County of Albemarle
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT/PLANNING

Architectural Review Board
mmaliszewski@albemarle.org
434-296-5832 ext. 3276

DRAFT ARB ACTION MEMO / MINUTES

Date: December 18, 2023
Time: 1:00 PM
Meeting Room: Lane Auditorium
Members:
Chris Henningsen, Chair: Absent
Frank Hancock, Vice-Chair: Present
Frank Stoner: Present
Dade Van Der Werf: Present
Taro Matsuno: Absent
Staff:
Mariah Gleason
Khris Taggart

CALL TO ORDER: Mr. Hancock called the meeting to order at 1:01 p.m. and established a quorum.

DISCLOSURES: Mr. Stoner disclosed that he would need to recuse himself from the Flow Hyundai discussion.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

CONSENT AGENDA:

a. **ARB2023-100: Glenbrook at Foothills Phase IV Initial Plan**

Location: South side of Three Notch'd Rd., west of 5466 Union Mission Lane

Proposal: To construct a mix of 45 single family attached and detached residential units with associated site improvements.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski
Representative: Scott Collins

Motion: Mr. Stoner moved to approve the consent agenda and forward the recommendations outlined in the staff report for the Initial Site Plan to the Agent for the Site Review Committee, as follows:

- Regarding <u>requirements</u> 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.

- Regarding <u>recommendations</u> 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. Indicate on the plan where mechanical equipment will be located.
    2. Add the standard mechanical equipment note to the plans: "Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated."
    3. Provide information on wall-mounted light fixtures with the next submittal.
    4. Revise the plan to provide landscaping along the full length of the north perimeter of the project area.
    5. Revise the plan to include trees on the north and west sides of the 7-space parking row.
    6. Include a landscape plan with the next submittal.
    7. Revise the plan to provide landscaping along the full length of the north perimeter of the project area.
    8. Provide trees between the railroad and lots 116-120.

Mr. Van Der Werf seconded the motion.
The motion was carried by a vote of 3:0. (Henningsen and Matsuno absent)

REGULAR REVIEW ITEMS

a. ARB2023-101: Hyundai Initial Site Plan

Location: On the west side of Rt. 29, approximately 1280' south of the Rt. 29/Hilton Heights Rd. intersection.

Proposal: To establish a Hyundai auto dealership consisting of two showrooms with service bays; a carwash; storage, display, customer and employee parking; and associated site improvements on approximately 5.72 acres.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart
Representative: Kevin Schafer, Justin Shimp

Mr. Stoner recused himself from the discussion. (His firm has been hired by Flow to manage Flow's new construction projects.)

Khris Taggart gave a Power Point presentation summarizing the staff report and confirmed that the architecture for the car wash and the building fronting Berkmar were not being reviewed because they were not expected to be visible from the EC street. Mr. Van Der Werf noted that Berkmar Dr. is not an Entrance Corridor. Kevin Schafer, with Design Develop, represented the applicant and summarized the project, describing the layout and architecture and explaining its appropriateness for the corridor. Justin Shimp, with Shimp Engineering, addressed the Board, noting that the requested planting along Rt. 29 could be accommodated, but adding trees along the north and south perimeters would be too difficult. He said that he planned to resubmit, incorporating Board suggestions into a revised plan. Mr. Schafer discussed the architecture in more detail, noting the comments about the top-heavy appearance and the possibility of reducing the extent of the overhang. Mr. Van Der Werf asked about the quantity of trees to be added and requirements for calculating the number of display spaces. Mr. Taggart responded that the discrepancy in parking numbers made it difficult to calculate the number of required trees. Mr. Van Der Werf noted that it is good to consider the top-heavy character and the scale of the fascia, but this trademark design is especially detached from the architecture of the area because it is not grounded. He also said that the massing and "carving" of the fascia are hard to understand. He added that the Malloy site successfully used island trees to meet some landscape requirements.

Mr. Hancock noted that the landscape priority is the Rt. 29 frontage. He questioned the impact of adding perimeter trees and suggested "beefing up" the islands at the Rt. 29 end of the perimeters. He noted that

some of the precedent images in the submittal use additional elements, columns, grilles, louvers, etc., to mitigate the impact of the fascia. He said that the step down in the fascia makes the building look off-balance and top-heavy. Mr. Van Der Werf noted that the solar screen in the precedent images adds texture, and the examples with fascias of shallower depth looked more appropriate. He suggested the addition of an element at the side to connect the eroded fascia to the ground, possibly using a change in material, i.e., masonry.

