



FINAL ARB ACTION MEMO/MINUTES

Date: November 15, 2021

Time: 1:00 PM

Meeting Room: Virtual Meeting

Members:

Frank Stoner: Present
Frank Hancock: Present
Fred Missel, Vice-Chair: Present
Chris Henningsen: Arrived a few minutes late
Dade Van Der Werf, Chair: Present

Staff:

Margaret Maliszewski
Khris Taggart
Carolyn Schaffer

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 the review of ARB-2021-130: Stonefield D1.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

CONSENT AGENDA: None.

Mr. Henningsen joined the meeting at approximately 1:05.

Regular Review Items

a. ARB-2021-110: Greenbrier Wawa

Location: 1215 Seminole Trail

Proposal: Construct a convenience store and service station with fuel pump canopy, underground storage tanks and associated site improvements.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representative: Mark Fontaine, Ryan Perkins

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

Ryan Perkins with Kimley Horn attended the meeting by phone and represented the applicant. He stated that several other representatives of the project were also in attendance with him. He stated that he had no pushback on any of the comments listed in the staff report but noted that moving the fire hydrant was an issue and they would prefer to treat it with landscaping. ARB members had no questions for the applicant.

The ARB members discussed the proposal. Mr. Stoner said that the proposal was consistent with the guidelines and previous approvals. Mr. Missel noted that grasses could effectively screen the hydrant. Mr. Hancock noted the nice plan and Mr. Henningsen noted the applicant's willingness to work with staff on the listed comments. Mr. Van Der Werf concurred and asked staff to share the list of recommendations. Ms. Maliszewski noted a proposed revision to the recommendations regarding the fire hydrant, based on the discussion.

Motion: Mr. Missel moved for approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for ARB2021-110: Greenbrier Wawa with the conditions listed in the staff report, amended as follows:

1. Add landscaping to provide more complete screening/integration of the fire hydrant and water meter.
2. Revise the photometric plan using an LLF of 1.0 for all fixtures.
3. Revise the finish for the parking lot lights (poles and fixtures) to bronze.
4. Add a street tree along Greenbrier west of the monument sign and add shrubs between Greenbrier and the 8-space parking row.
5. Add landscaping between the Greenbrier sidewalk and the new path connecting the sidewalk to the parking lot to compensate for the lack of trees in other required locations.
6. Provide additional low-level planting along the Rt. 29 and Greenbrier frontages to offset visual impacts, compensate for smaller trees and help establish an overall coordinated landscape.
7. Revise the Luminaire Location Summary to correspond to the 22' 11" maximum canopy height and make other corresponding corrections as necessary, while maintaining a maximum of 30 fc under the canopy.
8. Revise the photometric plan using an LLF of 1.0 for all fixtures. Reduce the illumination under the fuel pump canopy to a maximum of 30 fc.
9. Revise the landscape plan to integrate the monument signs more fully into the landscape.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

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

b. ARB-2021-117: Overlook Hotel at Pantops

Location: The south side of Rt. 250 East approximately 20' west of the Hansen Rd./Rt. 250 Intersection

Proposal: To construct a four-story hotel in addition to associated site improvements.

Staff Contact: Khrist Taggart

Representative: Kevin Schafer

Khris Taggart summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Missel asked for clarification on the landscape easements. Mr. Van Der werf asked if the retaining wall near the bank was existing or new (new). Justin Shimp and Kevin Schafer represented the applicant. Mr. Schafer discussed the proposed architecture, noting that the design was intended to address the context and present a cohesive appearance; he summarized the building materials and colors, noted the side towers as unique forms in scale with the building, and said that the building would be visible only for a limited time. Mr. Shimp stated that the stepback was meant for pedestrian orientation and he addressed landscape issues.

Mr. Missel asked how the proposal demonstrated sensitivity to the existing natural landscape and how it contributed to an organized development plan. The applicants noted the terraced retaining walls and the limitations of the site. Mr. Stoner asked if the retaining wall color was accurately represented in the renderings. Mr. Schafer responded that it was, and that the block is Anchor Diamond Pro in “James River” color. Mr. Stoner asked for clarification on the material of the monument wall panel (siding). Mr. Hancock asked if the applicant looked at the possibility of adding trees between the retaining walls. Mr. Shimp noted that trees were added at the base of some walls, that shrubs between the walls were revised to evergreens, and that trees could be added along the street, west of the entrance. He confirmed that an off-site grading easement would be required, but both parcels are under the same ownership. Mr. Van Der Werf asked how the building orientation guideline was being met, said that it was technically feasible to use the building as a retaining wall, and asked about parking under the building. Mr. Shimp noted that the hotel use required windows on the east elevation and said that putting the parking under the building wouldn’t change the layout much.

