

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD STAFF REPORT

Project #/Name	ARB-2023-107: Barnes Lumber Countywide Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria
Review Type	Countywide Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria
Parcel Identification/ Zoning	056A20100071B0/Heavy Industry (HI), 056A2010007100/Downtown Crozet District (DCD), 056A2010002500/Commercial (C1), Entrance Corridor (EC)
Location	5625-5755 The Square, south of the railroad tracks, east of Oak St., north and west of the residences on Hill Top St.
Owner/Applicant	Crozet New Town Associates, LLC / BRW Architects (Kurt Keesecker)
Magisterial District	White Hall
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.
Context	The site of the proposed development lies in the heart of Crozet.
Visibility	Development in most of the project area could be visible from the Entrance Corridor.
ARB Meeting Date	March 3, 2025
Staff Contact	Margaret Maliszewski

PROJECT HISTORY

- November 2, 2023: The Board of Supervisors approved a zoning text amendment adding developments subject to public/private partnerships as a category of Countywide Certificate of Appropriateness. The Barnes Lumber criteria are the first to be reviewed by the ARB under this new category.
- January 16, 2024: The ARB held a work session on proposed countywide criteria for the Barnes Lumber project area and provided the applicant with several comments to consider in revising the proposal.
- July 1, 2024: A revised submittal was received from the applicant. Staff met with the applicant to discuss it on September 5, 2024. Comments were emailed to the applicant on September 11, 2024.
- November 7, 2024: A revised submittal was received from the applicant. Staff comments were provided to the applicant on November 14 and 20, 2024.
- January 15, 2025: A revised submittal (the subject of this report) was received from the applicant.
- The county is awaiting revised road plans for the development.

ANALYSIS

The table below presents the applicant’s current proposed criteria, related comments from the 1/16/2024 ARB meeting, current issues and comments by staff on the proposal based on the ARB’s previous direction and EC Design Guidelines, and staff recommendations on the current proposal.

	1/3/2025 PROPOSED CRITERIA	1/16/24 ARB COMMENTS	3/3/25 REVIEW COMMENT/ISSUE	3/3/25 RECOMMENDATION
VISIBILITY	Development may receive CofA if the designs’ lack of visibility can be demonstrated to AC staff. (map p. 25)		The applicant believes that the development in the eastern end and southern portion of the project area will not be visible or will only be partially visible from the Entrance Corridor. County regulations require that any portion of the development visible from the EC will require review and approval. A Certificate of Appropriateness is not required for development that is not visible from an Entrance Corridor.	Revise this criterion to read, “Any portion of the development that is visible from the Entrance Corridor will require a Certificate of Appropriateness.”
BLOCK PATTERN	Development must follow block pattern as illustrated on page 15. (#2, p. 9, p. 15)	The ARB did not provide a definitive answer to the question: “are the view corridors combined with the proposed fencing and landscaping sufficient methods for achieving a appropriate appearance for the ECs and establishing consistency with the ECDG?”	The applicant proposes a block pattern and visual connections as the means of establishing an organized development. Three visual connections are shown. The location of the connections has shifted one block to the west compared to the January	<u>Question for ARB discussion:</u> Are two view corridors sufficient to establish a coordinated and appropriate appearance along the corridor?
VISUAL CONNECTION	Visual connection will be established in locations illustrated on p. 15 with trees planted as illustrated in diagram on p. 17. Visual Connections indicated are intended as a			

	minimum, additional Visual Connections may be provided. (#2, p. 9, p. 15, 17)		2024 review. The submittal materials note that the easternmost connection will not be visible from the EC and that the visual connections with their perpendicular tree pattern will emphasize the urban character of the development, prevent overly long and uninterrupted facades along the corridor, and afford glimpses into the active interior of the development. This references the existing pattern of views that open into residential and commercial properties along the corridor and rows of trees aligned perpendicular to the corridor to identify and define property edges. Two visual connections may not be sufficient to establish a coordinated appearance along the corridor.	
		Coordinate the 5' depth of the EC buffer throughout the document	The buffer depth has been coordinated.	None.
		Illustrate in plan view relative locations of fencing and trees along the EC frontage. Show sufficient planting area for the trees.	The relative locations of fencing and trees along the EC frontage is illustrated on page 15. Pages 17 and 18 show fencing in relation to the property line adjacent to the railroad, but no trees parallel to the fence. A note on page 17 says "new fence and plantings to be located within 5' of property line." 5' seems minimal, but the ground continues off-site to the railroad tracks.	Consider increasing the depth of the tree/fence buffer to 10' minimum.
LANDSCAPING	Trees are required parallel to the tracks where indicated on p. 15. Tree plantings in these areas shall comply with AC ARB ECDG, #32a-b, including tree caliper requirements, spacing and interspersing with ornamental flowering trees. Trees shall appear on the AC Plant List. (diagram p. 15; 32a-b)	The ARB did not come to consensus on this item: "Should trees be provided along the corridor when buildings are proposed without parking lots between the building and the railroad?" One member recommended consistent planting along the corridor edge.	The applicant proposes trees parallel to the tracks for the western portion of the frontage. The submittal states that the railroad embankment will screen trees along the eastern portion of the frontage. Given the mature height of large shade trees, it is anticipated that much of the trees would be visible if planted along the	Revise the criteria to provide trees parallel to the tracks along the full frontage of the development (allowing breaks at the visual connections).

