



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

DRAFT ARB ACTION MEMO MINUTES

Date: February 1, 2021

Time: 1:00 PM

Meeting Room: Virtual Meeting

Members:

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

Staff:

Margaret Maliszewski
Khris Taggart
Carolyn Shaffer

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Van Der Werf called the meeting to order at 12:59 p.m. and established a quorum.

DISCLOSURES

- Mr. Hancock disclosed that he received an email from Valerie Long regarding the phasing of the Rio Hill redevelopment project.
- Mr. Henningsen disclosed that he also received an email from Valerie Long regarding the phasing of the Rio Hill redevelopment project and that he would recuse himself from the Sleep Number review.
- Mr. Van Der Werf disclosed that he and Mr. Stoner met with the Rio Hill redevelopment applicants.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

CONSENT AGENDA

a. ARB-2020-130: Rivers Edge Initial (TMP: 03200-00-00-005A0, 03200-00-00-005A1)

Location: On the east side of Rt. 29 at River's Edge Lane, approximately 1000' north of the Rt. 29/Lewis and Clark Drive intersection.

Proposal: To construct 100 multi-family residential units and associated site improvements on approximately 32.53 acres.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representative for Project: Justin Shimp / Rachel Moon

Prior to taking action on the consent agenda, Mr. Van Der Werf asked if ARB members thought the final submittal for this project could be reviewed by staff. It was the consensus of the ARB members that staff level review of the final application would be appropriate.

Motion: Mr. Missel moved to approve the consent agenda and forward the recommendations outlined in the staff report for the Initial Site Plan 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) 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 architectural designs with the next submittal.
 2. Provide site sections to clarify the visibility of the proposed development from the EC street.
 3. Update the plans to include information on accessory structures and equipment.
 4. Include the standard mechanical equipment note on the architectural plans.
 5. Provide a lighting plan with the next submittal.
 6. Provide landscaping that helps integrate the site entrance into the EC, taking into consideration any future signage that will be needed.
 7. Identify trees that are to remain that meet the landscaping requirements for interior roads.
 8. Revise the landscape plan to provide additional pedestrian way trees and show all trees at 2½" caliper at time of planting.
 9. Revise the landscape plan to provide large shade trees 40' on center along the perimeters of the 38-space parking lot and the curved perimeter of the 24-space lot.
 10. Revise the landscape plan to show all exterior and interior parking lot trees at 2½" caliper at planting.
 11. Show tree protection fencing on, and coordinated throughout, the grading, landscaping, and erosion and sediment control plans.

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.

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

Regular Review Items

a. ARB-2020-129: Scruby Property – Verizon Tier 3 PWSF (TMP: 05400-00-00-072A0)

Location: East side of Greenwood Station Road, just south of I-64 (See Figure 1)

Proposal: To construct a telecommunications facility consisting of a 94' monopole tower with associated structures and equipment.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski and Khris Taggart

Representative for Project: Nathan Holland, Lori Schweller

Margaret Maliszewski summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members had no questions for staff, but Mr. Missel noted generally that the treetop tower policy produced good results regarding visibility.

The applicant chose not to make a presentation. Mr. Van Der Werf asked about the grading within the drip lines of trees to remain. Ms. Schweller noted that alternate routes of access were considered and the grading would be addressed.

Two members of the public commented on the proposal. Todd Zimmerman of 200 Seven Oaks Farm asked the Board to consider views of the balloon from Mirador, Seven Oaks and Rt. 250. Nancy Schlichting, representing the owner of Mirador, stated that alternate sites were available that would push the tower out of view of the historic properties. She also asked the Board to consider the views from locations other than I64.

Mr. Van Der Werf asked staff for the photos of the other views mentioned by the members of the public. Staff stated that they were not prepared to present those views because they were from locations that were not the subject of ARB review. Ms. Maliszewski noted that other committees and other reviewers would be addressing those views.

The ARB members noted that they understood the concerns about views from the historic sites but believed the view from I64 was appropriate.

Regarding the Certificate of Appropriateness for the ground equipment and base station:

Motion: Mr. Missel moved to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the ground equipment and base station as proposed.

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.

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

Regarding visibility of the monopole:

Motion: Mr. Hancock moved to forward the following recommendation to the Agent:
The ARB finds that the proposed location will sufficiently minimize the visibility of the

monopole from the I-64 Entrance Corridor.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

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

Regarding the Special Exception:

Motion: Mr. Missel moved to forward the following recommendation to the Agent:
Revise the plan to eliminate grading from within the driplines of trees to remain.

Mr. Van Der Werf seconded the motion.

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

b. ARB-2020-135: Rio Hill Redevelopment (TMP: 04500-00-00-094A0)

Location: West of Rt. 29, East of Berkmar Drive, south of Woodbrook Drive

Proposal: To renovate a majority of the existing Rio Hill Shopping Center (excluding the Kroger store and the southeast corner of the center), removing portions of the existing canopies and store entries to update the current façade.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representative for Project: David Timmerman, Josh Kagan

Mr. Stoner joined the meeting during the presentation of this item.

Khris Taggart summarized the staff report in a Power Point presentation. The ARB had no questions for staff. David Timmerman (with BRW Architects) and Josh Kagan. (property owner's representative) represented the project. Mr. Kagan noted that retail has changed and they want to transform the public experience in this shopping center, using this renovation as a stepping stone to a broader redevelopment. Mr. Timmerman talked about various aspects of the project, including the future plan to demolish the southeast corner and rebuild, adding canopies back into the design for an improved pedestrian experience, TJ Maxx and Sierra as the economic engine for the redevelopment, the need for conditional approval or expedited review due to contractual obligations, and the proposal for staining the masonry. Mr. Hancock asked about the architectural panels (phenolic, Stonewood Co., composite with a variety of colors and appearance of texture, durable) and noted the positive feature of turning the column bases into planters. In discussion, the ARB members generally commented that the proposed design was a good one and the proposal was well done. Mr. Hancock noted the big parking lot and its need for trees. Mr. Missel clarified that the ARB could approve the Comprehensive Sign Plan at this meeting. Mr. Henningsen noted that the design effectively breaks up the long façade and noted that it was acceptable to approve the TJ Maxx and Sierra designs. Mr. Van Der Werf reiterated the need to increase tree canopy in a future phase.