The ARB discussed the proposal. Mr. Hancock said that the tower elements were not successful as “fronts” and noted that the west elevation will have a high level of visibility. He wondered if a partial solution could be a landscape easement on the adjacent parcel and he suggested that the building could move closer to the street. Mr. Henningsen said he echoed Mr. Hancock’s comments, that what is intended as the front is really the side and the tower elements need more attention – they need to be more distinctive. He said the large expanse of siding is making the building look bigger; a coarser grained material is needed to break up the mass. He said the siting of the building was logical. Mr. Missel agreed with the preceding comments. He said the use was appropriate, but the associated building size and parking requirement were not appropriate for this site. He said the setback and oblique angle may help mitigate appearances, and more impacts need more landscaping. Mr. Van Der Werf asked staff to share the list of recommendations. Ms. Maliszewski noted a proposed revision to the recommendations regarding landscaping near the bank, based on the discussion.

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

- Regarding the Special Exception Request:
 - The ARB does not recommend approval of eliminating the stepback requirement; however, an alternate architectural design that does not include a stepback but establishes a cohesive overall appearance for the building can be considered.
- 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:
 - Resolve the development issues arising from the tree conservation and landscaping easements on the subject property.
- Regarding recommendations on the plan as it relates to the guidelines: None.
- Regarding conditions to be satisfied prior to issuance of a grading permit:
 - Maintain grading outside the driplines of trees to remain. Show tree protection fencing on, and coordinated throughout, the grading, landscaping, and erosion and sediment control plans.
- 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 make the northern tower address the EC street and possibly further conceal the eastern retaining walls. Adjust the placement, height, materials and detailing of the tower elements to achieve a more cohesive overall appearance for the building.
 2. Revise the architectural drawings to include the standard window glass note.
 3. Revise the installation of the PTACs to allow for flush mounting with the exterior wall.
 4. Include a note on the lighting plan indicating that the 20' maximum height of the pole-mounted light fixtures includes any base.
 5. Revise the landscape plan to provide additional plantings along the base of the retaining walls visible from the EC to achieve a more appropriate appearance.
 6. Revise the landscape plan to provide adequate planting area between the retaining wall and the walkway along the 12-space parking row. Provide medium trees, 2½ caliper at planting, at 25' on center, in this planting area.
 7. Revise the site plan to include the height of the retaining wall located just east of the site entrance.
 8. Provide large perimeter parking lot trees, 2½" caliper at planting, at 40' on center.
 9. Revise the landscape plan to provide 4 additional trees to meet the interior parking area landscaping requirements.
 10. Revise the landscape plan to provide trees along the front of the building.
 11. Consider increasing the variety of evergreen shrubs for increased plant health.
 12. Show existing landscaping on the existing conditions plan. Identify landscaping to be removed.
 13. Provide landscaping to compensate for removed landscaping required to mitigate visual impacts of the bank site.
 14. Show existing wooded area on the existing conditions plan.
 15. Revise the landscape plan to mitigate the visual impacts of the terraced retaining walls.
 16. Indicate retaining wall material(s) and color(s) on the plan. A physical sample may be necessary for review.
 17. Revise the landscape plan to provide medium trees and shrubs at the base of the retaining wall along the 12-space parking row.
 18. Revise the landscape schedule to accurately reflect proposed species and quantities.
 19. Maintain all landscaping and retaining walls on site or provide off-site landscape, grading, and construction easements.
 20. Provide a perspective view that shows the retaining wall east of the site entrance with those at the north end of the building.

21. Add trees at the base of the lowest retaining wall on the west side of the site where planting area is available.
22. Revise the site plan to include details on the guardrails for the retaining walls. Standard utilitarian guardrails will not be appropriate.
23. Show existing trees on the existing conditions plan.
24. Show areas designated for preservation, if any, on the site plan. Maintain grading outside the driplines of trees to remain. Show tree protection fencing on, and coordinated throughout, the grading, landscaping, and erosion and sediment control plans.
25. Please note separate sign applications are required for all proposed signs. Provide with the sign applications physical samples of the colors proposed for the signs.
26. Revise landscape plan to match the previously approved landscaping in the landscape easement adjacent to the bank.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

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

c. ARB-2021-118 RST Residences

Location: East side of Rt. 29, north of Ashwood Blvd. (See Figures 1 and 2)

Proposal: To construct a residential development with approximately 254 apartments in 4 buildings and 78 townhouses in 6 blocks, with associated site improvements.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representative: Ryan Yauger

Margaret Maliszewski summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Missel asked if the EC buffer was comprised of new trees (yes). Mr. Van Der Werf asked if the buildings closest to the EC had the same heights and finished floor elevations (yes). He also asked if the parking lot in the southwest part of the site met the EC planting requirements (yes regarding quantity of interior trees; no to perimeter trees and planting size). Ryan Yauger represented the applicant and said that they agreed with most of the comments listed in the report. He noted the landscape issues and said that trees in the new buffer could be redistributed to address comments. Mr. Missel asked for clarification on the cemetery and VDOT land and expressed concern about the potential appearance if trees on the VDOT parcel were removed. Mr. Hancock asked if planting on Rt. 29 was in the right-of-way (street trees, yes). Mr. Van Der Werf asked about the possibility of adding trees on the north side of Ridgewood Drive. The applicant said that the cemetery is a separate parcel under the control of the applicant. Mr. Van Der Werf asked if there were elevators in each building (yes).

