County of Albemarle
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT/PLANNING

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

DRAFT ARB ACTION MEMO / MINUTES

Date: January 16, 2024
Time: 1:00 PM
Meeting Room: Lane Auditorium
Members:
Chris Henningsen, Chair: Present
Frank Hancock, Vice-Chair: Present
Frank Stoner: Present
Dade Van Der Werf: Present
Taro Matsuno: Absent
Staff:
Margaret Maliszewski
Mariah Gleason

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Mr. Henningsen called the meeting to order at 1:07 p.m.

2. **QUORUM:** The clerk called the roll, and a quorum was established.

3. ANNUAL MEETING

a. Election of Chair
Mr. Van Der Werf nominated Mr. Henningsen as Chairperson for 2024. Mr. Stoner seconded the nomination. There were no other nominations.
Motion: The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0. (Matsuno absent)

b. Election of Vice-Chair
Mr. Van Der Werf nominated Mr. Hancock for Vice-Chair for 2024. Mr. Stoner seconded the nomination. There were no other nominations.
Motion: The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0. (Matsuno absent)

c. Adopt ARB 2024 Submittal and Meeting Schedule
Motion: Mr. Hancock moved to adopt the 2024 calendar.
Mr. Van Der Werf seconded the motion.
The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0. (Matsuno absent)

d. Adopt ARB Rules of Procedure
Motion: Mr. Hancock moved to re-adopt the Rules of Procedure without changes for 2024.
Mr. Van Der Werf seconded the motion.
The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0. (Matsuno absent)

4. **DISCLOSURES:** None.

5. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** Neil Williamson, President of the Free Enterprise Forum, addressed the ARB regarding performance standards, personal wireless facilities, the ARB's focus on visual mitigation, and the time and cost of approval processes, and suggested that the ARB provide direction on visual mitigation of personal wireless services facilities and work with staff, applicants and the BOS to develop workable performance standards to reduce the visual impacts of telecommunications facilities across the County, not just in the Entrance Corridors.

6. **CONSENT AGENDA:**

a. ARB2023-110: Old Dominion Village

Location: 1263 Parkview Drive, 5258 Three Notch'd Road
Proposal: To construct 110 dwelling units, comprised of 94 townhouses and 16 single-family detached residences, and associated site improvements on 24.06 acres.
Staff: Mariah Gleason
Representative: Tim Miller

Motion: Mr. Hancock moved to approve the consent agenda and forward the recommendations outlined in the staff report for the Old Dominion Village 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.
  1. Consider limiting townhouses located in blocks along the EC to 2 stories in height.
- 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. Provide architectural designs with future submittals. Show how shapes, scale, and materials in visible areas will relate to the local and regional contexts.
  2. Consider limiting townhouses located in blocks along the EC to 2 stories in height.
  3. Provide architectural designs for Lots 17-74, 86-93, and 106-110 or revise the plan to eliminate visibility of these lots. More robust landscaping is one option.
  4. Portions of townhouses that are visible from the corridor must demonstrate compatible, human-scaled details, designs, and features and avoid the appearance of "blankness".
  5. Provide architectural elevations for all townhouses that are visible from the EC street. Show that the elevations do not have a "back of building" appearance. Incorporate sufficient fenestration, detailing, and organization of features to achieve appropriate scale, proportion, massing, lack of blankness, etc.
  6. Demonstrate that the EC criteria for window glass is being met.
  7. If accessory structures visible from the EC are proposed, show how they will be integrated into the overall development and compatible with building designs used on the site.
  8. Indicate if the sewage pump station located west of Lot 56 will include above-ground features, and if so, show how it will be screened from view of the EC.
  9. Provide a detail for the fencing to be used around the dog park. Consider the use of board fencing and coordination with development's signage/entrance to facilitate a compatible, orderly, and attractive appearance along the corridor.
  10. Identify where refuse areas will be located. Provide sufficient details and notes to demonstrate that these features will not be visible from the EC.

