



FINAL ARB ACTION MEMO/MINUTES

Date: July 19, 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 1:01 p.m. and established a quorum.

DISCLOSURES: ARB members had no disclosures but Mr. Missel introduced Molly Nealon, a new intern who was listening in on the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

CONSENT AGENDA: None.

REGULAR REVIEW ITEMS

a. ARB-2021-67: Discount Tire

Location: 1638 Seminole Trail

Proposal: To demolish an existing fast-food restaurant building to construct a 7,680 sq. ft. building to accommodate a Discount Tire vehicle service facility in addition to associated site improvements on approximately 1.32 acres.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representative: Ryan Yauger, Quoc Truong, Terri Guerrero

Khris Taggart summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members had no questions for staff. Ryan Yaeger represented the applicant and stated that the design team would welcome feedback from the ARB, particularly regarding building massing and color and the treatment of the blankness on the north wall. Mr. Hancock asked the applicant if they had considered ways to increase planting area along the front of the site. Mr. Yaeger responded that they were considering a combination of shifting the building and creating planting islands, noting that making customers walk around the building is not ideal. Mr. Van Der Werf asked the applicant if they had any thoughts on alternate materials or methods for relieving blankness. The applicant noted that the narrow site is not conducive to adding planting area; different materials and massing will be pursued. The ARB went into discussion. Some ARB members were not concerned about the blankness of the north elevation. Mr. Missel asked if brick detail could be added for relief, or if glass from the front elevation could be continued around the corner to the north (no because bathrooms are located there). ARB members asked for clarification on the building materials (all split faced block; 2 shades of brown). Mr. Hancock suggested that a perspective view of the north elevation as viewed from the street would be helpful, and that heavier planting on the north side could help relieve blankness. He also noted that the renderings look brick, but the elevations look like block. Mr. Van Der Werf stated that the split faced block is less appropriate for the ECs; ground face would be better. He asked if a 2-way travelway is necessary on the north side (the applicant will look into this). Mr. Henningsen reiterated that the drawings were inconsistent regarding the appearance of brick and block and noted that the brick looks better. Mr. Missel suggested that a work session would be an appropriate next step.

Motion: Mr. Missel moved to approve the Initial Site Plan and forward the recommendations outlined in the staff report 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:
 - The ARB recommends approval of the Initial Site Plan with the following condition:
Revise the plan to provide additional planting area along the Rt. 29 frontage to accommodate required frontage trees free of utilities and easements. Note that this will likely require the elimination of the 8-space parking row and possibly some of the adjacent travelway.
- 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 masonry to one with a more finished appearance.
 3. Revise the building forms to establish a more cohesive appearance for the overall building.
 4. Revise the design of the north elevation to incorporate architectural detailing to relieve blankness.
 5. Revise the size of building forms and the distribution of materials and colors to create a better sense of human scale and greater coordination throughout the building.
 6. Revise the color of the ACM to a more muted, earth tone color.
 7. Revise the architectural drawings to include the standard window glass note: *Visible light transmittance (VLT) shall not drop below 40%. Visible light reflectance (VLR) shall not exceed 30%. Specifications on the proposed window glass should be submitted with the application for final review.*
 8. 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.

9. Revise the site plan to provide a dumpster enclosure detail. A material that coordinates with that approved for the main building would be appropriate.
10. Add the standard mechanical equipment note to the site plan and architectural drawings: *"Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated."*
11. Revise the photometric plan to indicate that the plan was calculated using an LLF of 1.0 for all fixtures and revise the photometrics accordingly.
12. Revise the color temperature of the pole-mounted lighting to a soft, warm white (3000K).
13. Revise the lighting plan to indicate the color temperature for the under-canopy lighting. A lighting temperature of 2000K-3000K would be appropriate.
14. Revise the height of the pole-mounted fixtures to a height that does not exceed 20', including the base and indicate this on the plan.
15. Add the standard lighting note to the lighting 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."*
16. Revise the plan to provide additional planting area along the Rt. 29 frontage to accommodate required frontage trees free of utilities and easements. Note that this will likely require the elimination of the 8-space parking row and possibly some of the adjacent travelway.
17. Revise the site plan to provide a planting area along the north elevation of the building.
18. Revise the site plan to include the standard landscaping note: *"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."*
19. Revise the plan to show a pedestrian way across the frontage with the new development.
20. Add planting beds along the retaining walls to allow for trees at 2.5" caliper and shrubs at 24".
21. Revise the plan to indicate retaining wall material, color, manufacturer. A block in a muted, earth-tone color would be appropriate. Samples may be required.
22. Terrace all retaining walls over 6' in height and provide planting beds.
23. Revise the plans to correct the depth of the landscape buffer.
24. Please note separate sign applications are required for all proposed signs. The following preliminary comments are provided:
 - a. Revise the wall signs to use either face illumination or halo illumination.
 - b. Revise the sign proposed on the south elevation so that it has a more coordinated appearance. This can be done by reducing the size of the sign and/or changing the layout to a single line of text.
 - c. The background of any cabinet signs proposed will be required to have an opaque background if internally illuminated.
 - d. Include the size of the existing freestanding sign on the sign drawings. If the sign is taller than 12' and larger than 32 square feet, the proposal must include a 25% reduction in height and area until the height reaches 12' and area reaches 32 sf.
25. Provide a perspective showing the view of the north elevation from the street.
26. Consider reducing the width of the travelway on the north side to create planting area at the building.
27. Update the rendering to accurately show the scale and type of the proposed building materials.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

