



FINAL ARB ACTION MEMO / MINUTES

Date: January 5, 2026

Time: 1:00 PM

Meeting Room: Lane Auditorium

Members:

Chris Henningsen, Chair: Present
Frank Hancock, Vice-Chair: Absent
Frank Stoner: Present
Dade Van Der Werf: Present
Taro Matsuno: Present

Staff:

Margaret Maliszewski

CALL TO ORDER: Ms. Maliszewski called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

ANNUAL MEETING

- A. Election of Chair: Mr. Stoner nominated, and Mr. Van Der Werf seconded, Mr. Henningsen for Chairperson. The ARB voted 3:0 (Henningsen abstained, Hancock absent) in favor of the motion.

Ms. Maliszewski turned the meeting over to Mr. Henningsen.

- B. Election of Vice-Chair: Mr. Matsuno nominated, and Mr. Henningsen seconded, Mr. Hancock for Vice-Chair. The ARB voted 4:0 (Hancock absent) in favor of the motion.
- C. Adopt ARB 2025 Submittal and Meeting Schedule: Mr. Van Der Werf motioned and Mr. Henningsen seconded acceptance of the ARB 2025 Submittal and Meeting Schedule. The ARB voted 4:0 (Hancock absent) in favor of the motion.
- D. Adopt ARB Rules of Procedure: Mr. Henningsen motioned and Mr. Stoner seconded acceptance of the Rules of Procedure without changes. The ARB voted 4:0 (Hancock absent) in favor of the motion.

DISCLOSURES: Mr. Henningsen disclosed that he would recuse himself from the Crozet FasMart discussion because he worked on the original design of the building.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

CONSENT AGENDA: None.

REGULAR REVIEW ITEMS:

- a. **ARB-2025-30: Microaire Final Site Plan**

Location: 3590 Grand Farks Blvd

Proposal: To construct an office addition on the north side of the building and to undertake related site improvements.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski
Representative: Chuck Rapp, Collins Engineering

Ms. Maliszewski summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members had no questions for staff. Chuck Rapp addressed the ARB and summarized the proposal. Austin Williams and Morris Younathan (MCA Architecture) attended virtually to address architectural questions. ARB members asked about reconciling the color datum of the existing building (white bands maintained at top and bottom of wall), the possibility of extending the windows on the EC elevation (no), and the projection of the colored metal (yes, 6 – 12”). No members of the public wanted to speak to the application. In discussion, the ARB members said that the contemporary design was appropriate because of the fenestration, entrances, and human scale. The level of visibility of the stormwater facility and the mechanical equipment were noted.

Motion: Mr. Stoner moved for approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for ARB-2025-00030: Microaire with the conditions listed in the staff report, amended as follows:

1. Add the standard mechanical equipment note to the architectural plans: “Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated.”
2. Eliminate Site Note 1 on sheet 2 of the site plan.
3. Consider extending some of the stormwater basin shrubs and grasses into the frontage planting to better integrate the landscape throughout the site.
4. Revise the lighting plan to consistently show footcandle readings carried out to the property line or to 0 fc.
5. Ensure that illumination does not exceed 20 fc on site.
6. Revise the Luminaire Schedule to show a color temperature of 30K for all new light fixtures.
7. Revise the luminaire schedule to show that poles and fixtures will have a bronze finish.
8. Revise the lighting plan to show a maximum fixture mounting height of 20’, including the base.
9. Add the standard lighting note to the site 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.”
10. Revise the plan to clearly show the extent of the proposed permanent utility easement.
11. Revise the plant schedule to only include plants from the County’s approved list.
12. Correct and coordinate the location of the existing monument sign and related landscaping throughout the site plan.
13. Note that a separate sign application is required for moving the existing freestanding sign and/or erecting a new sign.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.
The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0 (Hancock absent).

b. ARB-2025-31: Airport Industrial Final Site Plan

Location: Northside of Airport Road., north and east of Timberwood Blvd.

Proposal: To construct a building to house light industrial flex office space, with associated site improvements.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski
Representative: Chuck Rapp, Collins Engineering; Palmer Ferguson, CJMW Architecture; Huner Wood, United Land Corp.

Ms. Maliszewski summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Matsuno asked staff to show again some views from the street. Chuck Rapp addressed the ARB and summarized the proposal. ARB members asked the applicant if there would be street trees on the other side of the travelway south of Building 1 (yes), if the architecture team had ideas for color/detail changes for the blank areas (no, but willing to investigate; stucco panels are knock-out panels for future doors/windows), and about landscaping in the triangular bed south of Building 1 (more is possible; eventually a building will provide screening). No members of the public wanted to speak about the application. In discussion, ARB members said that a landscape buffer can successfully offset blankness, the distance from the street is a mitigating factor, a color change and additional attention to landscaping south of Building 1 would be appropriate.

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved for approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for ARB-2025-00031: Airport Industrial with the conditions listed in the staff report, amended as follows:

1. Provide an alternate treatment for the central concrete bay of the EC-facing elevation of Building 1 to relieve blankness. Consider additional landscape screening as an alternative.
2. Provide typical treatments for knock-out panels for review.
3. Replace the “sky high” concrete stain color with an earth tone.
4. Indicate on the plans the materials of the overhead and pedestrian doors.
5. Remove Site Note #1 from Sheet 2 of the site plan.
6. Add the standard mechanical equipment note to the architectural plans: “Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated.”
7. Revise the lighting plan to limit the color temperature of all lamps to 3000K.
8. Revise the lighting plan to indicate the color proposed for the light poles.
9. 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.”
10. Revise the planting size of the trees along the extension of Timberwood Blvd. to 2½” caliper.
11. Increase the planting size of interior and perimeter parking lot trees to 2½” caliper.
12. Revise the plant schedule to provide replacements for Ilex crenata and taxus x media densiformis that are found on the County’s approved list.

Mr. Matsuno seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0 (Hancock absent).

WORK SESSIONS

a. ARB-2025-22: Crozet FasMart Amendment

Location: 1248 Crozet Avenue

Proposal: To paint the exterior of the building.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representative: Eric Warner, GPM Investments

Ms. Maliszewski summarized the history and design alternatives for the project in a PowerPoint presentation. Eric Warner addressed the ARB, summarized the proposal, and shared images of buildings with painted masonry in the vicinity of the project site. ARB members asked if limewash was considered (yes) and confirmed that the proposed roof color matches the existing. No members of the public wanted to speak about the application. In discussion, the ARB members appreciated the contextual photos. Mr. Matsuno said his preference was to not paint the building, that Option 1 was the best of those offered, but

couldn't support painting as proposed. Mr. Stoner agreed that Option 1 was the best of those presented but thought that painting the column bases a different color felt awkward. He thought Fashionable Gray was a better choice for the brick and was OK with the red cupola roof. Mr. Van Der Werf noted that the subject building was different from the others in design and detail. He did not support using opaque paint, wanted to see a limewash proposal (renderings or photos), and wanted Frank Hancock to consider the options. Some ARB members said that the simpler designs were better. A lighter gray for the roof and a light lime wash were recommended.

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved to consider alternate coatings, for example, lime wash in a future work session.

Mr. Matsuno seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 3:0 (Henningsen recused, Hancock absent).

OTHER BUSINESS

a. Minutes Approval:

Motion: Mr. Henningsen moved for approval of the minutes from the December 15, 2025, ARB meeting.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0 (Hancock absent).

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

c. Next ARB Meeting: Tuesday January 20, 2026, 1:00 PM – Lane Auditorium

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:25 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Tuesday January 20, 2026, at 1:00 p.m.