DRAFT

11. Locate mechanical equipment to eliminate visibility from the EC and, on the site and architectural plans, show all equipment locations with complete details on proposed screening.
12. Include the standard mechanical equipment note on the site plan and architectural drawings: "Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated."
13. Provide a lighting plan with future submittals that satisfies all guideline requirements.
14. Provide a landscape plan with future submittals that:
    a. Complies with the requirements listed in the Code of Development,
    b. Satisfies all guideline requirements,
    c. Includes a plant list that aligns with the county's approved plant list,
    d. Shows the required street trees along interior roads free of utility conflicts,
    e. Includes the standard planting note on the site 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.", and
15. Revise the plan to include tree protection fencing details and locations on the grading, landscaping, and erosion and sediment control plans.
16. Revise the grading plan to show proposed contours that are more rounded where they meet existing conditions at the eastern boundary with TMP 56-74 and in areas along Parkview Dr.

Mr. Van Der Werf seconded the motion.
The motion was carried by a vote of 3:0:1. (Matsuno absent, Stoner abstained)

7. REGULAR REVIEW ITEMS
a. SP2023-19: Stonefield Outdoor Storage, Display and Sales

Location: Four parking spaces along the northeast elevation of the building at 1951 Swanson Dr. and six parking spaces along the southeast elevation of the building at 1954 Swanson Dr.
Proposal: To establish outdoor sales, storage and display of vehicles associated with a Tesla vehicle sales office.
Staff: Margaret Maliszewski
Representative: Steve Blaine

Staff summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members had no questions for staff. Steve Blaine represented the applicant. He had no formal presentation but offered to answer any questions. ARB members had no questions for the applicant. Mr. Van Der Werf stated that he had no objection to the proposal. The other ARB members agreed.

Motion: Mr. Stoner moved to recommend approval of SP-2023-19 Stonefield Tesla Outdoor Sales, Storage and Display with the conditions outlined in the staff report as follows:
1. Use of this site must be in general accord with the Tesla Parking Plan. To be in general accord, vehicles for sales, storage and/or display must be parked only in the spaces indicated for sales, storage and display on the Tesla Parking Plan.
2. Vehicles for sales, storage and/or display must be parked in striped parking spaces.
3. Vehicles must not be elevated anywhere on site.

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

8. **WORK SESSIONS**

a. ARB2023-107: Barnes Lumber Countywide CofA Criteria

Staff: Margaret Maliszewski

Location: 5625-5627 The Square
Proposal: To establish design criteria for future applications for development of the Barnes Lumber property under the Public Private Partnership category of Countywide Certificates of Appropriateness
Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski
Representative: Kurt Keesecker

Mr. Stoner recused himself from the conversation. Staff presented a summary of the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members asked about the location of the public plaza and recent history on this category of Countywide Certificate. Kurt Keesecker with brw architects, representing the applicant, joined the conversation. He thanked staff for guidance in this new process and the ARB for the opportunity to discuss the proposal. He noted the challenge of the long frontage along the EC (1200-1300' long, with blocks 300-500' long), with the railroad located between the EC and the development, the issue of building front vs. back, the plan for the development's incremental growth, and the planned inward focus of the development, and he noted agreement with the questions staff posed for clarity.

Mr. Henningsen asked if any comments gave him heartburn or did he think they were generally reasonable? Mr. Keesecker said the issue is generally the tension between needing detail to point to and understanding how to move forward while baking in flexibility. He said guidelines related to what can be detailed and what can be flexible for the future, without providing specifics in the documents, would be helpful. When we decide what needs to be detailed, we can work with the team to flesh out those details. The FBC elements - articulation and transparency - are based on the Rio29 code. Mr. Van Der Werf expressed appreciation for the work that went into the outline. Mr. Keesecker stated that site and architectural elements tools, exceptions, and clarifications tried to address certain unique qualities on the site. The visual connections idea is meant to reinforce the fabric of the corridor by breaking down into blocks. Mr. Keesecker said he would be happy to address any questions about motivation or approach.

