



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: November 4, 2019

Time: 1:00 PM

Meeting Room: Conference Room 241

Members:

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

Staff:

Margaret Maliszewski
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

None.

CONSENT AGENDA

None.

Regular Review Items

a. **ARB-2019-109: Auto Zone** (TMP 061W0010A00300)

Location: Southwest corner of the intersection of Rt. 29 and Westfield Rd.

Proposal: To construct an auto parts retail store with associated site improvements

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representative for Project: Craig Kotarski

Discussion: The ARB asked if there was still a separate building site to the south, to which staff replied yes. Staff explained there is room for an addition to the south, and that currently, there is landscaping that has been added there as a result from a comment from the last review.

The applicant said in terms of the site plan, while there still is a site for a future building addition, the applicant has removed the right-in/right-out to Route 29 on the southern side. He said the entrance connection would have required a VDOT waiver, and the applicant decided this was not worth pursuing.

The applicant said as far as mitigating the blankness of the windows, the glass will be clear and will not have tint on it. He brought a sample of the glass to view. He presented a picture of the prototype, noting that the evergreen tint had been changed to no tint at all, but will still meet the factors of the transmittance (VLT, VLR) at 87 and therefore, the County requirements.

The applicant said that as they have done different brick patterns on three of the elevations, they can do the same underneath the windows. He said these are full fenestration windows into the building, which helps with lighting and energy. He said this accomplishes the same goal as the evergreen tint would have.

The applicant said they noted that the fully-screen HVAC units are located on all four elevations, with a small dash to denote them on the plan. He said they are fully screened, both at the 21-foot and 23-foot elevations.

Replying to the ARB's question about window displays, a certain part of the store has fixtures right behind it and the reason they put the windows so high is because it's up over the shelving for either the backstock or the sales floor. He said this is why faux windows are down below on the prototype because they would only see the back of the shop.

The applicant said in the past, real windows have been put in, without fenestration into it. He said they have, in the past, recessed the windows into the brick and instead of them being black, they put a painted line behind it so that it looks more fenestration, but is not truly there. He said it is not seeing into the store because they would be seeing the stock on the other side of the wall. He said this is always taken into consideration, and it is something the applicant prefers not to do due to a security issue. He said someone could break into the windows and steal stock, and that there is also a visibility issue with the back side of the store and stock.

The ARB mentioned signage issues, and that perhaps one of the signs was too long, according to staff. The applicant responded that they had reduced about 4 feet off of each side of the sign, resulting in a total 7-8 feet reduced in between the pilasters and the piers. He said if they do pull

the EIFS is to where it is above the storefront, the sign will be hanging off the EIFS part on and onto the brick, which would be sizing the sign to something that the applicant doesn't want to have to approve, per their standards, because that sign is the size that they are allowed, as well as the wall of the right hand elevation facing Westfield Road.

The applicant said that almost every square inch of their floor plan is accounted for. He said there are 32"x32" piers that are a structural component on each side of the store front.

The ARB discussed the possibility of the EIFS going all the way out instead of stopping, expressing that it seemed as if the panels that go from pier to pier on the other elevations seemed more resolved than this one, which seemed to "float."

The applicant said this how they felt as well, and could take it to the pilasters and piers, but wanted to work with staff on this. He expressed concern that if it was brought in any more to the true storefront, they would have a sign hanging off, which would not have a good symmetrical look.

The ARB suggested doing away with the orange bands, as done on the side, as they could possibly enlarge the rest of the logo on the front. The applicant said this was a possibility, but that the orange color is the company's main color, more so than red. He said the prototype store is a smooth-faced building painted with the trademark. He said this building was a one-off, and that they feel that they should try to get their main orange color on the building somehow.

Staff reminded that the side areas in the ordinance has "maximum allowable," and that this doesn't mean that the ARB absolutely has to approve that. Staff said that the ARB needs to approve something that looks proportional to the building. The ARB asked staff if the EIFS was considered to be part of the sign, or if it was just a color band. Staff replied that zoning would draw a rectangle around the orange band and letters. The applicant said that with every sign that they use, they have a square footage calculation, and that this was something they could provide whenever needed.

Staff said last time, they had discussed that those colors weren't within the range that the ARB normally approves. Staff suggested that if the ARB were to consider using the orange color, it may be another reason to reduce the size down. Staff also said that this didn't have to be resolved immediately, and that there is a separate signing permit that is required.

The applicant said the red doors are supposed to match the brick. He said the main doors, and even the delivery door, had all been noted in the plan to match the brick.

The ARB expressed that this was an improvement from the previous submission, including the brick. There was concern about how the windows function well for a warehouse store, but don't work so well for an Entrance Corridor façade. It was suggested that if there was just one good, true window in each of the side bays and no floating clerestory, it would be more appropriate.

