



DRAFT ARB ACTION MEMO / MINUTES

Date: December 2, 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 (Virtually)
Taro Matsuno: Present

Staff:

Margaret Maliszewski

CALL TO ORDER: Mr. Henningsen called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. The clerk called the role. Mr. Van Der Werf requested to participate virtually. All members physically present voted to accept his request and a quorum was established.

DISCLOSURES: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

CONSENT AGENDA: None.

REGULAR REVIEW ITEMS:

a. **ARB2024-65: Albemarle-Charlottesville Regional Jail**

Location: 160 Peregrory Lane

Proposal: To demolish a portion of the existing jail and build an addition.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representative: Thad Rich, Michael Gibson, Luke Janik

Margaret Maliszewski summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members questioned the minimal setback and asked to see an image of the existing condition. The applicants addressed the Board, noting that they had no issues with the landscape and lighting recommendations, that there were no other viable locations for the mechanical area, that the driveway to that area would be grass pavers, that the common standards for jail design resulted in many of the features that have negative visual impacts but they would make changes to dress up the blank walls and screen rooftop equipment. They stated that the cast stone wall would have bands of smooth- and split-face block, not rock face; they presented samples for the brick, block, metal and glass; and they said that the blank upper wall could be alleviated with vertical changes, but not windows. ARB members asked the applicants about adding windows to the upper wall area (not possible); about the extent of the mechanical enclosure, about the internal programming (results in the rear of house uses on the EC front), the security fence (16' tall with razor wire, egress path, could it be a solid wall?).

In discussion, the ARB noted the constraints of the program, suggested that interior changes could result in a more appropriate appearance for the EC, noted the improvement on the south elevation and the

unfortunate lack of detail on the east side of the building, reiterated the need to screen equipment, add detail to the blank façade, and a desire for an alternative to the security fence. Mr. Van Der Werf said noted his concern with the fundamental issues of siting and massing, and the difficulty accepting the result without knowing that other solutions have been fully pursued. Mr. Stoner asked if this design old be approved if it was for a different use. The singularity of the use was noted, as was a need for the County to uphold its guidelines, and the character of this corridor. Mr. Henningsen said that more should be done to make the EC elevation look less like the side of the building.

Motion: Mr. Hancock moved to provide the applicant with the comments listed in the staff report for ARB2024-65 Albemarle-Charlottesville Regional Jail, amended as follows, to be addressed with the next submittal:

1. Provide a sample of the Bur Ridge Blend cast stone for review.
2. Add detailing to the upper wall of the addition to relieve blankness and mitigate mass.
3. Add notes to the architectural plans confirming that VLT and VLR will meet guidelines requirements with untinted glass. *Visible light transmittance (VLT) shall not drop below 40%. Visible light reflectance (VLR) shall not exceed 30%.*
4. Show how visibility of rooftop equipment will be eliminated from all vantage points on Avon Street.
5. Show how visibility of equipment in the mechanical area on the Avon Street side of the building will be eliminated.
6. Provide perspective views clearly showing the appearance of the mechanical area on the Avon Street side of the building. Show how it will contribute to an orderly and attractive appearance on the corridor.
7. Add the standard mechanical equipment note to the site and architectural plans. : “Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated.”
8. Resolve the excess spillover on Avon Street.
9. Revise the photometric plan to show illumination not exceeding 20 fc.
10. Revise the lighting plan to indicate the proposed colors for light fixtures and poles. Bronze is standard in the ECs.
11. Add the standard lighting note to the plan. “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.”
12. Clarify the method of attachment and appearance of the strip light at the mechanical equipment area.
13. Add low-growing landscaping along the Avon Street frontage where trees would conflict with utilities.
14. Add the standard plant health note to the 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.”
15. Show tree protection fencing for the trees located along Peregory Lane.
16. Consider alternatives to mitigate the appearance of the security fence along the corridor.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.
The motion was carried by a vote of 5:0.

b. ARB2024-66: Northside Drive Industrial

Location: at the southwest corner of the intersection of Rt. 29 North and Northside Drive

Proposal: To construct a new light industrial flex building.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representative: Keith Lancaster, Charlie Armstrong