Mr. Van Der Werf said that, effectively, other than view corridors and tree requirements, the proposal leaves open the extent of fencing, building setback and scale, landscaping or not in parking lots, and blankness of buildings (mural or perforated). He asked if that was a fair description of how open the armature is at this point. Mr. Keesecker said, yes, but it will be guided by zoning for massing and height, with the addition of our Form Based Code elements to address architecture without putting a specific design in place. Mr. Van Der Werf asked if there is a minimum setback proposed along the EC. Mr. Keesecker responded that there is no setback requirement against the corridor itself other than the proposed fence zone, which needs more attention regarding size. There are setbacks along the perimeter and others will be triggered by the new block pattern that will be generated along new roads. The only road with a site plan at this point is the road extending from The Square to Hill Top Street. He noted that the first block on the left is the location of the plaza.

Mr. Van Der Werf stated that the railroad creates a fundamental edge condition, and it isn't clear what the character of that edge will be. He understands the need to be flexible, yet thinking about what it might become, there isn't enough clarity about how it will develop to be comfortable approving it as an armature that can be self-executing in terms of staff review. If there was a consistent, clear idea about fence and landscape, that would create a sense of a screen that could allow flexibility beyond, or if there was a clear idea of massing and setback. Right now, it is unclear what we would have other than three interruptions with trees on them. As good as that is for regulation massing, it doesn't respond to the question of the edge and how that character is assured. Is there a way to define requirements for the edge and corridor-facing portion that still allows some flexibility, but also preserves some continuity and integrity?

Mr. Keesecker said the view corridors are meant to establish a block pattern which doesn't exist on the other side of corridor. The other side has varying setbacks and inconsistent landscaping. We wanted to provide some consistency without being too prescriptive. Grading along the railroad is such that the railroad embankment climbs above the 240 corridor and the site falls away, with a 25' difference at the east end. The embankment acts as a substantial view blocker. It won't be 1200' of fence because of the topography. It is the western end and the next block that we may need more detail on to speak to the nature of the edge, as opposed to the east end. Mr. Henningsen said that the tracks must be the back even though that is the corridor. It still must be treated in an acceptable way, but it isn't reasonable to require that to be the front of the building. Mr. Van Der Werf said he agreed, particularly if an entrance defines the front. He supported the transparency the applicant has proposed so that folks can see that the buildings are inhabited and used.

In response to staff's question about trees along the EC frontage when buildings are proposed without parking lots between them and the tracks, Mr. Van Der Werf advocated for a consistent planting requirement along the whole edge that starts to define a consistent planted or buffer edge (not the same tree all along). So much of the existing corridor is bounded by landscape, and some residential developments preserve a landscape buffer. That is a pattern that could be applied here, then allow more flexibility beyond. Mr. Hancock said trees are critical when there is parking, but otherwise, we are talking about a town condition, and you expect to see buildings. View corridors allow a great glimpse in. That is a good way to do it. The reality of planting near the railroad is that the plants may not thrive, and it pushes the buildings further away. A large portion of the development is dedicated to a public plaza that is a green space that may provide a lot of the required vegetation.

Mr. Van Der Werf said that the plaza is a great amenity, but it may not be visible from the EC. Absent a site massing plan, the recommendation for consistent planting is made on the assumption that parking will be in the back. If we end up with lots of buildings along the tracks, we'd still want to see landscaping to soften them, but it would be a different edge than if it was parking lots and fences. Industrial buildings existing in Crozet are reflective of circumstances that made them, and they are great unique situations, but I don't know that we can prescribe that same activity. I would hate for this to look like the Northeast Corridor, just driving by the backs of buildings with parking and dumpsters. I don't think that would happen. Mr. Hancock said that the fence will screen anything at ground level; it has to be screened anyway. He said he liked the honesty of "this is the back of the building" rather than having two fronts, which isn't usually successful. At some point you have to trust that the guidelines are going to give us the outcome we advocate for. At some point you want some diversity. Hopefully this would allow some of that flexibility. We are going to have different buildings. There will be relationships between them. There won't be a single façade or motif expressed. Mr. Keesecker said that the timing will be such that it may be toothy at times. There will be one building first, and then the next, but they may not be next to each other. Mr. Hancock said we are building a town here. It does leave a lot to….

