

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**January 7, 2019**

The Albemarle County Architectural Review Board met on Monday, January 7, 2019, 1:00 p.m., Room 241, Second Floor, County Office Building, Charlottesville, Virginia. Those members present were Stan Binsted, Chair; Frank Hancock, Frank Stoner, Dade Van Der Werf, Vice-Chair and Bruce Wardell.

Staff present were Heather McMahon, Sharon Taylor and Margaret Maliszewski.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Wardell called the meeting to order at 1:04 p.m. and established a quorum.

**DISCLOSURES**

Mr. Wardell invited disclosures. Hearing none, the meeting moved to the next item.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Wardell invited public comment. There being none, the meeting proceeded.

**ANNUAL MEETING**

**a. Establish day, time and place of regular meetings**

The ARB confirmed that the 2019 meeting schedule was approved on November 13, 2018.

**b. Elect Chair**

**Motion:** Mr. Stoner nominated Mr. Binsted for Chairperson for 2019.

Mr. Van Der Werf seconded the motion.

Mr. Binsted was elected Chair by a vote of 5:0.

Mr. Wardell turned the meeting over to the new Chair. Mr. Binsted invited nominations for Vice-Chair.

**c. Elect Vice-Chair**

**Motion:** Mr. Wardell nominated Mr. Van Der Werf for Vice-Chairperson for 2019.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

Mr. Van Der Werf was elected Vice-Chair by a vote of 5:0.

The meeting moved to the next item.

**REGULAR REVIEW ITEMS**

a. **ARB-2018-154: Hyatt House at Stonefield Town Center** - Preliminary Review of a Major Site Plan Amendment; preliminary review of an architectural design (TM/Parcel 061W00300019A0 -portion)

**Proposal:** To construct a six-story (maximum 80 feet tall) hotel building encompassing 92,247 square feet and a single-story retail component encompassing 12,567 square feet on an undeveloped, 1.04-acre portion of this parcel.

**Location/Context:** The site is situated approximately 475 feet north of Hydraulic Road and approximately 830 feet west of Seminole Trail (Route 29), within The Shops at Stonefield town center. Commercial enterprises as well as services characterize the area: the Hyatt Place hotel lies to the immediate west, across District Avenue, and various restaurants and retail businesses lie to the south and east, along Bond Street. The lot has been cleared and graded and is currently vacant.

**Staff Presentation:**

Ms. McMahon summarized the proposal as follows:

This is a preliminary review of a major site plan amendment and preliminary review of an architectural design. The proposal is to construct a six-story (maximum 80 feet tall) hotel building encompassing 92,000 square feet and a single-story retail component encompassing 12,000 square feet on an undeveloped, 1.04-acre portion of this parcel, which is currently a grassy undeveloped area in the Stonefield Town Center. Commercial enterprises and services characterize the area; the lot has been cleared and graded but it is currently vacant.

The site is situated approximately 475 feet north of Hydraulic Road and approximately 830 feet west of Seminole Trail (Route 29). Given the proposed height and placement, the site will have maximum visibility from Hydraulic Road and by District Avenue through the surface parking lot south of the Hyatt Place Hotel. The Regal Cinema and retail buildings further block visibility of the lower story's view. The hotel will also be visible from the intersection of Commonwealth Drive and Hydraulic as you travel eastward, and the upper portions of the side (east) elevation and rear (north) elevation will be visible from Seminole Trail (Route 29). This development was originally called Albemarle Place and the ARB has reviewed various site plans for the development from 2005 through 2016. This is the first review of the Hyatt House Hotel proposal that the ARB will have seen, and it is proposed in the open space directly across District Avenue from the Hyatt Place Hotel, which the ARB reviewed in 2011.

Extending nearly 80' from grade, the scale of the building mirrors the Hyatt Place Hotel directly across District Avenue, however, know that the maximum height requested, 80', will require a special exception as the Code of Development for Stonefield requires that any building taller than five stories in Block D receive a special exception from the Board of Supervisors. The six-story Hyatt Place Hotel received a special exception for height in May 2011. The southwest corner tower is the dominant feature; it is capped with a wide flat roof; the amount of the coping between the tops of the tower elements and the bottom of the deep eave roof, which is about 9', suggests that it may be used as a sign band. As you can see, the Hyatt House in the upper right and some other hotels use this area for signage.

