



County of Albemarle
Community Development Department - Planning

Margaret Maliszewski
mmaliszewski@albemarle.org
Telephone: (434) 296-5832 ext. 3276

January 17, 2024

Kurt Keesecker
brw architects
112 4th Street, NE2
Charlottesville, VA 2290

RE: ARB-2023-107: Barnes Lumber Countywide Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria

Dear Applicant,

The Albemarle County Architectural Review Board, at its meeting on January 16, 2024, held a work session on the proposed Barnes Lumber Countywide Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria. The ARB unanimously voted to forward the comments and recommendations to the Applicant as discussed by the ARB in the January 16, 2024, work session, as outlined in the attachment to this letter. Once you've had a chance to review this information, let's discuss next steps.

If you have any questions concerning any of the above, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Margaret Maliszewski
Planning Manager, Department of Community Development
434-296-5832 x3276
mmaliszewski@albemarle.org

cc: Crozet New Town Associates, LLC, 300 2nd St., NE, Charlottesville VA 22902 (fstoner@milestonepartners.co)
File

ARB-2023-107: Barnes Lumber Countywide CofA Criteria

Red text represents ARB comments made at the January 16, 2023 ARB meeting.

Criteria	Recommendations	Questions for ARB	1/16/24 Comments
View Corridors & Frontage	1. Coordinate the 5' depth of the EC buffer throughout the document. 2. Illustrate in plan view relative locations of fencing and trees along the EC frontage. Show sufficient planting area for the trees. 3. Confirm that the 30' building heights are represented accurately.	1. Are rear elevations facing the corridor acceptable? yes 2. Should trees be provided along the corridor when buildings are proposed without parking lots between the building and the railroad? There was no consensus on this item. One member recommended consistent planting along the corridor edge. 3. Should ECDG street tree and parking area requirements apply to lots south of the public road? no 4. Should the criteria provide for trees along long building elevations? yes 5. The criteria would allow for fences the full length of the frontage (only broken by the view corridors), with parking behind the fences, and buildings beyond the parking with murals on all sides visible from the EC. 6. Are the view corridors combined with the proposed fencing and landscaping sufficient methods for achieving an appropriate appearance for the ECs and establishing consistency with the ECDG?	The applicant suggested that criteria could be established for when a building is within a certain distance from the property line on the north, then it wouldn't need a fence or trees, ensuring that 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. And, when there is a parking lot, the EC guidelines for parking lot landscaping and a fence apply. Site sections and further developing 3 or 4 zones would be helpful.
Fences	1. Clarify that the 6' fence height is a requirement (no shorter, no taller). 2. Add standards for articulation along the length of fence. 3. Add standards for fence material. No vinyl, no reflective finishes. 4. Provide a scalable plan.	1. Should parking lot trees be located on the EC side of the fences? yes 2. Should fence designs be consistent across individual blocks? No 3. Should durability of fence material be a consideration? no 4. Are non-solid fence designs appropriate? No Should a maximum transparency percentage be established?	Defer to existing fence criteria.

Façade articulation	1. Increase the minimum depth of recesses and projections for greater façade articulation detectable from the EC street. 2. Eliminate texture change as a possible method of articulation or require it in combination with other features 3. Further clarify the extent of “change in detailing” needed to qualify as a mass/scale mitigation method. 4. Provide images for consideration illustrating how parapet breaks, arcades, and awnings/canopies can mitigate mass/scale.		ARB supports all the recommended articulation changes. A combination of methods may be an option.
Building transparency		1. Are murals an acceptable blank wall treatment for buildings on this EC? 2. Are murals on all visible elevations acceptable? Should there be a limit to the number of elevations on a single building that can be covered with murals? Across multiple buildings? 3. Should design criteria be added for murals? 4. Should mural content be subject to ARB review?	Blankness is better handled through architectural design. Murals are not acceptable as a treatment for blankness. The ARB does not want to completely eliminate the possibility of murals. Consider relaxed transparency percentages.
Building materials	1. Add vinyl siding to the exclusions. 2. Revise the aluminum panel limitation to focus on metal, generally, and on appropriate shape and configuration. 3. Clarify that “façade” means any/all building elevations, or revise “façade” to “elevation”.		The recommendations are acceptable.

Lights & Signs	1. Clarify that criteria to be more specific about what lights with “armatures” allows for. 2. Clarify that the following sign types are not allowed: box and cabinet style signs, internally illuminated signs, channel letters signs		The recommendations are acceptable.
Exclusions		1. Should permanent areas for outdoor dining areas be subject to ARB review? 2. What maximum length of time should be considered temporary? 3. Is there any objection to excluding converted train cars from ARB review?	Staff will return with additional information and recommendations on temporary structures.