The ARB asked if the two horizontal windows on each side of the storefront were necessary. The applicant replied that they serve the purposes of natural lighting, visibility, and energy conservation, and that this was part of the newest prototype. He said years ago, this was added to the prototype, along with the four faux windows on each side and six clerestory windows.

Because of how close the windows are to the existing storefront, the ARB suggested giving up the two horizontal windows closest to the storefront and keep the other two (a total of four) on the outside. The applicant replied that this would not be a problem. There was another

suggestion from the ARB that if the two windows on the side bays were closer together to appear as a larger, central figure in each side bay, it may be more appropriate. The ARB suggested that a change in material could also help better define this. It was also suggested to do away with all the windows in question. The applicant said they could do the same stack pattern, as shown on the other three elevations, on the front and place them underneath the windows to resolve the "floating" scheme.

There was comment from the ARB said the overall composition was a huge improvement from where they started, and that their job was not to micromanage, as the windows would not seem offensive in the Entrance Corridor to passersby. There was another comment from the board about getting rid of the two windows in the center bay to clean up the look. There was also a preference stated from the board to see the sign band and storefront line up somehow, and that perhaps the store could be made slightly bigger, and the sign slightly smaller. The board also noted that there was alignment with the canopy, which offered some visual alignment.

The ARB said the south elevations appeared to be appropriate.

The ARB said if there was just one clerestory window on each side, and the windows were centered and organized in a way with the brick to look more like a traditional window opening that had been filled in, it would be more appropriate. A larger, single transom with a brick panel underneath was recommended by the board. The applicant said the windows are close to 4 feet wide, and asked the board if they felt that combining the windows into one, to be 6-7 feet wide, was too much. The ARB replied that 8 feet would be too wide in that bay, but that 6 feet would be appropriate. The applicant said they could add the brick paneling below the window, just as with the other three elevations.

The applicant said that getting rid of the two windows closest to the storefront on each side, combining the two together on the outside into one, then putting a brick pattern with different stack coursing below it would be an acceptable solution.

The ARB asked what orange colors had been approved before. The applicant responded that the colors they were presenting were their trademark colors, and that they have the documentation to prove this. He said he understood the County had their own requirements, and that this was not something he could speak to as it was out of his realm, and the company has a sign manager that handles this work. He said this would be something the sign manager would have to discuss with staff. Staff said that the final site plan approval was written in a way that the was on notice that the colors would have to meet the guidelines in the sign application.

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved for approval of the final site plan with the conditions listed in the staff report, amended as follows:

1. Resolve the "floating" character of the transom windows by eliminating the two transoms closest to the storefront and revising the end pairs to a single larger transom, with brick detailing below.
2. Revise the color of the red doors in the color elevation sheet to match the color of the brick wall.
3. Revise the notes on the elevations sheet to clearly state that the glass has no tint.
4. Show the locations and heights of rooftop equipment on the architectural elevations.
5. Add the standard mechanical equipment note to the architectural drawings: "Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated."
6. Revise the lighting plan to reduce spillover onto adjacent streets to less than .5 fc.
7. Revise the photometric plan to use a maintenance factor of 1.0.

8. Revise the lighting plan to indicate the color/finish of all light fixtures as bronze.
9. Add the standard lighting note to the plan: "Each outdoor luminaire equipped with a lamp that emits 3,000 or more initial lumens shall be a full cutoff luminaire and shall be arranged or shielded to reflect light away from adjoining residential districts and away from adjacent roads. The spillover of lighting from luminaires onto public roads and property in residential or rural areas zoning districts shall not exceed one half footcandle."
10. Coordinate the landscape plan (which shows 223 Pennsylvania Sedge) with the plant schedule (which shows 210 Pennsylvania Sedge).
11. Provide two 2½" caliper trees along the southern travelway.
12. Note that 3M 3630-143 Poppy Red and equivalents, and 3M 3630-44 Orange are not approvable sign colors. Revised colors meeting EC sign guidelines will be required with the sign application.
13. Coordinate landscaping at the base of the sign. Revise the monument sign note to state that the sign location is shown for information only; a separate sign application is required for review and approval.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

The motion carried by a vote of 3:0. (Mr. Wardell and Mr. Hancock were absent.)

OTHER BUSINESS

- a. **Minutes Approval:** None
- b. **Next ARB Meeting:** November 18, 2019

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:32 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Monday, November 18, 2019 in Room 241, Second Floor, County Office Building at 1:00 p.m.

Stan Binsted, Chair

(Recorded by Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk. Transcribed by Golden Transcription Services)