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

b. SE-2021-25 and -26: Stonefield Town Center Block C2-1

Location: In the Stonefield development at the northeast corner of Bond Street and District Avenue

Proposal: To increase the maximum number of stories from 5 to 7 and to transfer 73 residential units from Block E to Blocks A through D to construct a 112-unit multi-family residential building, including two stories of parking at the base.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representatives: John Beirne, Bob Pineo, Brett Buehrer

Margaret Maliszewski summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members had no questions for staff. John Beirne and Bob Pineo represented the applicant. They had no presentation and stated that staff summarized the proposal accurately. Mr. Beirne noted that the mass of the building would be broken down. ARB members had no questions for the applicants. The ARB went into discussion. Mr. Hancock stated that the request was straightforward and seemed appropriate based on the hotel proposal. Mr. Henningsen agreed with staff's recommendation. Mr. Stoner asked if the open space would be replaced or provided elsewhere. Mr. Beirne stated that the site was originally approved for commercial development; it was not intended as open space, but there is a possibility that Bond Street could be closed for special events. Mr. Missel stated that it was logical to put the density there. Mr. Van Der Werf agreed that the massing should be compatible with the surroundings and that the height was mitigated by distance from the ECs.

Motion: Mr. Henningsen moved to forward the following recommendation to the Agent for the Site Review Committee:

The ARB has no objection to the Special Exceptions requested for Stonefield Block C2-1.

Mr. Missel seconded the motion.

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

PRESENTATION

a. Rio Corridor Plan

Mr. Van Der Werf stated that the presentation would be postponed until a future meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. Hollymead Town Center: Comprehensive Sign Plan

Staff asked the ARB if they would like to eliminate review of wall signs for Buildings C, D, E and F in the Hollymead Town Center Area B, because the visibility of those building from Rt. 29 is very limited. Members noted the reduced visibility but were concerned that removing the limitations of the approved Comprehensive Sign Plan would result in sign designs that have greater visibility, so the Board did not move to make the change.

b. EC Guidelines Discussion: Discussion

Mr. Henningsen presented his work on the Greenwood section of the Rt. 250 West corridor. He noted the National Register nomination for the Greenwood-Afton Rural Historic District as a good resource for the task. He said that maintaining the rural historic character will be important and site layout and landscaping will be priorities along this segment of the corridor. ARB members discussed the work. Mr. Missel noted that distant views shouldn't be forgotten. Mr. Stoner suggested that the format of the document might

change for corridors with few structures. Mr. Van Der Werf said that the evidence might suggest that structures in this segment shouldn't be visible from the street. Mr. Stoner suggested that the one-pager be reoriented with a focus on an image of a single building/property, and all relevant information about that resource be included on that single page to help reduce redundancy. Mr. Van Der Werf asked if staff would be able to begin compiling the Greenwood segment information into the one-pager format and noted that members should continue compiling information on the other segments.

c. Minutes Approval: July 6, 2021

Motion: Mr. Hancock moved for approval of the minutes from the July 6, 2021, ARB meeting.

Mr. Missel seconded the motion.

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

d. Next ARB Meeting: August 16, 2021, 1:00 PM – VIRTUAL MEETING

Mr. Stoner stated that he would not attend the August 16 meeting and Mr. Missel stated that he would probably not be able to attend the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:18 p.m. to the next Virtual ARB meeting on Monday, August 16, 2021 at 1:00 p.m.