



FINAL ARB ACTION MEMO/MINUTES

Date: March 21, 2022

Time: 1:00 PM

Meeting Room: Virtual Meeting

Members:

Chris Henningsen, Chair: Present
Frank Hancock, Vice-Chair: Present
Frank Stoner: Present (arrived at 1:02 PM)
Dade Van Der Werf: Present
Taro Matsuno: Present

Staff:

Margaret Maliszewski
Khris Taggart
Carolyn Shaffer

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Henningsen called the meeting to order at 1:01 p.m. and established a quorum.

DISCLOSURES

Mr. Hancock disclosed that he would recuse himself from the Rio Point and Crozet Storage reviews because his firm prepared the site plans for those applications. Mr. Stoner stated that he would not recuse himself from the Crozet Storage review but disclosed that an agent with his firm has been helping the seller; no compensation is involved but he wanted to note the connection. Mr. Van Der Werf, Mr. Henningsen and Mr. Stoner disclosed that they had conversations with the Crozet Storage applicant. Mr. Matsuno stated that the Crozet Storage applicant asked for a meeting, but they were not able to arrange a suitable time.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

CONSENT AGENDA

a. ARB-2022-17: Rio Point Initial Site Plan

Location: 878 E. Rio Road

Proposal: To construct 327 multi-family and single-family dwelling units in apartment buildings and attached townhouses with associated site improvements.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representative: Craig Kotarski

Mr. Hancock recused himself from the item.

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved to approve the consent agenda for ARB-2022-17 Rio Point 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 Plan with the following condition:
 1. Move the stormwater facility located north of Buildings 8 and 9 out of the landscape buffer and to a location that will not have a negative visual impact on the EC.
- Regarding recommendations on the plan as it relates to the guidelines: None.
- 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. Include architectural designs with the next submittal.
 - a. Include all items on the ARB submittal requirements checklist.
 - b. Address the “building architecture” requirements of the approved Application Plan.
 - c. Indicate how the 8/19/19 ARB architectural comments have been addressed.
 - d. Provides specs on proposed window glass with the architectural designs.
 - e. Add the standard mechanical equipment note to the architectural drawings: “Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated.”
 2. Provide a complete lighting plan with the next submittal.
 - a. Include the standard lighting note on 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. Provide a landscape plan with the next submittal.
 - a. Include all items on the ARB submittal requirements checklist.
 - b. Include the park design.
 - c. Include all items necessary to meet the ARB’s 9/3/2019 landscaping comments.
 - d. Provide a naturalistic configuration of street trees along the Parkway, with a quantity and density equivalent to the standard EC frontage planting requirements.
 - e. Provide landscape screening west of Building 9 to mitigate visual impacts of lighting.
 - f. Move the stormwater facility located north of Buildings 8 and 9 out of the landscape buffer and to a location that will not have a negative visual impact on the EC.
 - g. Include the designs of the trailhead park and the northwest amenity area in a landscape plan as part of the next submittal.
 4. Include bottom-of-wall and top-of-wall elevations, and materials and colors for all retaining walls. Provide information to clarify the appearance of the retaining wall on the northeast side of Building 8.

5. Consistently show existing trees/tree lines and new tree lines on the plans.
6. Show tree protection fencing on the grading, landscaping and E&S plans.
7. Note that demolition permits are required prior to demolition and the Albemarle County Historic Preservation Committee policy is to seek property owner permission to document historic properties before they are demolished.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

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

Regular Review Items

- a. **ARB-2022-13: Shoppers World Retail Building CSP Revisions/Reines & Rogers Sign**

Location: 220 Twenty-ninth Place Court

Proposal: To revise some of the criteria of an approved Comprehensive Sign Plan (CSP) to allow the installation of two internally illuminated wall signs with black faces and white illumination at night.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representative: Beth Robinson

Margaret Maliszewski gave a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the staff report. Mr. Hancock asked if staff spoke with the applicant about staff's additions to the CSP (no-the additions were just clarifications of previous approved criteria). Beth Robinson (Hightech Signs) represented the applicant. She noted that the fascia where the jewelry signs would be installed is a different color than the fascia for other signs on the building, and black letters will contrast better with the lighter wall color. Mr. Matsuno asked the applicant if she was OK with staff's changes to the CSP (yes, she was). Mr. Van Der Werf noted that it was a good proposal and he appreciated staff's additions.