Mr. Van Der Werf said that is what is so difficult. Leaving open such a range of possibilities, you could have one building as close to the rail line as possible, and another as far away as possible. I am struggling to understand how we could approve the degree of flexibility inherent here and have any assurance of what would result. Mr. Henningsen said the more rules you set up the less creativity there is. Obviously, you need enough rules to provide a developer with a framework to know what they are getting into on the front end.

Mr. Keesecker said the number of variables that happen on that frontage are limited: either a building at the zero lot line, a building some distance away from the edge with landscaping, and the parking scenario. We can get very prescriptive on the parking option, because in the other two the building must be designed well, or it is held off a little and the landscaping is inconsequential. The one with parking lots, the screening of the cars and how that planted edge occurs is the question. My preference is to screen the cars completely with planting because it is incremental and timeless. There is no clash of styles, but

planting may not be enough to screen the cars. And whether it would grow healthy and not be a maintenance issue are questions. We could game out those three scenarios, say what the building, building with parking, and building without parking would be and be prescriptive about what those would be, with less control on those without parking and more with parking. Mr. Van Der Werf said if view corridors remain, you could have a pattern for the zone between each view corridor so you wouldn't have three different conditions between view corridors, at least between the breaks. Mr. Keesecker agreed that one block could look contiguous in style. Mr. Van Der Werf agreed.

Regarding staff question #3. Mr. Van Der Werf said he was sympathetic to what Mr. Keesecker was saying about planting screening for parking. It seems there is agreement that a planting requirement should exist; not sure if the existing EC guidelines are the right ones to apply in this situation. Mr. Hancock said keeping to existing EC requirements for screening parking would be consistent. He confirmed that this mainly applies to canopy trees. Staff confirmed that the consensus on #3 is yes, and that there isn't a consensus on #2.

Mr. Keesecker said question #3 is related to lots south of the road. Mr. Hancock asked if that area is visible. Mr. Keesecker said it would be until other buildings are built. One major question is how much screening and planting for parking lots north of that road needs to occur. South of there, there will be less visibility; it is up to 400' away from the EC and it begins to slope down the hill. We're hoping that the EC guidelines would not apply south of the road. Mr. Henningsen said there was some confusion between the development's public road and the EC.

Mr. Van Der Werf said if development proceeds at the north first… Mr. Hancock said our elevated standards for EC wouldn't apply; given the distance, that seems appropriate. It is not needed beyond the line of development. Mr. Van Der Werf said if this were a single development, we would apply the requirement across the site. Staff summarized the difference between EC and standard site plan street tree requirements.

Regarding question #4, Mr. Van Der Werf said, yes, the criteria for trees along long building elevations should apply. Mr. Hancock said, given the precedent of industrial buildings in this area, a long building façade is not out of place. That would also push the building further into the site. Staff clarified that the standard guideline allows the trees for buildings that need relief. Mr. Hancock clarified that if the building is articulated architecturally, trees wouldn't be needed. It is almost an option.

