



FINAL RB ACTION MEMO / MINUTES

Date: May 26, 2026

Time: 1:00 PM

Meeting Room: Lane Auditorium

Members:

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

Staff:

Margaret Maliszewski
Khris Taggart

CALL TO ORDER: Mr. Henningsen called the meeting to order at 1:06 p.m. and established a quorum.

DISCLOSURES: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

CONSENT AGENDA: None.

REGULAR REVIEW ITEMS:

a. ARB-2026-00006 Car Lovers Rio – Major Amendment

Location: 1083 Rio Road

Proposal: To remove the existing vacuum islands and associated travelway configuration and establish a new layout with seven parking spaces and seven vacuum stations.

Staff: Khris Taggart

Representatives: Julia Moore and Justin Shimp, Shimp Engineering; Remus Witt, site manager; Matt Bascom; site owner

Khris Taggart summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members had no questions for staff. Julia Moore represented the applicant and clarified that the existing canopy on the building is to be removed and that the four pole lights with the existing vacuums are to be

removed. She said the applicant is on board with most of the recommendations but had a few questions. She wanted to confirm that black is a neutral color and showed an image of the equipment in the color. She said they want to keep the tube lighting. They have limited output (less than 3000 lumens), there are pole fixtures that will be removed, and they will use lamps with 3000K color temperature. ARB members asked if an architectural canopy to integrate the site had been considered (no, it would be more expensive), if there were specs for the shrubs on Rio (evergreens planted at 24" high), and if the tube lights would always be on (they run on a photocell). She confirmed that siding to match existing will be used where the canopy and equipment are being removed. No members of the public spoke about the proposal. In discussion, the ARB members agreed that the proposal will improve the site, that there is a missed opportunity in not pursuing an architectural solution for the canopies, that more consistent lighting and equipment is positive, and that the landscaping will help align the site with the EC guidelines. The members felt that black was more appropriate than the blue color and that the integral lights could provide a more cohesive appearance. The ARB discussed the tube lights and questioned if they create glare and if they were full cutoff. Staff noted that the tube lights were not approved with previous applications. A night-time photo of the illuminated vacuums would be helpful. The applicant said that they would not be very bright in the context and said that the same setup is in Roanoke and the tops of the tubes are blacked out, bringing them closer to full cutoff. The applicant offered to provide additional information after researching it further.

Motion: Mr. Henningsen moved to provide the applicant with the comments listed in the staff report, amended as follows, to be addressed with the next submittal:

1. Revise the site plan to show the locations of the existing equipment along the south side of the building.
2. Revise the submittal to show how the proposed vacuum equipment relates to the existing canopy along the south elevation. Provide an elevation.
3. Revise the site plan to show a double staggered row of evergreen shrubs in the frontage planting area.
4. Revise the site plan to include a double staggered row of evergreen shrubs along the perimeter of the diagonally striped paved area near the southeast corner of the site.
5. Revise the plans to show that the vacuums and related equipment will use a neutral color. Identify the color on the plan. Provide a sample with the next submittal. Black is considered a neutral color.
6. Revise the plan set to add "Demolition" to the title of sheet C1.
7. Revise the site plan to indicate that equipment is only approved in the locations specified on the plan. Any new equipment will require review and approval.
8. Revise the lighting plan to remove the tube lighting from the vacuum equipment or demonstrate that it is full cutoff.
9. If pole or building-mounted lighting is proposed, it must meet Guideline requirements:
 - a. Lighting levels not exceeding 20 fc.
 - b. Spillover not exceeding .5 fc.
 - c. Full cut off fixtures.
 - d. Freestanding pole heights not exceeding 20' including the base.
 - e. Wall and freestanding fixture finishes that are either dark brown, dark bronze, or black.
 - f. Lighting with a color temperature of warm white (2000K-3000K)
10. Revise the lighting plan to identify existing pole-mounted fixtures in the lighting schedule. Update the photometrics to include their illumination levels.