Regarding the Comprehensive Sign Plan:

Motion: Mr. Stoner moved to approve the Comprehensive Sign Plan for ARB-2022-13 Shoppers World Retail Building with the revisions as outlined in the table in the staff report.

Comprehensive Sign Criteria for the Shopper's World Retail Building

Red = Applicant's proposed additions

Blue = Staff's recommended additions.

SIGN FEATURE	DESIGN CRITERIA
SIGN TYPE	Channel Letter
LETTER FACE COLOR	White or Black (Day/Night, appearing white at night)
TRIM CAP COLOR/RETURN COLOR	Bronze or Black
RACEWAY COLOR	To match wall

ILLUMINATION	Internal. Illumination must appear white at night.
LOCATION(S)	Signs shall be located within the brick panels above the awnings or in the stucco sign bands of the tower.
LOGO/GRAPHICS DETAILS	*Graphics may use multiple colors.
*As of August 3, 2015, graphics with multiple colors may be used with channel letter signs, when the channel letter faces throughout the center are limited to a single color. Graphics shall be consistent with the Entrance Corridor Sign Guidelines.	

Mr. Van Der Werf seconded the motion.

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

Regarding the Reines & Rogers wall signs:

Motion: Mr. Stoner moved to approve the Reines & Rogers wall signs as proposed.

Mr. Van Der Werf seconded the motion.

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

b. ARB-2022-08: RST Residences

Location: East side of Rt. 29, north of Ashwood Blvd.

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: Khris Taggart

Representative: Ryan Yauger

Khris Taggart gave a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the staff report. ARB members had no questions for staff. Ryan Yauger, representing the applicant, stated that he wanted to address the colors of the west elevations, which he was willing to reconsider but wanted Board direction on, and the sizes of trees for the EC frontage and parking lots. Mr. Hancock stated that the applicants presented a nice package, that the white trim could be more muted, that maintaining the standard planting size of trees along the EC frontage is important even with the buffer, and that there is more flexibility for interior trees. He noted that the contemporary architectural style is tough to square with the guidelines, but distance, the buffer, the context and orientation are all factors. Mr. Stoner said he agreed with Mr. Hancock's comments. He said it was difficult to tell how bright the white color will be, but he agreed with the recommendation based on what he saw. He questioned the planting around the southwest parking lot. Mr. Matsuno supported the recommendation on retaining the 3 ½" caliper planting size for trees along the EC frontage and noted that he was less concerned about the interior trees. He supported the addition of vegetation around the dumpster. Mr. Van Der Werf said he agreed with the comments made by other Board members. Mr. Henningsen said he had no new comments, but did not have a problem with the white accents. Mr. Stoner asked Mr. Hancock about the comparative growth rates of trees planted at varying sizes. Mr. Hancock said that it can depend on the species, but agreed that a tree planted at a smaller size can catch up to a tree planted at a larger size. Mr. Matsuno asked about the Board members for their opinion on

the interior tree sizes. Mr. Hancock said he was open to using smaller planting sizes due to the distance from the street.

Motion: Mr. Hancock moved to approve the Final Site Plan and Architectural Review for ARB-2022-08 RST Residences with the conditions listed in the staff report, amended as follows:

1. Consider a more muted color substitute for the white fiber cement.
2. Revise the building elevation drawings to include a material and color schedule that is keyed to the sample board. Provide accurate material/color notations along the building elevations.
3. Revise the lighting plan to eliminate spillover in excess of .5 fc.
4. Revise the lighting plan to include details on wall light fixture type and style.
5. Revise the lighting plan to indicate that the plan was calculated using an LLF of 1.0 for all fixtures and revise the photometrics accordingly.
6. Revise the color temperature of the proposed lighting to indicate a warm white light with a temperature in the range of 2000K-3000K.
7. Revise the luminaire schedule to indicate the color of the pole-mounted fixtures.
8. Revise the plan to indicate the fixture heights will not exceed 20' including the base.
9. Revise the lighting plan to include fixture locations and illumination values for the wall-mounted lights.
10. Provide the frontage street trees at 3½" caliper.
11. Planting size of the exterior and interior parking lot trees may be 1½" caliper.
12. Revise the landscape plan to show shrubs, 24" at time of planting, along the south and west sides of the large parking lot.
13. Revise the landscape plan to show shrubs, 24" at time of planting, along the west side of the dumpster enclosure.
14. Show tree protection fencing on, and coordinated throughout, the grading, landscaping, and erosion and sediment control plans.

Mr. Matsuno seconded the motion.