Staff noted, regarding questions #5 and #6, that Mr. Van Der Werf spoke to the issues already. Mr. Van Der Werf said that the proposed criteria are not presently sufficient. Mr. Hancock asked if the fence would run the whole way or would there be a condition where the building facades are all the way up and the fence runs into the building. Mr. Keesecker said yes that could happen, especially on the western end of the site, it is likely there will be little parking behind the buildings, but that is future buildings. There would probably be parking there temporarily. It is a question of timing. I'm feeling more confident that when a building is within a certain distance from the property line on the north, then it wouldn't need a fence or trees, so the building is the feature. When it is a certain distance away, but it doesn't have parking, it needs to meet guidelines for trees. When there is a parking lot, it needs to meet EC guidelines for parking lot landscaping and a fence. That will make it easier to manage. Mr. Van Der Werf said site sections and looking at 3 or 4 zones may help. Mr. Keesecker added that we need to limit the number of murals. Staff reviewed the staff recommendations on the view corridors and frontage treatment. Mr. Keesecker confirmed that the yellow cylinders accurately represent 30' structures.

Staff noted that trees on the EC side of the fence could help mitigate the fence design. Mr. Van Der Werf Said he was in favor of the landscaping being on the EC side of the fence, and being visible to it, and if fences were softened by hedge or shrub plantings, or replaced by them, that could be preferable. The other ARB members agreed. Regarding consistency of fence design across individual blocks, Mr. Keesecker

noted that the block lengths are 300', 350', 500'. Mr. Van Der Werf said it is difficult to separate from building development and depends on how development evolves beyond the fence. Mr. Henningsen said it isn't important that there be a requirement for consistency. There was consensus that the answer is "no" to #2 under fences. Mr. Hancock said variation in the fence is OK. Staff asked if there was a point at which there is too much variation. Mr. Keesecker said that 80' is the maximum before articulation is required as per the Countywide fence criteria. Mr. Van Der Werf asked if there are requirements now for breaking down the scale of the fence? Staff said no, but staff recommended that some be added, and noted the already approved criteria. Mr. Keesecker suggested that referring to the existing criteria would be appropriate. Mr. Henningsen agreed. Regarding durability, Mr. Van Der Werf noted that the topic was not addressed with the Rio29 form-based code.

Staff asked about non-solid fence designs and confirmed that the existing criteria do not address that. Mr. Henningsen thought a specific rule wasn't needed for it. Staff explained that the existing criteria address security fencing and screening fencing separately. The members agreed that a solid fence was appropriate for screening.

Staff summarized the recommendations regarding façade articulation. Mr. Van Der Werf said he supported all 4 recommendations. The other members agreed. Mr. Van Der Werf asked if anyone had a minimum depth in mind. Mr. Henningsen said it depends on the context. Maybe 6" would be enough depending on materials and colors. Staff added that combining some of the methods of articulation would be appropriate. Mr. Keesecker agreed that point could be discussed further and incorporated into the proposal. He clarified that it would apply to a single long building, but the hope is that there would be a series of smaller buildings so that those individual buildings wouldn't need to articulate at all.

Staff said that transparency is the next topic and asked the questions posed in the report about murals. Mr. Van Der Werf said murals aren't an acceptable treatment, we shouldn't be permitting buildings with architectural blankness in the ECs. Allowing it for pre-existing buildings is one thing, but to promote it in new development is not something I support. Murals are so much about the content and imagery and what is represented, and we as a board are not authorized to regulate that content. I don't support it in the ECs. Mr. Hancock noted that they are not in our guidelines, and he agreed with Mr. Van Der Werf but didn't want to say they aren't allowed. Mr. Henningsen agreed. He said blankness is better handled when it is baked into the architecture. But I wouldn't want to say you couldn't do a mural. Maybe it is just not acceptable as a treatment for blankness, not that you can't have it, you just can't have a blank façade and paint a mural on it. Staff summarized the staff recommendations on transparency. Mr. Henningsen asked about the 30% transparency and if it was just where it faced the EC. Mr. Keesecker said it was just the facades visible from the EC, and that is a minimal amount for ground level in this district. It was based on the Rio29 code. Given the railroad location, Mr. Henningsen said that relaxing that a bit might be appropriate. Ms. Gleason noted that the Rio29 code has 60% at the ground and 40% above, which has been difficult for developers to achieve. She also noted 30% at ground and 25% above applies to other areas of Rio29.