Motion: Mr. Stoner moved for approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for ARB-2020-135: Rio Hill Redevelopment with the conditions listed in the staff report:

Regarding the site plan and architectural design for TJ Maxx and Sierra.

1. Provide samples for all materials and colors that confirm the use of warm tones.

2. If any new mechanical equipment is proposed, show how it will be screened from view from the EC.
3. Provide the standard mechanical equipment note on the architectural drawings.
4. Provide a lighting plan for review. Over-illumination of the building is not appropriate for the EC.
5. Identify the species proposed for the green screens on the site plan.

Regarding the site plan and the overall architectural design.

1. Provide samples for all materials and colors that confirm the use of warm tones.
2. If any new mechanical equipment is proposed, show how it will be screened from view from the EC.
3. Provide the standard mechanical equipment note on the architectural drawings.
4. Provide a lighting plan for review. Over-illumination of the building is not appropriate for the EC.
5. Identify the species proposed for the green screens on the site plan.
6. If the architectural designs proposed for TJ Maxx and Sierra receive approval prior to the design of the overall shopping center, coordinate the overall design with TJ Maxx and Sierra.

Regarding the CSP and the signs for TJ Maxx and Sierra.

1. Revise the CSP to include the following detail regarding graphics colors: "no limit to graphics colors as long as the total is limited to three, plus black and white."
2. All raceways must be painted or replaced so that the raceway color matches the color of the wall to which it is attached.
3. The signs for TJ Maxx and Sierra are approved as proposed.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

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

- c. ARB-2020-132: Albemarle Business Campus Block 5** (TMP: 07600-00-00-046A0 and 07600-00-00-05400 and 07600-00-00-046F0 (part)

Location: Rt. 631 at Rt. 780

Proposal: To construct a self-storage building as part of a larger mixed-use development.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representative for Project: Justin Shimp, Gretchen Elton

Margaret Maliszewski summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. The ARB had no questions for staff. Gretchen Elton addressed the board and discussed the new proposal to increase parapet height to screen rooftop equipment. Justin Shimp discussed the issues related to planting trees along the full length of the travelway south of the storage building noting the timing of construction and utilities. He indicated that there could be a consistent row of trees. Mr. Stoner asked if it was possible to have the trees with the easement in place. Mr. Shimp responded that the depth of the pipes was a consideration. Mr. Van Der Werf questioned the color of the black brick. Ms. Elton confirmed that it was a stark, dark black, adding that it has a slurry face, is called a "rustic face" CMU with a little texture (between split face and ground face). Mr. Van Der Werf questioned the changes in depth in the façade and confirmed that all massing was in the same plane. ARB members generally agreed that the design was attractive,

particularly given the use. Mr. Hancock noted his appreciation for adjusting the floor plan to include corridors at the windows.

Motion: Mr. Missel moved for approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for ARB-2020-132: Albemarle Business Campus Block 5 with the conditions listed in the staff report, amended as follows:

1. Adjust utilities to allow for large trees, 2½" caliper at planting, along both sides the full length of the travelway located south of the Block B building.
2. 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."
3. Eliminate the visibility of rooftop equipment. Use of the raised parapet is appropriate.
4. Provide manufacturer's names and color names/numbers for each proposed material.

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.

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

WORK SESSIONS

a. ARB-2020-69: Sleep Number (TMP: 06100-00-00-134A0)

Location: Fashion Square Mall

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

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representative for Project: Mark Kestner

Margaret Maliszewski gave a brief PowerPoint presentation to summarize the history of the project, the ARB's action in January, and the applicant's new submittal. The ARB had no questions for staff. Mark Kestner of Henningsen Kestner Architects described the most recent changes to the building design, noting the dark bronze metal used for the horizontal elements and the stucco on the larger vertical surfaces. He showed section details that illustrated the hard coat stucco on masonry substrate construction. He noted the substantial backer and the long-term finish this construction would provide. He called it a "real stucco product in the traditional sense". The ARB members each indicated that the revision appeared appropriate for the EC. Mr. Van Der Werf confirmed that the vertical pier elements were also constructed of block.

Motion: Mr. Hancock moved to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for revised materials as presented in the meeting.

Mr. Missel seconded the motion.

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

OTHER BUSINESS

a. EC Guidelines Discussion

Mr. Stoner gave a PowerPoint presentation describing the Rt. 151 Entrance Corridor and identifying buildings, structures, landscape features, and other important characteristics along its length. He discussed the overall rural character of the corridor, the presence of 4-board fencing, suburban style residences, commercial development near the Nelson line. The members noted the important mountain view, enhancing the natural resources along the corridor, the zoning along the corridor (RA), the types of development that would require ARB review, the possibility of additional winery/brewery/special events venues on the corridor, and the possible benefits of scenic highway designation.

b. Minutes Approval: January 19, 2021

Motion: Mr. Stoner moved for approval of the minutes from the January 19, 2021 ARB meeting.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

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

c. Next ARB Meeting: February 15, 2021

Mr. Hancock stated that he would not be able to attend the February 15 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m. to the next Virtual ARB meeting on Monday, February 15, 2021 at 1:00 p.m.