



COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
Department of Community Development
401 McIntire Road, North Wing
Charlottesville, Virginia 22902-4596
(434) 296 - 5823
Fax (434) 972 - 4012

ARB FINAL ACTION MEMO

Date: August 19, 2019
Time: 1:00 PM
Meeting Room: Conference Room 241

Members:

Stan Binsted, Chair: Present
Dade Van Der Werf, Vice-Chair: Present
Frank Stoner: Absent
Frank Hancock: Present
Bruce Wardell: Present

Staff:

Margaret Maliszewski
Carolyn Shaffer

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Binsted called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. and established a quorum.

DISCLOSURES

None.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

Regular Review Items

- a. **ARB-2019-83: Harbor Freight at Northtown Center**, Revisions to a Comprehensive Site Plan, (TM/Parcel 04500000011000)

Location: 440 Gander Drive

Proposal: To revise an approved Comprehensive Sign Plan to accommodate Harbor Freight signs.

Motion: Mr. Hancock moved to approve the changes to the Comprehensive Sign Plan with the conditions outlined in the staff report, as follows.

1. Revise the CSP criteria table as follow:
 - a. Note that the letter heights are maximums, not entitlements
 - b. Note that signs must never appear over-scaled within the architectural element, the wall, or the sign area
 - c. Add: Backgrounds of tag line cabinets must be opaque
 - d. Add: Tagline cabinet size must be secondary to the channel letter sign in size and scale
 - e. Clarify that acceptable shades of blues fall within this range: Pantone 280, 281, 282, 286, 287, 288, 289, 293, 294, 295, 296, 301, 302, 303, 2945, 2955, and 2965; and acceptable shades of red fall within this range: 1797, 1807, 186, 187, 193, 194, 1935, 1945, 1955, 200, 201, and 202.

Mr. Van Der Werf seconded the motion.

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

- b. **ARB-2019-84: Georgetown Hydraulic**, Preliminary Site Development Plan and Architectural Drawings, (TM/Parcel 060F000000300)

Location: Northwest corner of Hydraulic Road (Rt. 743) and Georgetown Road.

Proposal: To develop a previously-undeveloped 1.05-acre parcel with a 6,775-sf office building and associated improvements.

Regarding the Code of Development

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved to forward the following recommendations to the Agent:

The proposal meets each of the requirements of the Code to a sufficient degree.

Mr. Wardell seconded the motion.

The motion carried by a vote of 4:0.

Regarding the Preliminary Site Plan and Architectural Design

The ARB offered the following comments to be addressed with the Final Site Plan submittal:

1. Submit revised elevations with legible linework that accurately illustrates the brick patterns and detailing.
2. Provide material samples (glazing and metal) for review.
3. Clarify the materials key on Sheet A201 and provide details of the corbeled bricks. Clarify where brick arches are implemented.
4. Provide detailing of architectural relief, canopies and cornice.
5. Provide the standard window glass note to the architectural drawings: *Window glass in the Entrance Corridors should meet the following criteria: Visible light transmittance (VLT) shall not drop below 40%. Visible light reflectance (VLR) shall not exceed 30%.*
6. Provide manufacturer's specifications on the glazing for the Final Site Plan review.

7. Consider revising the tower roof detail.
8. If a refuse area is proposed, show it on the site plan and include details of the dumpster enclosure in the site plan.
9. Substitute evergreen trees with a height over 10' at maturity for the 5 viburnums presently proposed on the southeast corner and the 3 viburnums presently proposed on the northeast corner of the building.
10. Provide the top- and bottom-of-wall heights for the retaining walls surrounding the proposed ground-mounted HVAC units in the southeast and northeast corners of the building. Provide material samples for the retaining walls and provide a detail of the walls on the site plan set.
11. Relocate the landscape island and tree at the western edge of the parking area away from the stormwater outlet.
12. Include the mechanical equipment note on the site plan set and architectural drawings: *Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated.*
13. Provide a lighting plan for review that includes a photometric plan, a luminaire schedule, and manufacturer's cut sheets for all proposed wall-mounted and freestanding fixtures.
14. Provide the standard lighting note verbatim on the lighting plan submitted for the Final Site Plan review: *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.*
15. Ensure that no proposed tree conflicts with an existing or proposed utility or its easement and that large shade trees are placed a minimum of 7 feet from the center of a utility line. If trees are placed in easements, provide documentation from the easement holders that the vegetation is permissible.
16. Revise the site plan set to show all utilities and easements consistently throughout the site plan set.
17. Provide a note that the ginkgoes planted will not be female.
18. Provide four trees in the parking area at a minimum of 2.5" caliper. Update the plant schedule on Sheet 5 to reflect this change.
19. Ensure that no proposed tree conflicts with an existing or proposed utility or its easement.
20. Consider substituting locally native species for the non-native plants proposed.
21. Provide at least two more evergreen shrub species so that no one species of shrub proposed exceeds, in number, one-quarter of the total number of shrubs proposed.
22. Rectify errors in the plant schedule on Sheet 5.
23. Provide all site elements required by the Proffers and Code of Development approved with ZMA-2006-14, including a widened sidewalk; an entry plaza with picnic tables; a bicycle rack; and a bus shelter. Show these site elements on the site plan.
24. Provide additional vegetation on the retaining walls in the southwest and northwest corners of the parking area.
25. Provide details of the proposed retaining walls in the site plan set and submit material and color samples for review. Retaining walls over six feet must be terraced and landscaped.
26. Provide sufficient tree protection fencing around those trees to be preserved and clearly differentiate between trees to be removed and those to be retained on Sheet 2 of the site plan set.

