



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

ARB ACTION MEMO MINUTES

Date: January 4, 2021

Time: 1:00 PM

Meeting Room: Virtual meeting

Members:

Dade Van Der Werf, Chair: Present
Frank Stoner: Present
Fred Missel Vice-Chair: Present
Frank Hancock: Present
Chris Henningsen: Present

Staff: Khris Taggart

Margaret Maliszewski
Carolyn Shaffer

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ESTABLISH A QUORUM

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

3. Annual Meeting

a. Chairperson and Vice Chairperson: Election

Mr. Missel nominated Mr. Van Der Werf for Chairperson.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

There were no additional nominations.

Mr. Stoner motioned to close the nominations.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Henningsen.

The motion to close the nominations passed by a vote of 5:0.

The motion to elect Mr. Van Der Werf for Chairperson passed by a vote of 4:0 with Mr. Van Der Werf abstaining.

Mr. Van Der Werf nominated Mr. Missel for Vice-Chairperson.

Mr. Hancock seconded the nomination.

There were no additional nominations.

Mr. Stoner motioned to close the nominations.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

The motion to close the nominations passed by a vote of 5:0.

The motion to elect Mr. Missel for Vice-Chairperson passed by a vote of 4:0 with Mr. Missel abstaining.

b. Rules of Procedure: Adopt

Staff noted that the previously approved Rules of Procedure limited applicant comment to 10 minutes, but the ARB's standard practice was to allow 15 minutes. There was consensus that the Rules should be revised to allow applicants 15 minutes to present.

Mr. Missel motioned to adopt the rules of procedure with the noted revisions.

Mr. Van Der Werf seconded the motion.

The motion passed by a vote of 5:0.

c. 2021 Submittal and Meeting Schedule: Adopt

Staff stated that the proposed schedule follows recent standard practice of holding ARB meetings on the first and third Monday of each month beginning at 1:00 PM, with the date moving to Tuesday when Monday is a holiday. There was consensus for maintaining the schedule as described.

Mr. Stoner motioned to adopt the Submittal and Meeting Schedule as proposed.

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.

The motion passed by a vote of 5:0.

4. DISCLOSURES: Mr. Henningsen stated that he would recuse himself from the discussions on the Scott's Ivy Exxon and Sleep Number projects because his firm prepared the architectural designs for those projects.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

6. CONSENT AGENDA: None.

7. WORK SESSION: None.

8. Regular Review Items:

a. **ARB-2020-125: Scott's Ivy Exxon**

Location: 4260 Ivy Rd, on the north side of Rt. 250 approximately 265' east of the Rt. 250 and Ivy Depot Rd. intersection.

Proposal: To construct a 3,200-sf addition to an existing service station and to complete associated site improvements on approximately 1.59 acres.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representatives for Project: Scott Collins, Mark Kestner, Scott Ramm, Caleb Snyder

Mr. Henningsen recused himself from this application.

Staff presented a summary of the staff report and recommendations in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members had no questions for staff. Scott Ramm of Scott's Ivy Exxon greeted the Board. Scott Collins of Collins Engineering stated that the staff report was well done and noted that the proposed dumpster location is similar to the location shown in the architectural renderings. Mark Kestner, of Henningsen Kestner Architects, talked about the architectural design, the proposed materials, the budgetary constraints, the Napa brand, the Exxon brand canopy, the simple building massing, the extensive landscaping proposed, the 100% redevelopment of the site, the minimal visibility of the addition, and the goal of establishing a fresh new presence for the business. Mr. Missel asked if there was any flexibility in the addition height. Mr. Snyder noted that the brick texture on sheet A9 is incorrect – it should be metal. Mr. Van Der Werf asked about the travelway width, the possibility of adding a tree at the east end of the vending area, adding windows or other relief on the south-facing wall of the addition, and the potential to use alternate materials. In discussion, Mr. Stoner noted the major improvement of the added planting island, no major concerns about massing or landscape; and only concern is the color scheme. A unified appearance is appropriate, but the colors should be toned down. Mr. Hancock noted the improved organization of the site, agreed with the color comments, and asked for added fenestration or other means of relieving blankness on the south elevation. Mr. Missel noted his primary concern was the proposed colors and wanted to see a mitigation or reduction in the height of the addition. He was concerned about the westbound view down the 38' "slot" created by the wide travelway and asked for reduction there or at the out-only travelway. Mr. Van Der Werf acknowledged the previous comments and noted that there was an opportunity to create a separation between the historic development and the addition, that there are examples of weathered and textured painted brick buildings in the ECs, but most are recessive. The white color is jarring. He noted a need for relief on the south wall.