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

c. ARB-2022-15: Crozet Self Storage

Location: 5696 Rockfish Gap Turnpike

Proposal: To construct a 90,000 sf, 3-story self-storage building with associated site improvements.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representative: Andrew Lewis

Mr. Hancock recused himself from the discussion.

Margaret Maliszewski gave a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the staff report. ARB members had no questions for staff. Andrew Lewis addressed the ARB, noting that staff covered the pertinent issues. Mr. Matsuno asked about the wall near the southwest tower (a knee wall at the patio) and the plant that was chosen for the trellises (flowering jasmine). Mr. Van Der Werf said he appreciated the revisions that had been made to the design. Mr. Stoner asked about the roof material (asphalt shingles).

James Fretwell, a member of the Brownsville community, commented on the proposal, noting his concerns about the scale of the building, the inappropriate use for the gateway location, trash, parking spaces and community engagement. Mr. Van Der Werf said he appreciated the changes that had been made, noting that the mass was reduced and the relief was increased. He said the site plan is in a much better place. Mr. Stoner said he wanted to address Mr. Fretwell's comments. He noted that the use is a by-right use, that the ARB's role is to make sure the design "checks the boxes" regarding architectural character and impact, to make sure the building is compatible with the area and the guidelines – not to determine if the use is smart or economical. He said the applicant has done an exceptionally good job with the revisions, but the color and the EIFS are worth looking at. Mr. Matsuno supported the comments about the role of the ARB and thanked the application for the revisions. He said that some additional changes could still be made. Mr. Henningsen said he agreed with his fellow Board members, that the design was an improvement in massing, that he agreed with staff's comments and that there is still room for improvement. He said the biggest issue was alleviated (the massing) and pulling the building away from Crozet Ave. was an improvement. Mr. Matsuno addressed the southwest tower, noting that the mansard melts into the roof form. He suggested that the 2nd and 3rd story windows of the southeast tower should match those at the 2nd and 3rd stories of the rest of the building.

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved to approve the Final Site Plan for ARB-2022-15 Crozet Self Storage with the conditions listed in the staff report, amended as follows:

1. Revise the roof form of the southwest tower for greater coordination throughout the building.
2. Replace some of the EIFS with masonry (brick or stone) or an alternate material (possibly clapboard) to establish a stronger tie to the historic architecture of the area. The southeastern tower and/or the first stories of the gabled bays are appropriate locations for additional masonry.
3. Provide specs on the window glass for review.
4. Add holly shrubs to wrap around the western side of the equipment at the northwest corner of the building for better screening.
5. Add the standard mechanical equipment note to the architectural drawings.
6. Revise the photometric plan using an LLF of 1.0.
7. Revise the lighting plan to use lamps with a color temperature of 3000K.
8. Revise the lighting plan to identify the color of the finish for the light fixtures and poles. Bronze is recommended.
9. Include a note on the plan stating that maximum pole fixture height is 20', including any base for the pole.
10. Extend the shrubs and ground cover planting along the Rt. 250 side of the stormwater facility.
11. Provide in the plan details, including material and color, on the design of the seat wall. A muted earth tone color is recommended.
12. Extend the shrubs and ground cover planting along the Rt. 250 side of the stormwater facility.
13. Show tree protection fencing for the wooded area to remain at the west end of the site.
14. Consider revising the wall colors to emphasize the recesses.
15. Revise the windows of the 2nd and 3rd stories of the southeast tower to match the windows at the 2nd and 3rd stories of the rest of the building.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

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

WORK SESSIONS: None

OTHER BUSINESS

a. Minutes Approval: March 7, 2022

Motion: Mr. Stoner moved for approval of the minutes from the March 7, 2022 ARB meeting.

Mr. Matsuno seconded the motion.

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

b. Next ARB Meeting: Monday, April 18, 2022, 1:00 PM – VIRTUAL MEETING

c. Other items:

- i. **Comprehensive Sign Plan (CSP) for ABC development:** Staff asked the ARB for direction regarding a Comprehensive Sign Plan for the ABC development. Mr. Henningsen noted that the development differed considerably from the shopping centers where CSPs are more typical and that it would be difficult to establish one given the variety in building forms and styles. Mr. Stoner said he agreed. It was the consensus of the ARB that a Comprehensive Sign Plan was not required for the overall ABC development.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:09 p.m. to the next virtual ARB meeting on Monday, April 18, 2022 at 1:00 p.m.