



County of Albemarle
OFFICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Architectural Review Board
mmaliszewski@albemarle.org
434-296-5832 ext. 3276

ARB ACTION MEMO MINUTES

Date: March 1, 2021

Time: 1:00 PM

Meeting Room: Virtual Meeting

Members:

Frank Stoner: Present
Frank Hancock: Present
Fred Missel, Vice-Chair: Absent
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 1:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

DISCLOSURES

Mr. Hancock disclosed that he would recuse himself from ARB-2021-07: Starbucks.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

CONSENT AGENDA

None.

Regular Review Items

- a. **ARB2021-06:** Airport Parking Lot Elevator and Stair Replacement

Location: 15 Aviation Drive

Proposal: To remove the central parking lot elevator and flanking stairs; to construct two elevator pavilions, and to complete associated improvements.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representative for Project: Christopher Jaeger, Melinda Crawford

Margaret Maliszewski summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members had no questions for staff.

Chris Jaeger introduced the project for the applicant and Melinda Crawford summarized the history of the elevator replacement project and noted that value engineering led to canceling the previous design and proposing the current one. ARB members asked about the possibility of a future parking deck in the existing parking lot (not currently planned). ARB members commented that the current proposal was an improvement over the previous one and that the current design offered an appropriate “arrival experience.”

Motion: Mr. Stoner moved for approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for ARB2021-06: Airport Parking Lot Elevator and Stair Replacement with the conditions listed in the staff report, as follows:

1. Revise the plan to indicate that the masonry infill walls at the patio lookout will be constructed of material to match the existing wall.
2. Add the standard mechanical equipment note to the site and architectural plans: *“Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated.”*
3. Revise the lighting plan to maintain a maximum illumination level of 20 fc at the ground.
4. Consider revising light fixtures to those with color temperatures in the 2000K – 3000K range.
5. Identify on the plan the trees and shrubs to be demolished.
6. Provide a landscape schedule for proposed landscaping.
7. Add the standard plant health note to the 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.”*

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.

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

b. ARB2021-07: Starbucks – 2231 Seminole Lane

Location: 2231 Seminole Trail

Proposal: To demolish an existing office building to construct a 1,138 sq. ft. building to accommodate a drive-thru Starbucks in addition to associated site improvements on approximately .70 acres.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representative for Project: Craig Kotarski, Adam Updike, Ross Downing

Mr. Hancock recused himself from the review of the Starbucks proposal.

Khris Taggart summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members questioned the need for a 30'-wide travelway (applicant will provide more information), asked if there were examples of approved murals to consider (none), and asked for additional information on the context of the site (aerial views were shared). Adam Updike, Starbucks Store Development Manager, stated that the proposal was for a drive-thru only store with no indoor seating. Craig Kotarski (Timmons) stated that, generally, all of staff's recommendations could be accommodated. Material samples would be provided and a narrower travelway width would be

considered, potentially allowing for additional planting area. Ross Downing, Store Design Manager, noted the wood tones of the proposal, the mural content, the canopy detail, the materials. The timing of the review of the content of the mural was questioned. ARB members noted the appropriate scale of the building and its canopy and agreed that the size of the building mitigated the blank wall areas. It was generally agreed that the mural should be eliminated from the proposal so that a process and guidelines for reviewing murals could be established. Studying the city's program was recommended.

Motion: Mr. Stoner moved to forward the recommendations outlined in the staff report to the Agent for the Site review Committee, amended 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 samples for all materials and colors.
2. Provide details regarding the drive-thru related items. Revise the plan to indicate the color of the drive-thru related items. Colors that are compatible with the building design and that minimize the visibility of these elements from the EC would be appropriate.
3. 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.
4. Revise the dumpster enclosure detail to specify materials that are compatible with the building and appropriate for the EC.
5. Add the standard mechanical equipment note to the architectural drawings.
6. Provide a lighting plan with the next submittal.
7. Revise the landscape plan to add an additional tree along the frontage to achieve more consistent spacing and meet the minimum planting requirement.
8. Revise the landscape plan to show large trees, at 40' on center and 2½" caliper at time of planting, in the planting area east of the parking lot.
9. Revise the landscape plan to provide a row of shrubs along the full length of the proposed retaining wall along the southern perimeter of the site.
10. Revise the landscape plan to provide trees along the northern perimeter of the site that does not conflict with existing off-site landscaping.
11. Revise the landscape plan to increase plant diversity such that no single species of tree or shrub exceeds 25% of the total proposed for that plant type.
12. Increase the depth of the planting bed along the retaining walls or revise the shrub to one with an upright habit and mature size suited to the available planting area. Revise the landscape plan to provide a row of shrubs along the full length of the proposed retaining wall along the southern perimeter of the site.
13. Revise the plan to indicate retaining wall material, color, manufacturer. A block in a muted, earth-tone color would be appropriate.
14. Show areas designated for preservation and tree protection fencing coordinated throughout the plans.