Motion: Mr. Missel moved to forward the recommendations outlined in the staff report to the Agent for the Site Review Committee, amended as follows:

Staff recommends that the ARB forward the following recommendations to the Agent for the Site Review Committee:

- Regarding requirements to satisfy the design guidelines as per § 18-30.6.4c(2), (3) and (5) and recommended conditions of initial plan approval:
 - Prior to Initial Plan approval the following items shall be resolved to the satisfaction of the ARB: None. The ARB recommends approval of the Initial Plan without conditions.
- Regarding recommendations on the plan as it relates to the guidelines: None.
- Regarding conditions to be satisfied prior to issuance of a grading permit: None.
- Regarding the final site plan submittal:

A Certificate of Appropriateness is required prior to final site plan approval. The following items and all items on the ARB Final Site Plan Checklist must be addressed:

 1. Provide samples for all materials and colors.
 2. Revise the proposal to provide a design that maintains a connection to the historic architecture of the area, that does not use trademark colors as a major design element, and that establishes a cohesive overall design with human scale and minimal blankness.
 3. Coordinate the appearance and location of the dumpster screen in both the site plan and color renderings. The location shown in the architectural renderings is more appropriate than the one in the site plan.
 4. Provide street level views looking east and west from Rt. 250 with and without landscaping illustrating as much of the site as possible. Reduce width of travelways as much as possible to reduce visibility of the addition from the EC.
 5. Show the location of mechanical equipment (building- and ground-mounted) on the site and architectural plans and show how it will be screened from the EC. If the location is inside the building, note this on the plans. If located on the rooftop, provide a roof plan showing equipment locations, and show the equipment locations and heights on the elevation drawings.
 6. Coordinate the color of the vending machine enclosure with the approved building color.
 7. Consider rotating the vending machine enclosure so that the closed end faces the street.
 8. Provide a lighting plan with the next submittal.
 9. Revise the landscape plan to add one additional interior parking tree.
 10. Revise the landscape plan to show all interior parking trees at 2.5" caliper at time of planting.
 11. Revise the landscape plan to provide additional trees and shrubs consistent with the rest of the proposal at the southwest corner of the site.
 12. Show the tree protection fencing consistently throughout the landscaping, grading, and E&S plans.
 13. Sign applications are required for all proposed signs.
 14. Limit wall signs to individual letter signs.
 15. Consider a reduction in the height of the addition, as well as fenestration or other detailing to the south elevation.

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0 (Henningsen abstained).

b. ARB-2020-127: Wawa at Proffit Road Amendment

Location: Northeast corner of the intersection of Rt. 29 and Proffit Road

Proposal: To revise the approved site plan, including landscape revisions, to accommodate 8 Tesla charging stations and related mechanical equipment.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representative for the Project: Jonathan Ritchie

Staff gave a brief presentation summarizing the request and areas of non-conformity with the EC Guidelines. ARB members asked about the elevation of the parking area relative to Rt. 29 (8-10' below) and to Proffit Road (2-4'). Mr. Van Der Werf asked if the approved plan showed larger-than-standard gaps in planting (yes). Jonathan Ritchie with Bohler Engineering addressed the ARB. Mr. Hancock asked about the utilities in the area in question. Mr. Ritchie explained that the City installed a gas line behind the curb along Proffit, leaving only 4' for planting. Mr. Van Der Werf asked about other possible locations for the charging stations (close to other equipment, already ADA accessible, less space on east side with grade differential). In discussion, ARB members agreed that the view of the charging stations would be mitigated by distance from the EC and everything else on site. Mr. Hancock suggested that an evergreen shrub be used along the parking row. Mr. Henningsen supported the painting of the equipment on the dumpster wall.