Margaret Maliszewski summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Van Der Werf asked about the grading at the back of the site (level of visibility needs confirmation). The applicants addressed the Board, noting the Heavy Industrial zoning of the site and the lack of guidelines specific to the use, their attempt to mitigate impacts with landscaping and earth mounds, and their willingness to work with their supplier to alter the details of the design, and colors/textures. The ARB members asked if there is sufficient space for trees on the berm the full length of the property (yes); agreed to consider landscaping as a primary means of mitigation with demonstration that the plants can be established and will be effective; suggested that the north and south corners of the building may be most visible so detail may best be focused there; noted precedents for addressing blankness, including the theater and layering of landscaping at Stonefield; recommended alternate, earthier colors; and questioned the parking count (all users not yet identified).

In discussion, the ARB members said that if there is a way to make the landscaping work, they are open to it, that the grading should have a natural appearance, that the grading at the corner of Northside Drive may be an issue, that architectural detailing may best be focused there, that warmer colors should be considered and may help the building recede, that the parking pushes the building back and down from the street (potentially reducing impacts), that historical context for large agricultural buildings could be considered (see the Cornerstone Community Church project), questioned the appropriateness of the form and scale of the color-blocking, and noted that breaking the building into two structures would reduce the scale. Members asked if corrugated metal would be acceptable, said that glimpses of the building would be OK, and noted that the longevity of a metal building might be less. Mr. Van Der Werf said that some relief in the plane of the façade and footprint, greater articulation, would be appropriate.

Motion: Mr. Matsuno moved to provide the applicant with the comments listed in the staff report for ARB2024-66 Northside Drive Industrial, amended as follows, to be addressed with the next submittal:

1. Consider revising the architecture to reflect vernacular agricultural forms, to break up the length, to provide earth tones, and/or other methods to mitigate the building mass.
2. Provide material samples with the next submittal.
3. Show the locations of all ground- and building-mounted equipment on the site plan, roof plan, and elevations. Show how visibility from the ECs will be eliminated.
4. Revise the architectural drawings to add the roof-mounted equipment locations and heights to the elevations.
5. Add the standard mechanical equipment note to the site and architectural plans: Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated.
6. Revise the site plan to provide a complete lighting plan with the next submittal.
7. Add the standard lighting note to the lighting plan: 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 foot-candle.
8. Provide a complete landscape plan with the next submittal. Ensure the proposed species are on the recommended lists.
9. Provide an arrangement of mixed species along the Rt. 29 frontage in an irregular pattern coordinated with the proposed grading to help screen the building and integrate the development into the corridor.
10. Revise the site section to show the property line and existing overhead line.
11. Include the standard landscaping note on 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.
12. Provide trees along Northside Drive that meet the interior road landscaping requirements (2½" caliper and 40' on center).

13. Provide trees along the northern and southern perimeters of the parking lot that meet the perimeter parking area landscaping requirements (2½” caliper and 40’ on center).
14. Provide 8 interior parking lot trees at 2½” caliper.
15. Provide large trees along the north and south elevations to help soften the appearance of the exterior walls.
16. Provide perspective renderings from both directions on Rt. 29, with and without landscaping, to clarify visibility and potential impacts.
17. Revise the grading along the frontage to establish a more natural appearance.
18. Revise the site sections to include the slope west of the loading area behind the building.
19. Revise the site plan to show tree protection fencing along the southern perimeter of the site.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.
The motion was carried by a vote of 5:0.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. Minutes Approval:

Motion: Mr. Stoner moved for approval of the minutes from the November 18, 2024, ARB meeting.
Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.
The motion was carried by a vote of 5:0

b. Other items from staff or ARB members:

Returning to the jail project, Mr. Stoner noted that the EC Guidelines do not include an exemption for public projects and questioned how the jail could be approved if its design is inconsistent with the EC Guidelines. Members noted the existing condition, public need, character of the corridor, practicalities of the use that is uncommon in the corridors, and outside agency requirements as potential extenuating circumstances. Concern was noted for consistency in the corridors and equity in applying the guidelines to all proposals.

c. Next ARB Meeting: Monday, December 16, 2024, 1:00 PM – Lane Auditorium All members indicated that they planned to attend the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Monday, December 16, 2024, at 1:00 p.m.