15. Sign applications are required for all proposed signs.
16. Eliminate the mural from the proposal. The applicant may return in the future following ARB establishment of mural guidelines.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

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

c. ARB2021-08: Pantops Holiday Inn Express Minor

Location: 870 Pantops Corner Way

Proposal: To relocate mechanical equipment and add screening; to revise site lights and to add feature lighting; to remove the sunshade

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representative for Project: J. Wilson Enochs, III

Margaret Maliszewski summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members had no questions for staff. Wilson Enochs reviewed the applicant's proposal. The ARB asked questions about the sunshade (clarify safety issue, depth, posts, could it be installed higher on the wall - no), and asked if there was planting area available in front of the equipment fence (yes). ARB members discussed the proposal, noting general agreement that the equipment fencing was appropriate, that the blue lights were not appropriate and could establish a poor precedent, that wall lights should be reduced to a pedestrian scale which is typically considered to be 12-16', and that the sunshade was an important element on a prominent face of the building.

Motion: Mr. Hancock moved for approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for ARB2021-08: Pantops Holiday Inn Express Minor with the conditions listed in the staff report, amended as follows:

1. Provide alternate architectural elements to substitute for the sunshade on the west elevation.
2. Indicate on the plan the equipment height, the screen height and a screen color that blends with the building.
3. Include the standard equipment note on the site plan amendment plan: "Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated."
4. Provide a legible photometric plan for review.
5. Provide cut sheets in the site plan for all proposed fixtures.
6. Revise the lighting plan to note the light loss factor (LLF) used to calculate the photometrics. To meet county requirements, the LLF must equal 1.0. Revise the photometrics as necessary.
7. Revise the lighting plan to show lamps with a color temperature between 2000K and 3000K.
8. Revise the lighting plan to note the color of the light fixtures and poles. Bronze or black would coordinate with nearby developments.
9. Revise wall fixture mounting heights to lower, pedestrian scale heights (20' or lower).
10. 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."

11. Eliminate the blue lights from the proposal.
12. Eliminate illumination of the building for purposes other than safety and security.
13. Note that a site plan amendment is required for the equipment and screening.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

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

d. ARB2021-09: Caliber Collision

Location: 1720 Seminole Trail

Proposal: To establish an auto body shop use in an existing 9,200 sf building with associated site improvements on a 1.02-acre parcel

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representative for Project: Melissa Hernandez

Khris Taggart summarized the staff report in a Power Point presentation. The ARB had no questions for staff. Melissa Hernandez gave a brief summary of the project. ARB members asked the applicant if the equipment could easily be relocated (the applicant wants to maintain the current proposed location), if the applicant could screen the equipment (yes), if landscaping could be added (yes), and for clarification on the fence (a stained wood plank fence is proposed). ARB members discussed the fence material (a metal material would be more compatible), the importance of screening the rooftop equipment, and partial mitigation of the equipment by the location at the west end of the building. Staff explained the proposed actions, noting the need to be sure that the rooftop equipment screening would have an appropriate appearance.

Motion: Mr. Hancock moved to forward the following recommendation to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors:

The ARB does not recommend approval of the Special Use Permit as proposed because screening issues have not been resolved and it is not clear that the visual impacts can be sufficiently mitigated. The applicant should return for a work session with the ARB to review alternate fence designs that are more coordinated with the building, and options for mitigating the view of the new rooftop equipment, including but not limited to: alternate equipment locations, paint color, and/or landscape screening.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

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

e. ARB2021-12: 1680 Seminole Trail

Location: 1680 Seminole Trail

Proposal: To renovate the property to accommodate an automobile dealership

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representative for Project: Scott Collins

Margaret Maliszewski summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members asked staff if there were any buildings changes (only repair of wall surfaces where the drive-thru structure will be removed, with the repair to match the surrounding wall condition). Scott Collins briefly addressed the ARB, noting that the proposal had been before the board previously. ARB members asked if the new retaining wall would match the existing (yes). ARB members agreed that the site plan and the adaptive reuse were appropriate, that the proposal was a big improvement, and that the additional planting was appropriate.