Motion: Mr. Hancock moved to approve the proposed amendment with the following conditions:

1. Paint the equipment attached to the dumpster wall to match the dumpster wall.
2. Revise the shrubs along the charging stations to an evergreen species.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

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

9. Other Business:

a. ARB-2020-69: Sleep Number: Proposal to revise materials

Proposal: To revise the metal panels to Master Wall stucco panels with the same color and joint pattern.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representatives for the project: Mark Kestner, Caleb Snyder

Staff summarized the applicant's request in a brief PowerPoint presentation and noted that the request was not consistent with the guidelines or past practice. Mr. Missel asked for further clarification on the proposed change and staff showed additional images highlighting the areas of the building that were originally proposed as metal, which the applicant proposed to change to stucco. Mark Kestner discussed pricing issues, the goal of keeping the building massing and overall architectural intent, and the combination of materials. Board members asked the applicant about making the material change in less visible areas, the material for the underside of the canopies (Hardi) and noted the importance of precedent and balancing budget with aesthetics. Board members noted that the face of the canopy is an odd location for stucco and asked if the horizontal bands could be a different material than the vertical panels. They suggested replacing the high cost material under the canopy and increasing the quality material on the vertical surfaces. Mr. Snyder clarified that the horizontal band was 10" of stucco and 6" of bronze flashing. Mr. Van Der Werf suggested that the applicant retain more metal or other more friend material at the corner and horizontal elements. Mr. Kestner pointed out that there would be two textures for the stucco – a rough texture in tan and a fine sand texture in blue. He stated that stucco is a reasonably long-lasting material if applied and flashed correctly. ARB members noted the need for additional information confirming the lifetime of the proposed stucco; asked if the current design was proposed originally, would it have been approved; suggested that stucco was acceptable on vertical elements but not horizontal ones; requested stucco details; and confirmed that maintaining the joint pattern was appropriate.

Motion: Mr. Missel moved to provide the following comments for the applicant's next submittal, which can be reviewed in a work session:

1. Consider further adjustments in the blend of materials to retain more metal or incorporate another more refined material at the corner and at the horizontal elements, and possibly some of the vertical elements.
2. Provide stucco details showing how the stucco will be a long-lasting material.
3. Accurate color renderings showing views from the EC street would be helpful.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0. (Henningsen abstained)

b. EC Arterials: Update

Staff provided a PowerPoint presentation outlining recommendations for the EC-designated streets that do not have arterial status, as follows:

Pursue arterial status for:

- Avon Street Extended - full length
- Barracks Road - from the city limits to Georgetown Road
- Thomas Jefferson Parkway (Rt. 53) – full length from Rt. 20 to the County line
- Richmond Rd (Rt. 250) - from Rt. 22 to County line

Consider County Scenic Highway:

- Barracks Rd (Rt. 654) – beyond Georgetown Rd
- Irish Road (Rt. 6) – full length
- Louisa Road (Rt. 22) – from Rt. 231 to the County line
- Stony Point Road (Rt. 20) – from Proffit Road north to the County line
- Thomas Jefferson Parkway (Rt. 53) – full length, if arterial status is not achieved

Consider County Historic District:

- Thomas Jefferson Parkway (Rt. 53) – full length, if arterial status is not achieved

Staff reported that the ARB's recommendations would be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors who are scheduled to review this topic in February.

ARB members had comments and questions including: Why is there no recommendation for Rt. 631; What is the role of the ARB in scenic highway and historic district review; What is the plan for public input; We may not want to designate as ECs the streets that are primarily residential or are likely to have few commercial development proposals. Similarly, the industrial character of Avon Street may be less suited to the application of EC guidelines.

c. EC Guidelines: Discussion on Rt. 250 West

Mr. Van Der Werf gave a detailed PowerPoint presentation describing segments of the Rt. 250 West corridor and identifying significant buildings, landscape features, and other important characteristics. The ARB members agreed that the format of the presentation should be used as a template for future discussions about the other corridors, that the ARB's work would start with a focus on the ECs in the western part of the County, that each member would forward ideas for buildings to be celebrated and buildings that should not be used as examples, Mr. Henningsen is next with Rt. 240, and Mr. Van Der Werf will continue working on the east end of Rt. 250 West.

d. Minutes Approval: December 21, 2020

Motion: Mr. Missel moved for approval of the minutes from the December 21, 2020 ARB meeting.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 5:0

10. Next ARB Meeting: January 19, 2021 (TUESDAY)**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on TUESDAY, January 19, 2021, a virtual meeting beginning at 1:00 p.m.