



FINAL ARB ACTION MEMO/MINUTES

Date: June 7, 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 1:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

DISCLOSURES: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

CONSENT AGENDA: None.

Regular Review Items

ARB-2021-49: Umansky Subaru Preliminary Site Plan

Location: On the west side of Route 29 North at the intersection of Hilton Heights Road and Route 29.

Proposal: The applicant proposes to renovate the Umansky Subaru showroom building by applying ACM (aluminum composite material) panels on portions of the Rt. 29 elevation and the majority of the Hilton Heights Road elevation, by painting the existing brick and EIFS gray, by adding elements to the south and east elevations including towers and canopy. The renovation proposal also includes additions to the rear (west) elevation.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representatives: Bob Pineo, Evan Phillips

Khris Taggart summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members asked why there was an SP condition regarding compatibility (because the ARB at the time thought the two phases should be compatible but the applicant was not ready to design the Phase 2 building), and if there was precedent for also requiring that the future design of the Phase 1 building be compatible with the Phase 2 building (staff could not identify any). Bob Pineo (Design Develop) made a presentation to the ARB, noting his desire to make better buildings and the advantage flexibility provides in achieving that goal; that compatibility is the root issue; that the trademark branding elements in the design are good design elements; the need for each dealership design to evolve over time; and that Honda and Chrysler are in the process of redesign. Mr. Pineo asked to move to more of a work session type format, and the ARB agreed. The ARB members thanked the applicant for an excellent submittal. Members noted that the two buildings feel like separate buildings, not phases; they questioned the openness of the landscape (staff clarified that the existing condition does not match the approved plan, and the proposed plan does not clearly show the intent to maintain the approved landscaping); discussed what compatibility means, agreeing on mass, scale, proportion and detailing being more important than materials; asked if Phase 1 has an obligation to be compatible with Phase 2 (staff will return with an answer). Mr. Van Der Werf stated that the branding is prominent in the color and signage and noted that local context could be more fully represented by reducing metal and adding more natural materials with texture and warmer tones. Mr. Stoner asked if the EIFS paint is meant to be darker than the metal panels (no). Mr. Pineo asked if board members had concerns about the mass of the canopy. It was the consensus of the ARB that the canopy would benefit from being stepped back. The ARB discussed the impact of the blue band at the top of the building and the amount, size and color of the wall signs in conveying the brand image, noting that color changes could reduce impacts. Staff summarized that the ARB seemed to feel that the compatibility condition wasn't necessary and that the proposed design was compatible with the Phase 1 building. Given the potential for future changes to both buildings, staff recommended that the applicant may wish to request an amendment to the SP to remove the condition.

The ARB offered the following comments on the proposal for the benefit of the applicant's next submittal:

1. Consider reducing the amount of ACM panel used in the design, increasing the use of warmer colors, and increasing materials with greater texture.
2. Revise the plans to include the standard window glass note: *Visible light transmittance (VLT) shall not drop below 40%. Visible light reflectance (VLR) shall not exceed 30%.*
3. Indicate if any roof or ground-mounted equipment is proposed with the renovations to the building. If new equipment is proposed, show locations and show how that equipment will be screened from the EC.
4. Indicate if any site or building-mounted lighting is proposed with the renovations to the building. If new lighting is proposed, provide complete details.
5. Revise the landscape plan to show all previously approved landscaping, and further clarify the proposal to identify plants to remain, plants to be removed, and plants to be added.
6. Revise the landscape plan to provide show the correct quantity of shade trees along the parking area adjacent to Hilton Heights Rd.
7. Revise the landscape plan to show all approved landscaping along the eastern end of the building.
8. Revise the landscape plan to include plant species.
9. Sign applications are required for all proposed signs.
10. Changes to coping color and sign colors could help reduce the trademark impact.

Motion: Mr. Missel made a motion finding that the proposed architectural design for the Umansky Subaru Building Renovation is compatible with the design of the Phase 1 building.

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 5:0

WORK SESSIONS: None

OTHER BUSINESS

a. EC Guidelines Discussion: Next Steps

The board members discussed the outline presented by staff for content to be included in addendums to the Entrance Corridor design guidelines that would assist applicants, staff and board members interpret the design guidelines as they apply to new development in the corridors. They recommended the following additions: Historic use patterns under 2b; Designed landscape features under 2bb; exemplary new buildings under 2bc; and the addition of a list of ARB-approved projects. The ARB agreed that the one-pager for the Rt. 151 corridor would be completed first as a “test run” and Mr. Stoner agreed to assist. The Board agreed that compiling information can proceed prior to finalizing the design of the format of the document. The ARB also agreed that work on the other corridors that have not yet been reviewed would resume once the work on the western corridors is complete. Board members noted that intern/student help would be good, and that new photography could be limited to sites not covered in open source formats.

b. Minutes Approval: May 17, 2021

Motion: Mr. Henningsen moved for approval of the minutes from the May 17, 2021, ARB meeting.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0

c. Next ARB Meeting: June 21, 2021, 1:00 PM – VIRTUAL MEETING

Mr. Missel noted that he would not attend the June 21 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m. to the next Virtual ARB meeting on Monday, June 21, 2021 at 1:00 p.m.