Motion:
Mr. Van Der Werf moved to 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:
  - Staff does not recommend approval of the site plan at this time. Prior to initial plan approval, the following items shall be resolved to the satisfaction of the ARB:
    1. Increase the depth of the planting area along the EC frontage to accommodate the required large shade trees free of utility/easement conflicts.
    2. Add planting areas and trees to meet perimeter parking requirements.
    3. Increase the number of interior trees in the parking areas near Building A.
    4. It is strongly recommended that the Special Use Permit application for outdoor storage, display, and sales be submitted prior to resubmitting the initial plan, and that the SP concept plan include additional measures for mitigating the visual impacts of the storage, display, and sales. If not, remove all labels associated with the outdoor storage, display, and sales use.

- 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 and an approved Special Use Permit for outdoor storage, display, and sales are 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 reduce the top-heavy appearance of the fascia and incorporate more traditional elements and proportions.
    2. Revise the architectural drawings to note where the Pueblo Tan ACM panels are proposed.
    3. Provide material samples with the next submittal.
    4. Revise the architectural drawings to include the standard window glass note: Visible light transmittance (VLT) shall not drop below 40%. Visible light reflectance (VLR).
    5. Show the outlines of roof-mounted equipment on the architectural elevations and show the footprints on the roof plan.
    6. Include the standard mechanical equipment note on the architectural plans: Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated.
    7. Provide a lighting plan with the next submittal. Limit all fixtures to full cutoff styles to minimize visual impacts of the development on the EC street.
    8. Provide a complete landscaping plan with the next submittal.
    9. Increase the depth of the planting area along the EC frontage to accommodate the required large shade trees free of utility/easement conflicts.
    10. Increase the depth of the planting area along the perimeters of the parking areas to allow for large trees, 40’ on center and 2½” caliper at time of planting.
    11. Revise the parking schedule to match the number of spaces shown on the site plan.
    12. Increase the number of interior trees in the parking areas near Building A.
    13. Provide a complete landscape plan for review in the next submittal.

14. Include the standard plant health note on the landscape plan in the next submittal: 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.
15. Sign applications are required for all proposed signs.

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.
The motion was carried by a vote of 2:0. (Henningsen and Matsuno absent; Stoner recused)

WORK SESSION

a. Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines Addenda: Route 631 Old Lynchburg Road and 5th Street
Staff: Mariah Gleason

Mariah Gleason presented a brief overview of the Rt. 631 addenda. The ARB members commented on the images (add one of the County Office Building property), the characteristics listed for the segments including un-relegated parking, the zoning of properties along the segment, the visibility of some properties from the street, and the allowable height of buildings in the commercial districts.

b. **Personal Wireless Service Facilities Ordinance Discussion**
Staff: Margaret Maliszewski

The ARB discussed the proposed ordinance changes, including the proposed increased height, denial criteria, the ordinance amendment process, and board vs. staff review. They acknowledged that the proposals are very site specific and wanted the members missing from the meeting to provide input. Neil Williamson, of the Free Enterprise Forum, asked the ARB to consider the larger picture, noting that the proposed changes would reduce the number of towers, which would mean less visual clutter. He said the taller facilities work better and the ECs are where they are needed for safety. The Board discussed the facilities in comparison to electric power lines and critical infrastructure. They noted that some level of administrative approval should be allowed.

The ARB agreed on the following points, and suggested that a final recommendation could be made at the next meeting when the missing ARB members will be present.

1. The increase from 10' to 30' could cause negative visual impact on the ECs.
2. The ordinance should provide greater clarity on when staff can deny an application based on visual impact.
3. Visual impacts on the ECs will be multiplied (height increase, elimination of limits on standoff, equipment sizes, changes to existing towers, etc.).
4. There is still a need for ARB review in a public meeting for sites in the ECs.
5. Options include:
    a. Leave existing regulations in place in the ECs.
    b. Allow some level of administrative review/approval in the ECs, based on specific criteria; for example, facilities that are not skylit can be reviewed/approved administratively.
    c. Require balloon tests <u>and</u> photo-simulations for new proposals and amendments to existing facilities in the ECs.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. Minutes Approval:

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved for approval of the minutes from the December 4, 2023, ARB meeting.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 3:0. (Henningsen and Matsuno absent)

b. Other items from staff or ARB members: None.

c. Next ARB Meeting: Tuesday, January 2, 2024, 1:00 PM – Lane Auditorium

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:19 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on **TUESDAY**, January 2, 2024, at 1:00 p.m.