	Trees are required within Visual Connections as illustrated in the diagram on p. 17. Trees shall appear on the AC Plant List. (p. 17)	-	eastern portion of the frontage. Large shade trees are shown 35' on center in the Visual Connections.	None.
FENCING	Required at edges where indicated per p. 15. Fence design compliant with ECDG. (32c, p. 11, 15)	Clarify that the 6' fence height is a requirement (no shorter, no taller).	Fence height is not specified.	Revise the criteria to state that fence height is 6'.
		Defer to existing fence criteria.	The proposal refers to the ECDG.	Clarify that fence design must comply with the ECDG and the EC security and screening fence criteria.
		Provide a scalable plan.	This comment was made in reference to block lengths. Block lengths range from approximately 280' to 380' (measured from center of intersections).	None.
		The ARB agreed that parking lot trees should be located on the EC side of the fences.	Page 15 of the submittal shows EC trees on the EC side of the fences.	None.
		The ARB agreed that fence designs should not be consistent across individual blocks.	A note on page 17 states that fence designs may differ between Visual Connections.	None.
		The ARB agreed that durability of fence material need not be a consideration.	-	-
		The ARB agreed that non-solid fence designs are not appropriate.	The submittal does not address this.	Revise the criteria to state that fence designs must be solid.
BUILDING ORIENTATION	Building facades facing the EC shall be oriented parallel to the EC street; primary fronts may face the interior of the site. (39b, p12)	Rear elevations facing the corridor are acceptable.	-	None.
BUILDING MATERIALS	Excluded materials are vinyl siding, horizontal or vertical (p. 21) Materials restricted to no more than 10% are: unpainted concrete masonry units; large-flat format metal panels 30" or greater in any one direction; T1-11 (p. 21)	Add vinyl siding to the exclusions.	Vinyl siding has been added as an exclusion.	None.
		Revise the aluminum panel limitation to focus on metal, generally, and on appropriate shape and configuration.	The 10% limit on "large format (30" or greater) aluminum panels has been revised to "large flat format metal panels 30" or greater in any one direction."	None.
		Clarify that "façade" means any/all building elevations, or revise "façade" to "elevation".	The term "façade" is used consistently.	None.

TRANSPARENCY	Elevations facing the EC will have 30% minimum ground story transparency, with transparency measured between 2’ and 12’ above grade. (p. 21) Elevations facing the EC will have 20% minimum upper story transparency, measured floor to floor. (p. 21) ECDG glazing requirements apply. (p. 21)	No changes requested.	The transparency criteria remain as originally proposed.	None.
BUILDING ARTICULATION	Façade segment lengths must be broken by a physical break or visual break through articulation on an interval of 2x building height at minimum. (p. 20) Articulation includes physical breaks in the plane of the wall, such as recesses, of 16” minimum; visual breaks in the plane of the façade including material change; other changes in roof line, parapet breaks, arcades, awnings/canopies. (p. 20) Compliant facades shall use a minimum of 2 of the above strategies. (p. 20)	ARB supports all the recommended articulation changes. A combination of methods may be an option.	-	None.
		Increase the minimum depth of recesses and projections for greater façade articulation detectable from the EC street.	Depth has increased from 6” to 16”.	None.
		Eliminate texture change as a possible method of articulation or require it in combination with other features	Façade articulation criteria now require a minimum of two strategies, one of which is the use of different materials.	None.
		Further clarify the extent of the “change in detailing” needed to qualify as a mass/scale mitigation method.		
		Provide images for consideration illustrating how parapet breaks, arcades, and awnings/canopies can mitigate mass/scale.		
LIGHTING	For buildings along the EC, wall-mounted light fixtures visible from the EC must be mounted on arms extending from the building. (p. 21)	Clarify that criteria to be more specific about what lights with “armatures” allows for.	The clarification stating that wall-mounted fixtures must be on arms extending from the building is sufficient.	None.
SIGNS	No backlit signs, no box or cabinet style signs, no internally illuminated signs, no channel letter signs visible from the EC. (p. 21)	Clarify that the following sign types are not allowed: box and cabinet style signs, internally illuminated signs, channel letters signs.	The sign types have been clarified.	None.
PERMISSIBLE ELEMENTS	Repurposed industrial equipment, railroad cars, storage containers, and other adaptive reuse of elements related to the site’s	The ARB did not object to these elements.	The proposal includes no design criteria particular to these repurposed elements.	Add design criteria to ensure appropriate appearances for repurposed industrial, lumber yard,

