be evenly distributed throughout the interior of the parking area.

10. Provide a wall detail and a material sample for the stone wall proposed between the EC and the front parking area. Matching the character of other retaining walls in the area would be appropriate.
11. Remove the decorative stone wall from the Existing Conditions & Demolition Plan.
12. Show tree protection fencing for preserved trees in both the grading and landscape plans.
13. Provide a conservation checklist in the site plan.
14. Ensure that no grading is proposed within the dripline of any tree designated as preserved.
15. If multiple tenants will occupy this building, submit a comprehensive sign plan for review. Note that ARB approval of a comprehensive sign plan is required for multi-tenant buildings with the final site plan.

Mr. Missel seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 5:0.

REGULAR REVIEW ITEMS

a. ARB-2019-155: Sleep Number / TMP 61-134A Commercial Development

Location: East side of Rt. 29 just south of Fashion Square Mall

Proposal: Request for approval of an Application Plan for an undeveloped parcel to allow commercial development in two phases.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representative for Project: Scott Collins

Discussion: ARB members noted the Acme Stove building as an example of a contemporary design that meets the EC Guidelines and questioned the extent of tree removal on the subject parcel. The representative for the project commented on the potential for future redevelopment of the site and noted that site-related comments in the staff report were reasonable. The architect described the design as a custom look for a specific brand. ARB members questioned the height and appearance of the retaining wall, the extent of new or existing planting on the north side of the property, the impact of the wall on the building, and the extent of visibility of the north side of the building. The ARB asked if the building could be shifted to the south to allow more space for planting on the north. The applicant responded that the entrance to the site made that impossible, and the building location responds to earlier suggestions to relegate the parking. The architect provided information on the proposed materials and stated that the white panel behind the sign would be eliminated. The context, shade and amount of blue metal was discussed. It was suggested that the white panels be "warmed up" some. The architect noted that there is articulation - all the materials are not in the same plane on the north elevation. The ARB noted that a site section and/or 3D rendering clarifying the visibility/appearance and relationship of the north elevation and retaining wall would be helpful, exploring the context with the bank would be worth exploring, the blue color may appear dated in a few years, form is not the issue – material

is, an alternate palette that relates to natural materials would be appropriate, the building scale is appropriate, the retaining wall could be better integrated into the design, form and scale and transparency are fine.

Motion on the Rezoning

Mr. Hancock moved to forward the following recommendation to the Planning Commission: Although the proposed architectural design does not currently meet the Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines, it is anticipated that a development with an appropriate appearance could be constructed following the proposed site layout.

Mr. Missel seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 5:0

Action on the Architectural and Site Designs

The ARB offers the comments on the site and architectural designs, as listed in the staff report, to be addressed in the next submittal.

Recommended changes to the architectural design:

1. Revise the architectural design including consideration of materials and colors to reflect the traditional architecture of the area.
2. Reconsider the white Master Wall panels for better coordination throughout the building.
3. Provide window glass specs and a sample. Tint and reflectivity are typically not considered appropriate in the Entrance Corridors.
4. Revise the design to eliminate the panel background for the wall signs.
5. Revise the elevation drawings to include material call-outs on each drawing.
6. Better illustrate the design of the north elevation.
7. Include the mechanical equipment note on the site and architectural plans: "Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated."
8. Provide perspective views showing the north elevation of the building and clarifying the relationship of the retaining wall to the north elevation. Ensure an appropriate appearance for the EC.

Recommended changes to the site plan:

9. Include the mechanical equipment note on the site and architectural plans: "Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated."
10. Provide complete lighting information with the next submittal.
11. Provide information in the plan illustrating proposed treatments for impacted areas on the bank parcel to the south.
12. Add one large shade tree to the perimeter of the easternmost parking row.
13. Consider providing landscaping on the north side of the building to help mitigate the appearance of the building.
14. Add the plant health note to the site plan. "All site plantings of trees and shrubs shall be allowed to reach, and be maintained at, mature height; the topping of trees is prohibited. Shrubs and trees shall be pruned minimally and only to support the overall health of the plant."
15. Indicate on the site plan the retaining wall material and color. A sample may be required for review.
16. Show a "tree line to remain" on the site plan.
17. Further illustrate and consider the relationship of the retaining wall to the building.

b. ARB-2019-143: Malloy Ford Special Use Permit

Location: 2060 Seminole Trail

Proposal: To demolish a portion of the existing building; to establish outdoor sales/storage/display of vehicles in the area previously occupied by the building, and to renovate the remaining portion of the building.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representatives for Project: Justin Shimp, Valerie Long, David Timmerman, Jeff Malloy

Discussion: The ARB asked about precedents for this type of display and required landscaping, and the use of the access road. The applicants discussed the reason for the proposal (success of service business, large size of some vehicles being serviced, need for additional parking), noted the atypical nature of the proposal (not really renovation, but a “reduction”), the incompatibility of the furniture store building with the auto dealership use, the “truth” of the blank wall, the need for VDOT approval of planting in the existing island, and the difficulties of 30” shrubs (cost, fewer choices). The ARB asked if alternate configurations for loading internal to the site had been explored. The applicant responded that too much parking would be lost. The ARB clarified that the distance to the new front elevation from the street is 264’. The ARB discussed the possible relocation of the frontage road to reduce visibility of loading and to establish frontage planting more consistent with the guidelines and adjacent parcel. The applicant noted issues with safety and grading. The ARB asked for more information on the treatment of the new façade (painted CMU) and noted that 5 trees along the elevation was sparse, questioned the use of a mural, asked if evergreens were considered. It was noted that too much was being added to the site; it needs better circulation and planting. A goal is to bring the buffer closer to the edge of the right-of-way. The ARB asked for more specific information on the landscaping in front of the building, vehicle turning radii, and easement/planting conflicts. The applicant noted that deferral to the next meeting would not negatively impact their schedule.

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved to defer action on the application until additional information was provided for review, as follows:

1. Comparative information on approved display lots in the ECs. (to be provided by staff)
2. More specific information on the landscaping proposed in front of the building. (to be provided by the applicant)
3. Auto turn analyses (to be provided by the applicant)
4. Additional information on the landscaping proposed in the new island located closest to the EC, including easements, utilities, coordination with adjacent property (to be provided by the applicant)

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 5:0

Mr. Missel left the meeting.

Work Session

- a. Rio29 – Form Based Code: Update

After considering staff's presentation on the status of the project and the proposed next steps, and following discussion, the ARB recommended that the issue of how orientation to Route 29 and relegated parking would be addressed should be added to the service areas discussion topic. With that addition, it was the consensus of the ARB that the proposed work plan was appropriate.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. Minutes Approval: January 6, 2020

Motion: Mr. Stoner moved to approve the January 6, 2020 meeting minutes.

Mr. Van Der Werf seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 3:0. (Hancock abstain, Missel absent)

b. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

Members nominated Mr. Binsted for Chair.

Members nominated Mr. Van Der Werf for Vice Chair.

Motion: Mr. Stoner moved to elect Mr. Binsted as Chair of the Architectural Review Board for 2020.

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 3:0. (Binsted abstain; Missel absent)

Motion: Mr. Hancock moved to elect Mr. Van Der Werf as Vice Chair of the Architectural Review Board for 2020.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 3:0. (Van Der Werf abstain; Missel absent)

c. Adoption of Rules of Procedure

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved to approve the Rules of Procedure without change.

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0. (Missel absent)

d. Next ARB Meeting: February 3, 2020

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Monday, February 3, 2020 in Room 241, Second Floor, County Office Building at 1:00 p.m.

Stan Binsted, Chair