Know that the County Code limits wall sign height to the cornice line of the building and, where no cornice exists, to the corresponding line along the top of the wall where a cornice would usually be located. So, in all cases, the cornice line applies to the main walls of the building and not to features that extend above the main walls. Hence, in the proposed Hyatt House design, the top of a sign may not be placed any higher than 65'-6", which is the top of the hotel block's main walls.

Mr. Wardell asked if it was the white walls.

Ms. McMahon replied that it was the white walls which project above the main walls that project and the definition is that in all cases the cornice line applies to the main walls of the building and not to features that extend above the main walls. She noted this is a protruding feature that extends above the main wall and thinks it is considered the main wall area. Ms. McMahon said she believes that signage is just shown here in a conceptual state and the applicants will have to come back for a sign permit.

Furthermore, the ARB has reviewed another hotel project with a similarly over-scaled, single-slope roof on its tower, in which the intent was coping illumination. Any illumination of the broad expanse at this height would be inconsistent with previous ARB approvals and it would make the building significantly more noticeable at night and from greater distances. It would not contribute to the unity and coherence along the corridor. Lastly, the corner tower with a flat roof is a format not traditionally found in architecture in the area; staff has recommended reducing the dominance of the tower form by reducing its mass or eliminating the over-scaled single-sloped roof.

This is a trademark design, similar to the Hyatt House in Raleigh, N.C. as shown in the slide. The marked difference between the two is the opacity of the ground level: the urban Hyatt House in Raleigh exhibits a large storefront window system across the entire façade that wraps around the corner onto the side elevation, while the proposed model in Albemarle has a less-transparent ground floor (stone veneer with rectangular apertures) until the retail component (with storefront windows) at the east end of the site is encountered.

In terms of materials and colors the first floor is clad in a stone veneer, which was previously approved for the Hyatt Place Hotel. While the upper floors consist of EIFS panels in shades of white, Sherwood Williams classic light buff and gray, as well as black fox. The color palette compliments the other buildings in Stonefield, however, the number of items is inappropriate for the size, mass for a building that is built from two Entrance Corridors. The Hyatt Place Hotel used a greater combination of materials including two shades of brick veneer, a stone pier, EIFS (stucco) and Alpolc copper panels. In a hierarchy of materials by quality, EIFS is at the low end of the spectrum; again, a building of this size and prominence should utilize higher quality materials in its design. Therefore, staff has recommended that the applicant revise the architectural design to reduce the amount of EIFS used and to increase materials that reflect traditional architecture of the area.

Planning staff has identified concerns with the site layout that include open space and parking requirements as established by the Code of Development for Stonefield. After my presentation Andrew Gast-Bray, Director of Planning, would like to address these concerns, however, note that in the staff report states that while there is currently an excess of parking within Stonefield, which this project proposes to utilize, other future developments in Block D could create shortages. Hence, incorporating structured parking into the hotel project should be considered at this time. In addition, staff has recommended that the proposal include the necessary open space to fulfill the Code of Development requirements.

Lastly, staff recommends the following as the primary points of discussion following Andrew Gast-Bray's and the applicant's presentations:

1. The need for a Special Exception for the proposed height.
2. Roof form on the tower.
3. Proposed building materials (appropriateness of the amount of EIFS proposed for a building of this scale, size, and prominence on two Entrance Corridors).
4. Appropriate landscaping of the courtyard wall and south elevation
5. Correction: Increasing the translucency, decreasing the opacity of the first floor on the south and east elevations.

Ms. McMahon offered to answer questions.

Mr. Binsted invited Mr. Gast-Bray to speak.

Andrew Gast-Bray, Director of Planning, said as Heather McMahon described the proposal does not happen in a vacuum, there were originally Code of Development requirements with the Stonefield site as a whole, whereas he did not think that what you are looking at today really requires us to delve into details on this, but it would be helpful to understand the context of some of the things around so that you can better get a feel for how this design contextualizes with connections in the area and as Heather mentioned the greenspace.

