



---

## FINAL ARB ACTION MEMO MINUTES

**Date:** October 6, 2025

**Time:** 1:00 PM

**Meeting Room:** Lane Auditorium

**Members:**

Chris Henningsen, Chair: Present  
Frank Hancock, Vice-Chair: Present  
Frank Stoner: Present  
Taro Matsuno: Present  
Dade Van Der Werf: Present (left at 1:45 PM)

**Staff:** Margaret Maliszewski  
Mariah Gleason

**CALL TO ORDER:** Mr. Henningsen called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

**DISCLOSURES:** Mr. Van Der Werf said that he would need to leave the meeting at 1:45. Mr. Henningsen disclosed that he would recuse himself from the Fasmart discussion because he worked with the firm on the original building design.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

**CONSENT AGENDA:** None

**REGULAR REVIEW ITEMS:**

**a. ARB-2025-22: Fasmart Store – Major Amendment**

**Location:** 1248 Crozet Avenue

**Proposal:** To revise the exterior of the building by painting it black and adding Nichiha panels on a portion of the side elevation.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski  
Representative: Eric Warner, GPM Investments

Mr. Henningsen recused himself from the discussion. Margaret Maliszewski summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members had no questions for staff. Eric Warner with GPM Investments represented the applicant and addressed the ARB, noting the amount of money

being spent on the project, that most of the work was interior to the building to remove a derelict Dairy Queen business, and that an exterior change is needed to alert the community to the change. He summarized the proposed changes. Mr. Van Der Werf asked why black was chosen (it is the new brand color being used on all exterior renovations). Mr. Stoner asked to see pictures of other completed facilities. Mr. Matsuno asked to see a color sample. Mr. Warner said that the color is a dark gray – not black. In discussion, Mr. Matsuno said that pictures of other locations may help, but he wasn't sure that painting the brick is an appropriate response, though he wasn't entirely opposed to a color change for the brick. He agreed that a painted coating would distract from the texture, but a stain or limewash might detract less from the materiality. Mr. Van Der Werf said that the black would be a stark contrast and outside the precedents, that this building has been identified as a successful example of meeting the guidelines, and that limewash might be more contextual. Mr. Hancock agreed and said that black paint downplays the detailing and elements that are consistent with the guidelines; that black is more of a contemporary color, and something would be lost if the building is painted black. Mr. Stoner said that he didn't think the black paint would fit, but light gray might. He asked what the color would look like in real life. Mr. Warner asked for ideas to let the community know something has changed. An example of a Fasmart in Ashland, VA was shown. Other locations were under construction but did not yet appear in Streetview. Mr. Stoner said he was sympathetic to retail branding, but the examples cited were contemporary. He asked if a black roof would be appropriate and said he did not support black as the brick color. Mr. Hancock agreed that black was not appropriate. Mr. Matsuno asked if replacing the monument sign, using a different brick, would work. Mr. Warner said that a red roof on the cupola (above the clock that is to be replaced) might be an option.

**Motion:** Mr. Van Der Werf made a motion for the applicant to return to the ARB with revisions to be discussed in a work session.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0 (Henningsen recused)

## **WORK SESSION:**

### **b. ZTA2024-01: Rio29 Form-Based Code Update**

Mariah Gleason summarized the changes to the Form-Based Code in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members asked for clarification on the priority of street types, asked how this would work with an optional code, suggested that small – medium trees would not provide sufficient shade for pedestrians, asked if the tree and lighting requirements were coordinated with VDOT (the code is under review by VDOT), and recognized that the revisions are a natural response to aspects of the code have proven problematic in practice. After discussion, it was the consensus of the ARB that staff should return for another work session after additional research on trees and lighting.

Mr. Van Der Werf left the meeting at 1:45 PM.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **a. Minutes Approval:**

**Motion:** Mr. Henningsen moved for approval of the minutes from the September 29, 2025, ARB meeting.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

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

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

**c. Next ARB Meeting: Monday, October 20, 2025, 1:00 PM** – Lane Auditorium

Members present indicated that they intended to attend the meeting.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:11 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Monday, October 20, 2025, at 1:00 p.m.