



DRAFT ARB ACTION MEMO / MINUTES

Date: January 2, 2024

Time: 1:00 PM

Meeting Room: Lane Auditorium

Members:

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

Staff:

Margaret Maliszewski
Khris Taggart

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

DISCLOSURES: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

CONSENT AGENDA: None.

REGULAR REVIEW ITEMS

a. ARB2023-102: Charlottesville Climbing Gym

Location: 2200 Old Ivy Road

Proposal: To expand the existing building to accommodate an indoor climbing gym.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representative: Robert Nichols

Margaret Maliszewski gave a Power Point presentation summarizing the staff report. ARB members asked about the location of existing vegetation (partially on site and partially off) and about the elevation from which the perspectives were taken. Robert Nicholson, architect, represented the project and introduced Mike Kinnick, tenant. He discussed the site section, perspective drawing and vegetation, stated that the landscape plan was being developed and that he anticipated a need for additional planting. He asked about the site plan process (site plan submittals made after ARB approval will be reviewed for conformity with ARB approvals). He stated that the exoskeleton provides a layer and depth where there is no fenestration. ARB members asked about the galvanized steel and the applicant stated that a painted finish could be considered. Mr. Nichols stated that the surface behind the exoskeleton will have the same finish as the walls below (painted stucco). The ARB discussed the rooftop equipment and the mechanical screen. The applicant indicated that the equipment had not yet been sized. Mr. Matsuno clarified that eliminating visibility of equipment is a priority. The ARB members discussed the visibility of the existing building and the relationship between the existing and new designs, noting that greater integration would

be needed if visibility was greater. Members discuss the galvanized steel, questioning whether it would have an appropriate appearance for the EC and noting that samples would be needed.

Motion: Mr. Matsuno moved to recommend No Objection to the request for the Special Use Permit and to provide the applicant with the comments listed in the staff report, amended as follows, to be addressed with the next submittal:

1. Provide specifications showing that the window glass guideline will be met.
2. Provide building elevations with equipment locations and heights. Show how visibility will be eliminated.
3. Add the mechanical equipment note to the architectural and site plans: *Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated.*
4. Provide lighting information with the next submittal. Full cutoff styles are recommended for all fixtures.
5. Add the standard plant health note to the landscape 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.*
6. Show tree protection fencing on the plan.
7. Material samples will be needed to determine if galvanized steel and perforated screening are appropriate.
8. Confirm the level of landscape screening that exists on site. Show screening equivalent to the existing condition.
9. Provide a site section that includes the full width of the EC street.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

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

b. ARB2023-104: Maplewood Final

Location: At the Southwest corner of Proffit Road and Worth Crossing

Proposal: To construct 70 multi-family residential units in six buildings with associated site improvements.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representative: Chuck Rapp

Khris Taggart summarized the staff report in a Power Point presentation. Mr. Van Der Werf confirmed that grading drops away from the EC side of the site. Chuck Rapp, with Collins Engineering, represented the applicant, noting that his team was working on moving the retaining wall located near the western property line and adding evergreens and shrubs. The Board members asked about the context of the site and discussed potential visibility, particularly regarding the west end elevation of Building 6. A representative of Riverbend Development said that some changes could be made to that elevation to relieve blankness. The ARB confirmed that the trees shown on the plan would be in addition to the trees already in place along Walgreen's border.

Motion: Mr. Stoner moved for approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for ARB2023-104: Maplewood Final Site Plan with the conditions listed in the staff report, amended as follows:

1. Revise the architectural drawings to note that adjacent townhomes will not use the same siding color.
2. Revise the architectural drawings to include a note stating that the design shown for Building #6 is what will be used for the overall development.
3. Revise the drawings to provide specs on the proposed window glass that meet the design criteria.

4. Revise the 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.
5. If building-mounted equipment is proposed, indicate locations and heights. Show how visibility of the equipment will be eliminated from the Entrance Corridor.
6. Revise the site plan Legend to include the HVAC units.
7. Move the mechanical equipment note from sheet 4 to the cover sheet of the architectural drawings, revise "road" to "entrance corridor" and clarify that the note applies to the overall development.
8. Revise the light fixture information on sheet 6 of the site plan to specify a color temperature between 2000K and 3000K.
9. Revise the site plan to show a consistent 6' minimum landscape buffer along the western property line.
10. Adjust the locations of trees along the western property line as necessary to avoid conflicts with trees on the adjacent parcels.
11. Add the retaining wall to the landscape plan.
12. Revise the landscape plan to replace the Acer Saccharum with a tree species from the approved plant list.
13. Revise the landscape plan to show a mix of deciduous and evergreen trees and shrubs in the landscape buffers.
14. Revise the landscape plan to include the standard plant health 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.
15. Further develop elevation G of Building 6 for more order in the windows and more articulation to reduce blankness or show that the elevation won't be visible from the EC street (possibly with additional screening).

Mr. Matsuno seconded the motion.

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

OTHER BUSINESS

a. Minutes Approval:

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved for approval of the minutes from the December 18, 2023, ARB meeting.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

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

b. Other items from staff or ARB members:

Personal Wireless Services Facilities continued discussion

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved to forward the recommendations as discussed and amended during the meeting, as follows:

1. The proposed changes could result in negative visual impacts that are inconsistent with the purpose of the Entrance Corridors, namely, orderly and attractive development that reflects the traditional architecture of the area. This includes the increase in pole height from 10' to 30', the elimination of limits on standoff, and changes to equipment sizes. These changes could increase the visual impacts on the corridor.

2. The ordinance should provide for a level of administrative review and approval in the Entrance Corridors, but it should provide greater clarity on criteria to be used by staff and review bodies for both approval and denial of applications based on visual impact.
3. There is still a need for ARB review of PWSFs in the Entrance Corridors. Submittal requirements should include balloon tests and photo-simulations. Maintaining existing regulations in the Entrance Corridor overlay is recommended.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

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

Annual Meeting

It was the consensus of the ARB that the annual meeting items should be moved to the January 16, 2024 agenda.

c. Next ARB Meeting: Tuesday, January 16, 2024, 1:00 PM – Lane Auditorium

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:07 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Tuesday, January 16, 2024, at 1:00 p.m.