



FINAL ARB ACTION MEMO MINUTES

Date: August 15, 2022

Time: 1:00 PM

Meeting Room: Virtual Meeting

Members:

Chris Henningsen, Chair: Present
Frank Hancock, Vice-Chair: Present
Frank Stoner: Present
Dade Van Der Werf: Present
Taro Matsuno: Present

Staff:

Margaret Maliszewski
Khris Taggart
Carolyn Shaffer

Attendees:

Jeff Lape, Joe Wrege, Jason Loucks, Nathalie Slobudiuk, Neil Williamson

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Henningsen called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

DISCLOSURES: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

Consent Agenda:

a. ARB-2022-70: Maplewood Development

Location: At the southwest corner of Proffit Rd. and Worth Crossing

Proposal: To construct 72 multi-family residential units in six buildings with associated site improvements.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved to approve the consent agenda for ARB-2022-70: Maplewood Development 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:
 - 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 architectural, landscape and lighting plans for review.
 2. Indicate locations and heights of building-mounted equipment. Show how visibility of the equipment will be eliminated from the Entrance Corridor.
 3. Include the standard mechanical equipment visibility note on the architectural plans: Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated.”

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

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

Regular Review Items

a. ARB-2022-66: Rio Point Final Site Plan

Location: 878 Rio Road E

Proposal: To construct a residential development consisting of apartment buildings, townhomes and associated improvements.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representative: Jeff Lape, Kline Design

Khris Taggart gave a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the staff report. ARB members asked questions about the reference to “extra parking spaces” (the proposed number of spaces does not exceed the required number), the required elements and number of spaces for the trailhead park (applicant will address), the stormwater facility in the planting buffer (yes, it is within the buffer). The applicants reviewed their proposal for the ARB, noting that 12 parking spaces are required for the trailhead park, so 2 can be eliminated; that the paved area of the park can be reduced; that the color of the metal accent roof is not intended to be yellow. ARB members asked questions and clarified that the intent of the trailhead park is primarily to provide parking; more diversity is recommended at the ends of the buildings; invest in the appearance of the buildings as viewed from the EC – increase articulation; consider adding gables to the end elevations; add windows to the townhome end elevations. Mr. Matsuno noted concerns about materials and planning. Mr. Hancock agreed with the staff report comments and acknowledged that the design is evolving, so another review will be needed. He noted that the side elevations of the townhomes will have an impact on the EC, that the white siding should be reduced and the windows should be increased. He said that the landscape plan should show all plant locations. Mr. Van Der Werf agreed that a revised submittal should be reviewed and that perspectives with and without trees would be helpful. Mr. Henningsen noted that more parking

in the trailhead parking lot would be more of an amenity as long as it has an appropriate appearance from the EC.

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

1. Revise the white used in the building designs to color(s) that are more muted in nature.
2. Revise the east and west sides of Buildings B and D and the north side of the townhomes to increase diversity in architectural character, materials, and colors. Possibilities include, but are not limited to, increasing the height of the stone veneer at the base of the elevations and adding more variation in colors.
3. Revise the color of the accent standing seam metal roofs on Buildings 8 and 9 to one that is more coordinated with the overall architectural design.
4. Provide perspectives from the Parkway with and without landscaping and with and without the future building.
5. Provide samples for all materials and colors.
6. Revise the architectural drawings to provide specs on proposed window glass that meet the design criteria as follows: Visible light transmittance (VLT) shall not drop below 40%. Visible light reflectance (VLR) shall not exceed 30%.
7. Add the standard mechanical equipment note to the architectural drawings: "Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated."
8. Revise the photometric plan to eliminate the spillover above ½ footcandle.
9. Revise the pedestrian light fixtures to ones that emit less than 3000 lumens or to fixtures that are full cutoff.
10. Revise the lighting plan to note in the schedule the light loss factor and maximum footcandles for the site. A LLF of at least 1.0 is required and lighting levels that do not exceed 20 footcandles would be appropriate.
11. Revise the schedule and cutsheets to provide information on the fixture colors and color temperatures for the area light and pedestrian light fixtures.
12. Revise the schedule and cutsheet for the bollard light fixtures to specify the same fixture.
13. Revise the lighting plan to note that the height of the pole-mounted fixtures including the base will not exceed 20'.
14. Revise the landscape plan to provide trees in the available planting areas between the buildings and sidewalks, and along the parking row associated with the trailhead park.
15. Revise the landscape plan to provide large shade trees, 40' on center, along the parking area between the clubhouse/pool area and the stormwater facility.
16. Revise the layout of the trailhead park so that the associated paved area is not the primary feature visible from the EC. Provide a park design that addresses the intersection and presents an appropriate face to the EC. More parking and less turnaround pavement would be appropriate.
17. If the path featured in the perspective view at the Rio/Parkway intersection is proposed, show it in the site plan and provide appropriate landscaping. Coordinate the perspective views with the proposed site layout.
18. Revise the site plan to note the specific color proposed for the retaining walls.
19. Revise the perspective to clarify the level of visibility of the retaining wall on the northeast side of Building 8.
20. Show tree protection fencing on the grading, and E&S plans.
21. Show all the buffer planting locations on the landscape plan.

WORK SESSION:

a. Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines Addenda:

Staff: Margaret Maliszewski

The ARB held a work session on the draft addenda for the Ivy East, Ivy West, and Rinehart Row segments, and the updated University segment of the Rt. 250 West Entrance Corridor. The ARB members offered comments and suggestions on the formatting of the Ivy West and East maps and captions (bigger images are better, include the maps, maybe add more images to get images and maps on two sheets, maybe use a 3-column layout, key photos to maps with small numbers/letters), the headings for the Rinehart Row segment (distinguish the “precedent images” from the caption text, maybe add an underline to clarify which images are associated with which text, grouped images under the heading works), and the method for distinguishing the boundaries of the segments on the map (highlight the segment more).

OTHER BUSINESS

a. Minutes Approval:

Motion: Mr. Hancock moved for approval of the minutes from the August 1, 2022, ARB meeting.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

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

b. Next ARB Meeting: Tuesday, September 6, 2022, 2:30 PM – Room 241, COB McIntire

Mr. Van Der Werf noted he has a conflict beginning at 3:00 and Mr. Stoner said he would not be able to attend this meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:16 p.m. to the next Virtual ARB meeting on Tuesday, September 6, 2022, at 2:30 p.m.