



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

FINAL ARB ACTION MEMO MINUTES

Date: February 18, 2020

Time: 1:00 PM

Meeting Room: Conference Room 241

Members:

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

Staff:

Margaret Maliszewski
Khris Taggart
Michaela Accardi
Leah Brumfield
Francis MacCall
Carolyn Shaffer

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Binsted called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and established a quorum. Mr. Van Der Werf arrived at 1:05 p.m.

DISCLOSURES

None.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

CONSENT AGENDA

None.

WORK SESSION

a. Rio209 Small Area Plan/Form Based Code/Countywide Certificate of Appropriateness

Staff Contact: Michaela Accardi, Leah Brumfield, Francis MacCall, Margaret Maliszewski

Staff shared research and suggestions for implementing façade articulation and transparency requirements as part of design criteria for a proposed Countywide Certificate of Appropriateness for the Rio29 area. The ARB discussed the subject and provided the following comments:

1. The “building segment with articulation options” concept is an acceptable approach to achieving façade articulation.
2. The options outlined by staff for articulating a façade should be pursued.
3. Intent statements should be provided for the Certificate and the architectural standards.
4. The ARB supported staff’s transparency recommendations with the following changes/comments:
 - a. There should be different transparency requirements for residential buildings.
 - b. 50% transparency seems high for single family residential, and possibly for professional offices.
 - c. On the Edge, 40% on lower stories may be more appropriate.
 - d. What would a full block of 60% ground floor transparency look like? Would it be too uniform? How can diversity, greater variety be built in?
 - e. Mirrored glass should be avoided.
 - f. Measuring transparency between 2’ and 10’ is appropriate. (Above 4’ is not.)
 - g. Should a maximum % of transparency be established?
5. Building segment widths should be considered relative to block sizes and may be expressed as a proportion of height.
6. The Arlington form-based code example is very complicated. A simpler approach is recommended. Illustrations/photos/diagrams would be helpful.
7. The Beaufort, SC example with requirements specific to different roads may be a good reference.
8. The intent statement reading, “simple, honest, human scale” resonates.
9. It will be important to be clear about the build-to line and how building elements relate to it (for example, balconies and canopies).
10. Determining the appropriate level of detail will be a challenge. It will be possible to have too few architectural treatments, and too many. A menu of options, with requirements from particular categories, may be a possible approach.
11. The standards must also address scale and hierarchy. For example, hierarchy could apply to a building corner. If a portion of a building is hierarchically more important, maybe other areas need fewer façade elements. Corners could have different requirements.
12. The examples of intent statements with positive; direct words are good. Those referencing “comfort” are not well defined and are less helpful. It is important to explain the purpose of the standards. Illustrations can help. Intent statements will also be useful for applicants.
13. It is anticipated that the design of single-family detached residences will remain exempt from EC regulations.
14. Differentiation across the character areas is appropriate.
15. Will streetscape materials and landscaping be considered? When this subject is reached, staff will report back to the ARB on these standards.
16. Materials/colors and lighting will be discussed in late March.
17. Staff briefly summarized the public input obtained so far in the process.

Neil Williamson with the Free Enterprise Forum commented that this was a “heavy lift” for staff and expressed concern about enforceability and flexibility, and recommended transparency with presentations and information.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. SDP-2019-80: Brookhill River Park: Review type

After staff’s explanation of the Brookhill River Park site plan proposal, the ARB agreed with staff’s recommendation that the proposal should receive a staff-level review, noting that other projects with similar circumstances (limited scope, limited visibility, and scheduling errors) would receive the same consideration.

b. ARB0-2019-76: Polly’s Folly: Exhaust Hood

Staff reported that the Polly’s Folly applicant wants to install a kitchen hood vent and the roof of the kitchen addition is the applicant’s preferred location for it. The ARB directed staff to obtain additional information from the applicant, including: the size of the unit, current photos of the building/site, verification that the unit can’t be installed on the side or rear, and other options for locating the vent.

c. ARB-2019-156: Wild Turkey PWSF: fence

Staff shared the applicant’s drawings illustrating ground equipment at 10’ high, with some visibility from the street above an 8’-fence. The ARB confirmed that a 10’ board-on-board fence was acceptable, but recommended that alternate locations for the equipment, further away from the street, be pursued, to eliminate the need for the fence.

d. Approve Action Memo/Minutes: February 3, 2020

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved to approve the February 3, 2020 meeting minutes.

Mr. Missel seconded the motion.

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

e. Next ARB Meeting: Monday, March 2, 2020

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Monday, March 2, 2020 in Room 241, Second Floor, County Office Building at 1:00 p.m.

Stan Binsted, Chair

(Recorded and Transcribed by Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk, Planning Commission and Boards)