	industrial, lumber yard, railroad, and rural context. (p. 22)			railroad, and rural elements.
EXEMPT FROM REVIEW	Seasonal shade devices, including umbrellas, tents, temporary canopies. (p. 24)		Umbrellas have not been subject to ARB review and are not recommended for ARB review at this time. Tents are subject to building code requirements (size and occupancy) and zoning setbacks. ARB review is not recommended as a requirement for tents intended for temporary events. Tents intended for permanent outdoor activities would need to be shown on a site plan and are not recommended to be exempt from EC review.	Revise the criteria to state that tents intended for permanent outdoor activities are subject to EC review and approval.
	Food trucks (p. 24)		Food trucks do not currently require ARB approval. A permanent outdoor dining area associated with a food truck(s) would need to be shown on a site plan. Building Code would apply egress regulations to areas with 50 or more seats. Sanitation requirements would apply. Exemption of permanent outdoor dining areas and associated elements from EC review is not recommended.	Revise the criteria to state that mobile food vendors will comply with relevant Albemarle County policies and regulations.
	Temporary structures as defined by the Virginia Construction Code. (p. 24)		Exemption of structures that otherwise require plans or permits is not recommended	Revise the criteria to state that temporary structures not requiring plans or permits are not subject to EC review.
	Artistic murals occupying less than 20% of the area of a façade visible from the EC. (p. 24)	The ARB said: 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.	Alternatives may include: 1. Murals occupying 20% of a façade that otherwise meets the architectural criteria. 2. Murals occupying 20% of a façade that does not face the EC street.	Revise the criteria to state that murals are not acceptable as treatment for blankness and to provide additional limitations to ensure appropriate appearances for the EC.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Points of Discussion:

Staff recommend the following as the major points of discussion:

1. Are two view corridors sufficient to establish a coordinated and appropriate appearance along the corridor?
2. Murals: Where and what percentage of façade coverage is appropriate?
3. Temporary structures, tents, mobile food vendors: What level of review is appropriate?

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval of the Countywide Criteria with the following changes:

1. Revise this criterion to read, “Any portion of the development that is visible from the Entrance Corridor will require a Certificate of Appropriateness.”
2. Question for ARB discussion: Are two view corridors sufficient to establish a coordinated and appropriate appearance along the corridor?
3. Consider increasing the depth of the tree/fence buffer to 10’ minimum.
4. Revise the criteria to provide trees parallel to the tracks along the full frontage of the development (allowing breaks at the visual connections).
5. Revise the criteria to state that fence height is 6’.
6. Clarify that fence design must comply with the ECDG and the EC security and screening fence criteria.
7. Revise the criteria to state that fence designs must be solid.
8. Add design criteria to ensure appropriate appearances for repurposed industrial, lumber yard, railroad, and rural elements.
9. Revise the criteria to state that tents intended for permanent outdoor activities are subject to EC review and approval.
10. Revise the criteria to state that mobile food vendors will comply with relevant Albemarle County policies and regulations.
11. Revise the criteria to state that murals are not acceptable as treatment for blankness and to provide additional limitations to ensure appropriate appearances for the EC.
12. Revise the criteria to state that temporary structures not requiring plans or permits are not subject to EC review.

ATTACHMENTS

- Attach. 1: [ARB-2023-107: Barnes Lumber revised application materials Jan 3, 2025](#)
Attach. 2: [ARB-2023-107: Barnes Lumber original application materials Nov 20, 2023](#)
Attach. 3: [ARB-2023-107: Barnes Lumber Jan 2024 staff report](#)
Attach. 4: [ARB-2023-107: Barnes Lumber Jan 2024 ARB action letter](#)
Attach. 5: [ARB-2023-107: Barnes Lumber interim staff comments Sep 2024](#)
Attach. 6: [Albemarle County Mobile Food Vendor FAQs](#)