Motion: Mr. Stoner moved for approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for ARB2021-12: 1680 Seminole Trail with the conditions listed in the staff report, as follows:

1. Revise the photometric plan to extend footcandle readings out to the property line. Show that spillover at the property line does not exceed .5 fc at the street.
2. Note on the lighting plan that the color of the fixtures and poles will be bronze.
3. Indicate on the lighting plan that maximum pole light height, including any bases, will be 20'.
4. Resolve the tree/light pole conflict on the south side of the building without reducing plant quantities.
5. Add details and/or notes to the plan indicating the construction type and material of the rebuilt retaining wall and describing an appropriate, coordinated appearance.
6. Revise the demolition plan to address the partial removal of the retaining wall.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

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

f. ARB2021-10: Hollymead Extra Space Storage

Location: Along Worth Crossing west of the Worth Crossing/Regent Street intersection, approximately 365' east of the Rt. 29 Entrance Corridor and 477' north of Timberwood Boulevard

Proposal: To construct a 105,726 sq. ft. self-storage building with associated site improvements on approximately 3.43 acres

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representative for Project: Brody Glenn, Barry Byrd

Khris Taggart summarized the staff report in a Power Point presentation. The ARB had no questions for staff. Brody Glenn discussed the building design, highlighting the drive aisle through the building. He and Barry Byrd presented revised elevations showing more brick higher on the building, more articulation (indentations) in the brick, an added canopy, and revised sign colors (green eliminated). ARB members asked about the EIFS colors (accent color is eliminated), the depth of the brick articulation (1½" – 2" recess), the differences/similarity of the corner elements (could be made more similar). In discussion, the ARB noted their appreciation for the applicant's proposed revisions and noted that they address most of staff's recommendations, though some of the brick detailing may not be readable from the EC street.

Motion: Mr. Henningsen moved to forward the recommendations outlined in the staff report to the Agent for the Site review Committee, amended 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. Revise the architectural design to increase the visibility of the brick proposed.
 2. Revise the architectural design to better establish a sense of human scale.
 3. Revise the distribution of building materials and architectural elements to help establish a cohesive whole and better relieve the blankness that is present along the north, west, and south elevations.
 4. Provide perspective renderings from both directions on the EC street, with and without landscaping.
 5. Provide specifications for proposed window glass. Show that VLT will not drop below 40% and VLR will not exceed 30%. Glass should be clear, without tint. If tinted glass is proposed, provide a sample for review. Add the standard window glass note to the architectural plans.
 6. Show the locations of all ground- and building-mounted equipment on the plans. Show how visibility from the ECs will be eliminated.
 7. Add the standard mechanical equipment note to the plan: "Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated."
 8. Provide a complete lighting plan with the final site plan.
 9. Sign applications are required for all proposed signs. Provide with the sign applications a sample of the color proposed for the signs.
 10. The revised elevations presented in the meeting sufficiently address comments 1-3.

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.

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

WORK SESSIONS

a. ARB2020-108: Airport Road Sheetz

Location: Northwest corner of Seminole Trail (Route 29) and Airport Road (Route 649)

Proposal: To construct a fuel station with a 6,077-sf building, 4,244-sf fuel pump canopy, a 1,024-sf carwash, and associated site improvements on three parcels totaling approximately 2.88 acres.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representatives for Project: Lee May, Tom Columbus, Jamie Gearhart, Valerie Long, Ryan Cheney

Khris Taggart summarized the revised submittal in a brief Power Point presentation. The ARB had no questions for staff. The applicants summarized their proposal, noting the changes to

signage, tower design and ice machine color. The ARB asked the applicants about material transitions at the drive-thru (nearly in the same plane), the comparative width of the stone piers at the towers, and the design of the southwest corner. The ARB discussed the apparent lack of resolution in the design of the southwest corner and the impact of deleting the stone at that corner and on the west side of the building. Valerie Long asked if removing the stone would resolve the issue. Mr. Van Der Werf clarified that the south elevation was a three-part façade and the material transitions don't relate to any architectural feature in plan view. The applicant suggested a Mapes canopy instead of an awning and showed the elevations with brick instead of stone.

Motion: Mr. Stoner moved to approve the revised architectural design with the following changes:

1. Eliminate the stone above the base at the southwest corner. Lower the cornice height to match the main wall height.
2. Eliminate the stone above the base on the west elevation. Lower the cornice height to match the main wall height.
3. Revise the south-facing elevation of the southwest corner to compose the service door, awning, grease storage, and glazed opening to relate to each other with a coordinated appearance. The use of a single Mapes canopy may be appropriate.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

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

Mr. Stoner left the meeting at 4:05 PM and indicated he would not be present at the next meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. EC Guidelines Discussion: Revised schedule

Staff summarized the recent changes in the schedule for the ARB's discussions of the Entrance Corridors and stated that an updated schedule would be distributed for review.

b. Minutes Approval: February 1, 2021

Motion: Mr. Henningsen moved for approval of the minutes from the February 1, 2021 ARB meeting.

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.

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

c. Next ARB Meeting: March 15, 2021

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m. to the next Virtual ARB meeting on Monday, March 15, 2021 at 1:00 p.m.