Mr. Gast-Bray said in Stonefield in the original Code of Development there were requirements for mixed use vertical which this is actually doing a better job of achieving than the original, but they wanted to phase if you remember in Stonefield because of the economy so that this is actually coming closer to achieving the original intent of Stonefield from that perspective. He said that connections were important and this site itself may not be the required place, but as you saw in the illustration where they talked about what is not Bond Street, which is the main street of Stonefield that goes between the Burger Bach and the Cinema. He said that is a key corridor and there has been some landscape that has been proposed – things have moved – the original Hyatt moved closer to align Bond Street and as a result the original green space that was there. Mr. Gast-Bray said originally the Hyatt was supposed to be back a little bit and then this was sort of the green space area. He said they moved this building forward in order to have a better alignment with Bond Street, and that is all good and as a result this is our first type of Code of Development that had all these elements together and we wanted to be flexible and the applicant has been and is meeting with us tomorrow trying to figure out what their part of achieving the Code of Development as this parcelizes and provides it. He said so right now there is some talk about that greenspace going somewhere perhaps on the back side in order to understand its context as a part of the Hydraulic process where they are looking at improving the intersection there is going to be a roundabout which is proposed here and there is going to be a treatment of a grade-separated interchange here and as part of that there is a planned connection to a bridge albeit over 29 and it is proposed to be the site for a transit station. He said that connection is going to be a key one for getting bikes, pedestrians and transit connections to the site so having good connections for bike, pedestrians and transit in all of these directions as a part of these Code of Developments that we are trying to define.

Mr. Gast-Bray said in summary we are looking to find a home for the greenspace where ever – we are not very specific about the size other than it should accommodate a plaza, which is a central place for the whole thing that needs to be able to accommodate events that would work for Stonefield-wide type of events – we are quite flexible with what that is. He said the small place in front of the Cinema and the very small greenspace that is down the hill from the little plaza up above where the Thai Restaurant is – those do not meet our requirements, but we are very flexible with what those are.

Mr. Gast-Bray said that we thought that those little elements would be important in informing sort of how this engages with the site as a whole and he just wanted to make sure you were aware of those elements.

Mr. Wardell asked with what you described are we to anticipate then with this crossing that happens on the north side - will that eventually be the frontage of Stonefield.

Mr. Gast-Bray replied that he can't comment on that because there is no guarantee that the Zan Road Crossing is a part of these SMART scale application that is going forward with some degree with the transportation improvements in this whole area. He said it is a key element, one that is the most popular of the entire transportation plan from the Hydraulic area project that was undertaken by Solutions 29 by VDOT – that being said, does it change it – there is no mechanism to make that the Entrance Corridor chances are it will be limited in

terms of the amount of car traffic, if any, that it will have. He said it is intended mostly to be the pedestrian, bicycle and transit connection for the area.

Mr. Wardell said that Bond Street will continue to be the main street and from the very beginning the site plan has been one where civic space has been privatized and the public gets the back side of all the buildings. He said that if there is something that is going to invert that relationship that would be important to know.

Mr. Gast-Bray pointed out that one of the reasons why he was presenting it – at this point we do not have any clarity as to what that would be – it is an opportunity that came out subsequent to the original plan for Stonefield. He said the advantages though to what the applicant has been suggesting there has been some talk perhaps of taking in one of the original designs one-half of the parking lot that is behind that might be dedicated to greenspace, which would then be a terminated vista for that pedestrian, bicycle, transit connection there in which case that would be the center of the plaza. He pointed out there has been no commitment to anything like that yet, but we would certainly feel that very favorable.

Mr. Binsted said as part of the nature of a site plan amendment, would they be required to identify that greenspace, and Mr. Gast-Bray replied that was possible.

Mr. Binsted noted that he did not know how we are reviewing this major site plan amendment without knowing what that greenspace is.

Mr. Gast-Bray said the challenge is that it could go someplace that is not contiguous with the site – it could go in a number of locations, and Mr. Binsted replied that he would think it would be up to the applicant to identify that as part of the nature of the major site plan amendment.

Ms. Maliszewski pointed out that this was just starting here at the ARB and that amendment has not been submitted yet.

Mr. Wardell asked do we have a site plan of the footprint of the building, and Ms. McMahon replied that behind you are the sheets that were posted of the concept or preliminary site plan at this point

Mr. Binsted said that today we are only looking at that footprint of the building. He invited other questions for staff.

Mr. Stoner asked if any minimum size been identified for this plaza.

Mr. Gast-Bray replied that it just needs to be justifiable in some way. The spaces that they have provided up to now have not been large enough to be the central organizing theme, but we don't have a full number either. He said it is really hard, without telling them exactly how they are going to build it, when you build in this flexibility, it is a challenge but we are trying to say justify the scaling of this - we want this to be a success whatever it is and in trying to provide that there just needs to be something that can easily be embraced by the Board of Supervisors especially since they are asking for a waiver.