The ARB discussed the proposal. Mr. Hancock said he appreciated the extensive landscaping and its similarity to Brookhill. He asked about the location of some of the perspective views (generally, the cemetery location). Mr. Henningsen appreciated the tree buffer and said more perspectives would be helpful, particularly at the approach into the development. He said he was not opposed to flexibility regarding tree caliper. Mr. Stoner said it was a nice plan and he also appreciated the buffer but noted that the planting was sparse in other parts of the development. He said he wouldn't mind some redistribution of trees. He said that 1½" caliper for street trees is small, but given the volume of the buffer, it was an acceptable compromise. He had no issue with the architecture given the proximity to the corridor. Mr. Missel agreed with much of the previous comment. He said that areas could be prioritized for larger trees and agreed that some parts of

the development appeared barren, and trees could be added to the tot lot to offset potential future changes to the VDOT-owned lot. Mr. Van Der Werf asked if plants could be added to the “wedge” east of the VDOT parcel and said that the white frames could be used to organize the western elevations. Mr. Van Der Werf asked staff to share the list of recommendations. Ms. Maliszewski noted a proposed addition to the recommendations to address the issue of trees to be added to the “wedge” east of the VDOT parcel and the area along the north side of Ridgewood Drive.

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 Site Development Plan.
- Regarding recommendations on the plan as it relates to the guidelines:
 1. Consider a more muted color substitute for the white fiber cement.
 2. Consider adding trees along Travelway B and Private Road C.
- Regarding conditions to be satisfied prior to issuance of a grading permit:
 1. Maintain grading outside the driplines of trees to remain. Show tree protection fencing on, and coordinated throughout, the grading, landscaping, and erosion and sediment control plans.
- 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. Consider revising the west elevations of Buildings 3 and 4 so that these EC-facing elevations have the appearance of primary elevations.
 2. Provide material/color samples for review.
 3. Consider a more muted color substitute for the white fiber cement.
 4. Provide perspective views of the apartment buildings.
 5. Provide a detail for the cemetery fence in the site plan. Chain link fence is not appropriate.
 6. Add the standard mechanical equipment note to the plan: “Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated.”
 7. Revise the lighting plan to eliminate spillover in excess of .5 fc.
 8. Revise the lighting plan to include details on light fixture type and style.
 9. Revise the lighting plan to include information on light fixture color temperature. Warm white light is appropriate.
 10. Revise the lighting plan to include information on light fixture color/finish.
 11. Revise the lighting plan to include proposed pole heights, with a maximum not to exceed 20’.
 12. Revise the lighting plan to include wall-mounted lights.
 13. 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.”
 14. Provide a complete row of street trees along the Rt. 29 frontage. (Fill the gap near the cemetery.)

15. Resolve the cable line/tree conflict along the frontage while maintaining an organized planting pattern.
16. Provide the frontage street trees at 3½" caliper.
17. Consider adding trees along Travelway B and Private Road C.
18. Add perimeter trees (2½" caliper, 40' on center) along the east, west and south sides of the large parking lot.
19. Increase the planting size of interior parking lot trees to 2½" caliper.
20. Consider adding trees along the west elevation of Building 1.
21. 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."
22. Revise grading to provide rounded contours in the vicinity of the new entrance from Rt. 29.
23. Resolve the conflict between grading and drip line of trees to remain in the vicinity of the cemetery and Rt. 29.
24. Maintain grading outside the driplines of trees to remain. Show tree protection fencing on, and coordinated throughout, the grading, landscaping, and erosion and sediment control plans.
25. Add plants in the wedge located east of the VDOT parcel, and north of Ridgewood Drive.

Mr. Missel seconded the motion.

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

Other Business

a. ARB-2021-96: Umansky Subaru

Khris Taggart made a PowerPoint presentation to summarize the issue before the Board – the reintroduction of the blue fascia. Mr. Van Der Werf noted that he thought the full Board should have a chance to weigh in on the issue because it had previously been a specific item of discussion. The other Board members were not concerned about the reintroduction of the blue trim. It was noted as a "subtle detail" and other improvements had been made.

Motion: Mr. Henningsen moved for approval of reintroducing the blue fascia into the architectural design as shown in the drawings presented at the meeting.

Mr. Missel seconded the motion.

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

Mr. Hancock left the meeting.

b. Stonefield D1 Amendment

Margaret Maliszewski summarized the request in a PowerPoint presentation, noting the various proposed color changes. Mr. Stoner asked for clarification about the cornice color (not yet chosen but would fall within a specified range). Alan Wong represented the applicant and provided some background on the proposal. Mr. Van Der Werf noted his primary concern as the change from gray to white for the large bay on the east elevation. Mr. Wong noted that other changes that were made compensated and sufficiently broke up the length of the building.

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved for approval of the revised colors as illustrated in the drawings presented in the meeting.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0. (Hancock recused)

c. Minutes Approval: October 18, 2021

Motion: Mr. Missel moved for approval of the minutes from the October 18, 2021, ARB meeting.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

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

d. Next ARB Meeting: Monday, December 6, 2021, 1:00 PM – VIRTUAL MEETING

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:13 p.m. to the next Virtual ARB meeting on Monday, December 6, 2021 at 1:00 p.m.