County of Albemarle
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT/PLANNING

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

DRAFT ARB ACTION MEMO / MINUTES

Date: April 15, 2024
Time: 1:00 PM
Meeting Room: Lane Auditorium
Members:
Chris Henningsen, Chair: Present
Frank Hancock, Vice-Chair: Present (left at 2:33)
Frank Stoner: Present
Dade Van Der Werf: Present (arrived at 1:04)
Taro Matsuno: Absent
Staff:
Margaret Maliszewski
Khris Taggart
Maria Gleason

CALL TO ORDER: Mr. Henningsen called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. and established a quorum.

DISCLOSURES: Mr. Stoner disclosed that he would recuse himself from the Flow Honda discussion because his firm is working with Flow on their construction projects.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.
CONSENT AGENDA: None.
WORK SESSIONS: None.

REGULAR REVIEW ITEMS

a. **ARB2024-24: Flow Honda Final** (TMP: 04500-00-00-068D4)

Location: 960-A Hilton Heights Road, on the west side of Route 29 North, at the intersection of Hilton Heights Road and Route 29.

Proposal: To renovate the Flow Honda showroom building by removing the existing entrance tower and canopy, adding a layered frame around new storefront windows, and adding a new canopy over the service vehicle entrance.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart
Representative: Kevin Schafer

Khris Taggart summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members had no questions for staff. Kevin Schafer (Design Develop) summarized the project for the Board, noting the addition of the white frame around the storefront, the lowered curtain wall, agreement with staff's recommendations, and the intention to pursue the overall campus idea in the future. Mr. Van Der Werf confirmed that Subaru still occupies the southern building. No members of the public spoke about the project. In discussion, ARB member's noted appreciation for staff's review, the applicant's presentation, the

retention of red brick, the appropriateness of the design, appreciation for the revisions to address ARB concerns, and the challenge of reviewing each dealership individually.

Motion: Mr. Hancock moved to recommend approval of ARB2024-24: Flow Honda with the conditions outlined in the staff report.

1. Provide a window glass sample for review.
2. Revise the lighting plan to provide information on the proposed finish for the building-mounted lighting.
3. Revise the lighting plan to include the standard lighting note: 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.
4. Confirm and replace all landscaping missing from the approved site plan.
5. Sign applications are required for all proposed signs. New signs will be reviewed for compatibility with existing signs. Information on the illumination value, fixture finish, and color temperature for the spotlight will be needed if proposed.

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

b. **ARB2024-25: Glenbrook at Foothills Phase IV Final Site Plan** (TMP: 056A2-01-00-062R0, 056K0-00-03-1160, 056K0-00-03-11700, 0056K0-00-03-11800, 056K0-00-03-11900, 056K0-00-03-12000, 056K0-00-03-000A0)

Location: South side of Three Notch'd Rd., west of 5466 Union Mission Ln.
Proposal: To construct a mix of 45 single family attached and detached residential units with associated site improvements.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski
Representative: Chuck Rapp (Collins Engineering)

Margaret Maliszewski summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members had no questions for staff. Chuck Rapp (Collins Engineering) addressed the ARB, noting the overall context of the project and the particular phase of construction. He said that he could try to blend more landscaping in. He noted that a representative of Greenwood Homes was present to answer questions about the architecture. Mr. Van Der Werf asked if more design elements could be added to the rear elevations. Mr. Stoner confirmed that the finished grade at the townhouses was above the grade of the railroad and that the townhouses were approximately 100' from the EC street. Mr. Henningsen asked for the dimensions of the townhouse offset (2'). No members of the public spoke about the project. In discussion, Mr. Stoner noted that it is a challenge with the house elevated above the street and behind the railroad. He thought some additional effort could be made regarding gables on the rear elevations, noting that over time some protection would be provided by the evergreen trees. He added that the color change is an effective strategy. Mr. Van Der Werf stated that it would be good to break up the rear elevations a little more, with gables or dormers, as a gesture to the frontality along the EC. Mr. Hancock said he thought the proposal was appropriate as is, and noted that the row isn't that big and one row is canted away from the street. Mr. Henningsen agreed and noted the distance from the street due to the location of the railroad. He said the colors and staggering adds interest. He asked if there was room for large canopy trees where the ornamentals are. A representative of Greenwood Homes said that they might be able to add a fake window at the top of the side elevation but would prefer to leave the rear elevations as proposed. Mr. Van Der Werf said that more character and design features would be appropriate in the public realm. Mr. Stoner noted the cost vs. value issue.

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved to recommend approval of ARB2024-25: Glenbrook at Foothills Phase IV Final Site Plan with the conditions listed in the staff report, amended as follows.

1. Add detail to the rear and side elevations of units 116-120 and 140-145 to add interest and relieve blankness. Details could include dormers, gables or vents (in end gables).
2. Provide window glass specs on the plans. Provide a glass sample for review.
3. Indicate on the plans where mechanical equipment will be located. For the equipment that will be visible from the EC, show related landscape screening and revise the note regarding screen color to clarify that the screen color will match the siding color.
4. Include a note on the site and architectural plans stating that any wall-mounted light fixtures will be full cutoff fixtures.
5. Resolve tree/utility conflicts at the northwest corner of lot 140 and along Leeham Street.
6. Revise the plan to include the dog park, landscaping at the dog park, and landscaping at lots 116 and 117. Show that the locations of all site features are coordinated.
7. Add large canopy trees along the EC elevations of units 140-145.

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.
The motion was carried by a vote of 3:0 (Stoner voted no; Matsuno absent).

c. **ARB2024-24: 999 Rio** (TMP: 06100-00-00-154B0)

Location: Fourteen multi-family attached lots and ten single-family attached lots, for a total of 38 dwelling units on approximately 1.92 acres. The proposal includes associated site improvements.