Staff reviewed the issues regarding lights and signs. Mr. Henningsen asked if those signs are limited on ECs in general. Staff responded that there are a lot of internally illuminated signs in the EC. This list was based on the images in the applicant's proposal. Mr. Keesecker said the design team does not want those lit up signs – it confuses the orientation of the buildings.

Staff said the last topic was exclusions. Mr. Van Der Werf said that the State of Virginia or Library of Virginia have a definition for temporary building. It may be 3 years. Staff noted that they would be doing additional research on that topic and on converted train cars. Mr. Van Der Werf asked if outdoor dining areas would have permanent elements. Mr. Keesecker said decking and on occasion something to hold up lighting or shade devices. This would be an energy-building ,temporary, get-the-ball-rolling thing. We would take your advice on how to address these temporary features. He noted Ix Park as an example. Mr.

DRAFT

Hancock said that no special requirement beyond what is needed for a site plan is needed. Mr. Van Der Werf noted an issue with signs on food trucks. He asked if the county has anything upcoming to deal with regulating that. Staff noted that the requirements related to food trucks have been worked on recently. Not many applications have been received yet and most are not associated with permanent dining areas. Mr. Van Der Werf said if it is a structure and visible from the EC it should be reviewed by the ARB. If it were something minimal the ARB could delegate to staff or streamline but as a blanket category we don't look at, that seems strange. Staff said they would come back with more on that topic, and can coordinate with the applicant on next steps, possibly another work session.

Mr. Van Der Werf moved to forward the comments and recommendations to the Applicant as discussed by the ARB in the January 16, 2024, work session.

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.
The motion was carried by a vote of 3:0. (Matsuno absent, Stoner recused)

b. SDP2023-71: Old Ivy Residences

Location: 2441 Old Ivy Road and undeveloped land to the west and north
Proposal: To establish a residential development consisting of a mix of 525 dwelling units on 35.37 acres with associated site improvements.
Staff: Mariah Gleason
Representative: Valerie Long, Williams Mullen

Staff summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Van Der Werf asked if there would be updated landscaping with the final site plan. Staff responded yes. Mr. Hancock asked if a motion was needed for this. Staff responded yes and noted a goal of moving to motions for all actions. Mr. Hancock said that the examples at the end were helpful to understand the level of detail. Mr. Stoner agreed. Mr. Henningsen agreed that it was a thorough presentation. Valerie Long represented the applicant, Graystar, and addressed the ARB, noting that other team members were attending virtually. She summarized the project, its level of visibility from the ECs, and referenced the final ARB site plan submittal that was being made on the 16th and some of the changes included in it. Mr. Stoner noted the impressive landscaping plan. He asked about the area to the north of the end of the retaining wall near the single-family units, and asked how much screening there is between the property line there (not as much). Mr. Van Der Werf noted the helpful images and site sections and noted that the section near the townhomes is the greatest concern. More illustrations of those buildings would be helpful with the next submittal. Mr. Hancock complemented the graphics and asked how the applicant's exhibits aligned with staff's recommendations. Ms. Long said that approximately half of the townhome row would not be visible and a 20' buffer is required. Mr. Van Der Werf said it would be interesting to see some examples of single-family in such close proximity to the EC. He said staff did a nice job of showing where the buildings will be visible; it makes sense. Mr. Hancock noted that we probably don't need to review all the single-family units based on the applicant's presentation. There aren't a lot of question marks. Given the distance, grade, and speed of travel on this corridor, concerns are reduced. Mr. Stoner agreed and said it has been shown that most of the development won't be visible. The only area that we want to be sure has adequate planting is behind the single-family. The developer will be motivated to do that since residents won't want to view the bypass. He suggested that staff could finish the review. Mr. Henningsen agreed and said that it couldn't hurt to review the parts of the development identified by staff for review. He noted the high-speed corridor and the narrow sight lines. He asked for a motion. Mr. Stoner asked if this must come back to the ARB. Staff responded that a final site plan application will be made that will need action and will include a lot of details that you haven't seen. If you think you don't need to see that level of review, staff recommend that a complete review be done, and the item can be placed on the consent agenda. The ARB members agreed with that approach. Mr. Van Der Werf said that the character, extent and species for the buffer are important. If staff reviews without our review, is there direction for staff now? Mr.