ADVISORY REVIEW ITEMS

a. ZMA-2019-08: Parkway Place

Location: 878 E. Rio Road

Proposal: To rezone approximately 27.31 acres from the residential (R4) Zoning District to Planned Residential Development (PRD) to establish a multi-family apartment community consisting of nine 3-story apartment buildings, a clubhouse, and associated improvements.

In consensus, the ARB provided the following advisory comments in response to the questions outlined in the staff report:

Building Massing/Scale

1. Are the form, mass, scale and detailing of the apartment buildings, as illustrated in the conceptual drawings, sensitive to the surroundings and appropriate for the Rio East and Parkway Entrance Corridors? **Finding ways to reduce uniformity and add diversity in architectural character, materials and colors would be more appropriate.**
2. Are the building lengths acceptable as shown? **For the buildings adjacent to the Parkway, find ways to break up the mass, possibly offsetting or staggering portions of the buildings, once if not twice, in addition to the current projections and bays.**
3. Is the 3-story building height (at a raised elevation) appropriate for buildings in the proposed locations? **Yes, provided that the proposed landscape can be incorporated and maintained.**
4. Would a mix of building heights be appropriate? **Two-story hyphens could allow the roofline to break in a meaningful way.** If so, what locations would most benefit from reduced building height? **These would be most appropriate along Parkway. It is less important for internal buildings.**
5. Is human scale exhibited in the proposal, **Yes.** or is it anticipated that human scale will be easily achievable in the proposed development? **Porches and material changes help.**
6. Are connecting devices necessary? **No.**

Trailhead Park

7. Does the illustrated trailhead park have an appropriate appearance for the Entrance Corridor? **Yes.**
8. Are revisions to the form, layout, character or treatment of the park required to make it appropriate for the EC? **The ARB should be allowed to review the design proposal.**
9. Are there any concerns about structures or equipment in the trailhead park? **The ARB should be allowed to review the design proposal.**
10. What treatments, if any, are required to make accessory structures and outdoor art appropriate for the EC? **The ARB should be allowed to review the design proposal.**

Landscaping, Lighting

11. Is the impact of the illumination of the site on the EC a concern? The ARB **endorsed staff's recommendation regarding extension of the buffer around parking area. Lighting will be reviewed with the site plan.**
12. Should large shade trees be added along the Parkway, consistent with standard EC Guidelines (large shade trees, 35' on center, 3½" caliper at planting with interspersed ornamentals)? **A more naturalistic configuration is appropriate, but an equivalent density (to EC frontage planting requirement) would be appropriate.**
13. Is a landscape buffer needed between the buildings and the park easement (in addition to the standard frontage planting)? **Confirm that planting in the easement is allowed. Confirm**

that there will be a mechanism for continued maintenance. The buffer is needed. Details on the contents of the buffer can be reviewed with the site plan.

14. If so, what is the appropriate character? (minimum height at planting, double-staggered row, mix of deciduous and evergreen, all evergreen, what is semi-opaque?) Details on the contents of the buffer can be reviewed with the site plan.
 - a. If so, how far should the buffer extend? Should Building 7 and nearby parking areas be screened from the Parkway? Yes.
15. Should screening be provided along the western perimeter of the parking lot to limit impacts of lighting on the Parkway? Yes.

The ARB offered the following comments on the application plan:

1. Consider varying building heights, varying buildings masses, and increased tree planting to offset visual impacts.
2. Provide landscaping along the Parkway in a naturalistic configuration, but at an equivalent density to the EC frontage planting requirement.
3. A landscape buffer is required along the northwest and southwest perimeters of the building/parking area. A 50'-deep mixed planting in a naturalistic arrangement is required.
4. Add trees in the open areas between the creek and the developed area to help limit visual impacts of the development.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. Signs and EIFS

It was the consensus of the ARB that synthetic stucco can be used for signs regardless of the material to which it is attached. However, the condition where the sign meets the ground must be addressed. 8" of a durable solid material (not EIFS) must be provided at the base unless the sign is located in a landscape bed whose design avoids potential maintenance issues of EIFS at the ground.

b. Wawa at Proffit Road

Regarding the changes in the building permit drawings, it was the consensus of the ARB that the pilaster cap should remain precast stone and Stone 4 should remain grey, but the aluminum parapet fascia could change from grey to white, the Stone 5 color could change from grey to eggshell, and the dark bronze storefront could change to white.

c. Minutes Approval: None.

d. Next ARB Meeting: September 3, 2019 (Tuesday)

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Tuesday, September 3, 2019 (Tuesday) in Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, County Office Building at 1:00 p.m.