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

Staff Contact: Mariah Gleason
Representatives: Stephanie Paul, Nicole Scro

Mariah Gleason summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members asked if the stormwater basin would be wet or dry (dry) and why trees could not be planted in the basin (engineering policy regarding maintenance). Nicole Scro addressed the Board, noting issues with staff's recommendations 1, 3, 10 and 17, regarding the appearance of the side elevation of unit 15, planting at and the appearance of stormwater facility, and path connections. She noted that the design of the stormwater facility was revised; it had to be daylighted due to utility easements. She said she would put landscaping wherever possible and showed photos of the Riverside facility. ARB members asked the applicant to clarify the intent for landscaping at the stormwater facility and discussed engineering and RWSA limitations. Mr. Van Der Werf suggested that the windows on the side elevation of unit 15 could be aligned and noted that the scale of the 3-story elevation made blankness a greater issue than on the 2-story elevation. Mr. Stoner asked if the maples were too big for the site (Armstrong variety is upright). Some members suggested adding a large tree between the emergency access and the stormwater facility.

Alexis Halley of 2038 Shepherds Ridge Road, Dunlora, spoke about the project. She said her property looks into the rear of the subject parcel. She asked if all existing trees would be removed and what would keep vehicle lights from shining into there windows. Ms. Scro responded that some trees on the adjacent parcel would remain.

In discussion, Mr. Van Der Werf complimented the applicant on the general architectural character of the project, noted that alignment was needed regarding the landscape plan, and adding a large canopy tree could help with the blankness of unit 15. Mr. Stoner commented that it is a tight site and had no issues with the stormwater facility. Mr. Hancock said the stormwater pond is better than parking on the EC and said that the green space between the street and the buildings is positive. He appreciated the masonry in the buildings. Mr. Henningsen agreed with those comments, said the architecture is appropriate as is, and

had no issues with the pond. The ARB, staff and the applicant discussed the landscape plans, noting that some of the applicant's images were earlier images that showed trees and shrubs no longer proposed. Staff clarified the location of the path connections. Staff noted that seeing water in the pond was not the issue; instead, the need to integrate the overall stormwater facility into the landscape of the site was the goal.

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved to recommend approval of ARB2024-29: 999 Rio Final Site Plan with the conditions outlined in the staff report, amended as follows, pending ARB approval of #3, 11 and 14.

1. Revise proposed plantings and/or the architectural design of the south elevation of Lot 15 to alleviate the appearance of blankness. Proposed landscaping should be coordinated with other landscaping located between the buildings and the EC to promote an integrated, attractive appearance.
2. Consider aligning windows on the south elevation of unit 15.
3. Provide perspectives showing the development from various vantage points on the EC. Show how the proposed landscaping will mitigate blank walls and how it will be used to integrate the overall development.
4. Revise the architectural drawings to note where trim colors will be white or sealskin.
5. Revise renderings to align with the architectural drawings as needed.
6. Provide a window glass sample for review.
7. Revise the final site plan to locate proposed mechanical equipment and identify materials that will be used to eliminate visibility of mechanical equipment from view from the EC.
8. Revise architectural drawings for the 2- and 3-story models to identify the locations and shielding of proposed mechanical equipment. This information should be consistent with the final site plan.
9. Revise the dumpster pad detail on Sheet C11 to identify a color for the wood gates other than white.
10. Revise the Lighting Plan to:
    a. Reflect corrected lighting information;
    b. Provide a note on the Lighting Plan stating that the wall mounted light fixtures will be downlight only;
    c. Specify the mounting height for freestanding, pole-mounted light fixtures on the Lighting Plan as not to exceed 20'. Add a note stating that the 20' height is a maximum that includes any base; and
    d. Include the standard lighting note on the lighting plan sheet (Sheet C10) stating: "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."
    e. Provide light fixture information for decorative lighting proposed on two-story attached units. Revise the photometric plan to account for these light fixtures.
11. Coordinate with RWSA to add landscaping at the stormwater management facility, if possible, to integrate the facility into the finished site and promote a coordinated, non-engineered appearance along the EC. Coordinate with the County Engineer regarding trees in the facility.
12. Provide a north arrow and scale on the Landscaping Plan.
13. Revise the landscaping plan to provide a coordinated and integrated appearance among landscaped areas along the EC frontage.
14. Revise the landscaping plan to show shrubs along the east elevations of Lots 1-14. Proposed landscaping should have a coordinated appearance that is integrated into the overall development.
15. Revise the quantity of "Rotundiloba Sweetgum" to 4, consistent with the landscape plan, and the botanical name for the Nellie R. Steven's Holly to "Ilex x Nellie R. Stevens'".
16. Include the standard planting note on the landscape plan sheet (Sheet C9) stating: "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."
17. Revise the site plan to show connections between pedestrian paths and the residential units.
18. Revise the Existing Conditions Sheet (Sheet C2) to note the removal of the existing, stand-alone tree near the northwestern corner of the parcel.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.
The motion was carried by a vote of 3:0. (Matsuno absent; Hancock left at 2:33)

OTHER BUSINESS

a. Minutes Approval:

Motion: Mr. Henningsen moved for approval of the minutes from the March 18, 2024, ARB meeting.
Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.
The motion was carried by a vote of 3:0. (Matsuno absent; Hancock left at 2:33)

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

c. Next ARB Meeting: Monday, May 6, 2024, 1:00 PM – Lane Auditorium???
Mr. Van Der Werf and Mr. Stoner stated that they would not be able to make the May 6 meeting. Staff will poll the other ARB members to determine if a quorum will be available.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:41 p.m. to the next ARB meeting, potentially on Monday, May 6, 2024, at 1:00 p.m.