11. Revise the landscape schedule to specify the planting height not the mature height.
12. Revise the existing conditions and site layout sheets to show all landscaping that exists within the site.
13. Revise the proposal to include a coordinated landscape design, including evergreen screening, along Rio Rd. and Gasoline Alley. Note that some existing shrubs may need to be removed to accomplish a coordinated design.
14. Revise the site plan to provide two trees along the southeast corner of the site.
15. Revise the site plan to include the standard plant health note.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

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

b. ARB-2026-00008 Veterinary Emergency Group Site Plan

Location: North corner of the intersection of Hydraulic Road and Swanson Drive

Proposal: To construct a veterinary clinic with associated site improvements.

Staff: Margaret Maliszewski

Representatives: Juanita Li and Bob Pinneo, Design Develop, LLC

Margaret Maliszewski summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Van Der Werf asked staff for details on the proposed retaining wall block and railing (Ridgerock Plus with Standard Cap in Eastern Gray). Bob Pinneo and Juanita Li represented the applicant and addressed the ARB, sharing a revised architectural elevation to address comments in the staff report, particularly incorporating some elements from the front elevation for a more cohesive design. The applicants presented sample building materials. ARB members said they appreciated the challenges of the site. Mr. Van Der Werf wondered if there were lessons to be taken from the cinema design with a site wall and layered landscape. He suggested considering something more muted, more uniform and layered, and possibly enhancing the corner. Other back elevations in the complex might also be considered. Mr. Stoner questioned the windows (the client wants as few as possible) and noted that the revised design without the windows was better; asked if wall-mounted signs would be proposed (yes; the approved Comprehensive Sign Plan will need to be updated to include this building); suggested that additional evergreen landscaping may compensate for less architectural detail in this case; for example, 4-5' tall evergreens and lattice panels with vines as used elsewhere in the center. Members suggested that the revised massing was an improvement and that projecting the center mass out would be appropriate and consistent with other buildings in the center. Materiality may transition from the front to the back. Mr. Stoner suggested that the orange composite panels might not be worth the expense on the EC side. Members generally agreed that the change in massing was moving in the right direction and that a layered landscape would be helpful.

Motion: Mr. Matsuno moved to provide the applicant with the comments listed in the staff report to be addressed with the next submittal:

1. Revise the design of the south elevation to present an appropriate appearance for the Entrance Corridor, to eliminate the back of building character, and to coordinate better with similar sized buildings in the shopping center. Revisions to the location and treatment of bays, the position of window/door openings within bays, the relation between the roof screen and the

bays, and the detailing of the bays are recommended. Revise side elevations to maintain coordination.

2. Indicate the proposed color of the Hardi siding on the drawings.
3. Add a note to the plan stating that window glass will meet the criteria: VLT not below 40% and VLR not above 30%.
4. Integrate the equipment screening with the overall architectural design as viewed from Hydraulic Road.
5. Add the standard mechanical equipment note to the site plan: "Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated."
6. Add the lighting information to the site plan amendment drawings. Provide a luminaire schedule that shows conformity with the Entrance Corridor lighting guidelines. Indicate the intensity of illumination from the proposed fixtures at ground level. Show that it does not exceed 20 fc.
7. Include the standard lighting note on 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."
8. Revise the site/grading plan to show the row of Arborvitae along the cinema.
9. Provide additional information in the plan to show how the trimming of the Arborvitae will result in an appropriate appearance and a healthy condition for the trees.
10. Revise the retaining wall material and color to coordinate closely with the adjacent Stonefield sign and the building across Swanson Drive.
11. Revise the site plan to include details describing the appearance of the safety rail.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

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

WORK SESSION: None

OTHER BUSINESS

a. Minutes Approval:

Motion: Mr. Henningsen moved for approval of the minutes from the May 18, 2026, 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: Monday, June 8, 2026, 1:00 PM – Lane Auditorium

Members present indicated that they planned to attend the June 8 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:23 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Monday, June 8, 2026, at 1:00 p.m.