Hancock said it should be heavy on evergreens. The applicant is motivated to make that a pleasant experience for the residents. From the retaining wall to the north, focus on predominantly evergreen trees, that would mitigate visibility. Mr. Stoner asked if a fence was added in the future, would it require review. Staff responded, yes, it would be a site plan amendment. Mr. Henningsen asked for a motion or revisions to staff's comments. Mr. Stoner said a lot of it we are already comfortable with and suggested simplifying the list. Staff explained that the recommended action is a list that outlines what is expected to be visible. Staff are asking for confirmation that the ARB agrees with the list. Mr. Hancock asked about comment 7, the grass pavers. Staff said it is about the appropriate application of ARB guidelines. Mr. Van Der Werf asked about comment 8, noting that we don't know enough to change that motion today. Staff explained that some of the items the applicant noted may be less visible will be addressed in the next review with the updated information. Staff are trying to keep today's action based on the items submitted for the work session. Subsequent changes would be reviewed with the next submittal, including any changes in anticipated visibility.

Motion: Mr. Hancock moved that ARB review of the final site plan and architecture for Old Ivy Residences will focus on the items recommended in the staff report, as follows:

1. Apartment Building 1 requires ARB review.
2. Portions of Apartment Buildings 2 and 3, identified in yellow in Figure 1, require ARB review.
3. North and west building elevations of Apartment Building 4 require ARB review.
4. The EC guidelines should be met for the portions of parking areas between Apartment Buildings 1, 2, and 3 and west of Apartment Building 4 that will be visible from the EC to promote a coordinated and attractive appearance along the corridor.
5. The dumpster enclosure north of Apartment Building 1 and west of Apartment Building 4 requires ARB review.
6. Provide complete details, notes, and labels for the proposed recreation area west of Apartment Building 4.
7. Landscaping along the emergency access road should be consistent with EC guidelines for internal roads in areas where the existing tree buffer is located more than 10 feet from the road.
8. Regarding the nineteen single-family detached units located along the northwestern EC frontage and two units on the west end of the northernmost townhouse:
    a. These units require ARB review.
    b. More specificity is needed on the Yaupon Holly to understand its impact on visibility.
    c. The landscaping plan should show a denser mix of trees and shrubs within the 20-foot vegetated buffer area along the EC to promote a consistent appearance along the corridor and reduce the visibility of proposed buildings that will have their backs or sides oriented to the EC.
9. Regarding the dumpster enclosure in the northern corner of the site:
    a. The design of the dumpster enclosure requires ARB review.
    b. Landscaping around the dumpster enclosure should be coordinated with landscaping in the 20-foot vegetated buffer for a cohesive appearance along the EC.
10. The upper stories of Apartment Buildings 2, 3, and 5, identified in blue in Figure 1, require ARB review.

Mr. Van Der Werf seconded the motion.
The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0. (Matsuno absent)

9. OTHER BUSINESS

a. Minutes Approval:

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved for approval of the minutes from the January 2, 2024, ARB meeting. Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

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

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

c. Next ARB Meeting: Monday, February 5, 2024, 1:00 PM – Lane Auditorium
Mr. Stoner stated that he would not be able to attend the Feb. 5 meeting.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:24 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Monday, February 5, 2024, at 1:00 p.m.

DRAFT