Mr. Van der Werf said to the extent staff identified future parking capacity as an issue, it looks like any greenspace relocation would likely take some existing parking, further exacerbating that problem.

Mr. Gast-Bray replied that is correct and if we take the final way it originally described Stonefield has basically said as they phased this in they would provide the parking in more structured ways in order to get enough critical mass

to merit that. He said we are trying to be flexible, but again we have not seen all of the designs coming in so it is hard because if we don't have the square footage we can't calculate how much parking.

Mr. Binsted invited the applicant's representative to address the ARB.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Representing the request were Charles Mcfarlane, partner with Mcfarlane Partners; Josh Desie, with O'Conner; John Berman with WW Associates; and Neil Bhatt, with nbj Architects.

Mr. Charles Mcfarlane discussed the following primary issues:

- Preliminary ARB request and unaware that was involving an amendment to the site plan. Our understanding of the preliminary site plan approval that was granted in 2011 and 2012 that included both the initial site plan and then what he understands Herb White calls phase one and then the ultimate plan which is phase two for this site our proposed site plan is actually showing a smaller footprint. So, our density and our proposal are less impactful on this site from a greenspace standpoint than what was approved by the county in the preliminary design which was phase one and the ultimate design – and he had those plans.
- The intent of our request is not in any way to suggest a change in the overall site plan – that is really for the firm to come before you if there is an issue to be discussed. We are here for a preliminary architectural review because he did not think their request impacts that in any way.
- Did not want to talk about things we don't have control over and would turn it over to the consultants and professionals.

Neil Bhatt, architect, spoke about the proposed colors and building materials for the building and the height of the signage which is a couple feet higher than the white. He said we will submit conceptual elevation from the Entrance Corridor and look at the sign height issue.

John Berman with WW Associates spoke about the parking in that even with losing 12 parking spaces with this development there is still enough parking available within Stonefield development itself to support the Hyatt House as well as the retail. He noted they had shared parking agreements.

Josh Desi, with O'Conner, discussed the following primary issues.

- Entrance in traffic coming onto Bond Street – two entrances one from the rear – plan speed bump on Bond Street.
- Meeting of four stakeholders tomorrow with county staff to think about the longer-term future.

### **Board Discussion:**

The ARB held a discussion with staff and the applicants on staff's comments and took the following action.

The ARB offers the following comments on the site plan amendment, for the benefit of the applicant's next submittal:

1. Provide renderings of the east and north elevations. Provide additional perspective views that show the proposed building in the context of adjacent buildings, and particularly in respect to the existing Hyatt Place Hotel. Provide perspectives from Bond Street as well as District Avenue.
2. Revise the renderings of the south and west elevations to show all proposed architectural features.
3. Provide dimensioned elevations of all four elevations with materials and colors identified. Provide material and color samples for review.
4. Revise the architectural design to reduce the amount of EIFS used and to increase materials that reflect the traditional architecture of the area.

5. Ensure that the parapet coping is not illuminated.
6. Note that a separate sign application is required. Back-lit/halo-lit channel letter signs are consistent with the shopping center.
7. Provide more transparency at the ground level through increased fenestration.
8. Revise the design of the tower to reduce its mass by eliminating the over-scaled single-slope roof.
9. Provide foundation plantings along the exterior of the courtyard wall and against the east building wall within the courtyard.
10. Provide the standard glass note on the elevations: *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%.*
11. Provide glass sample and/or manufacturer's specifications that provide the VLR and VLT values.
12. Provide a roof plan that shows the dimensions of all proposed rooftop mechanical equipment and show rooftop mechanical equipment on the architectural elevations. Show how all visibility of mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridors will be eliminated.
13. Provide top-of-wall and bottom-of-wall dimensions of the proposed courtyard wall. Provide material and color samples for the wall.
14. Ensure that the HVAC vent screens match the color of the surrounding wall.
15. Provide the standard mechanical equipment note on the site plan set and on the architectural drawings: *Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated.*
16. Provide a lighting plan for review.
17. Provide standard lighting note on the lighting 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.*
18. Consider providing foundation plantings on the south face of the building.
19. If planting is added, provide plant species that are native to the region from the approved plant list.
20. If planting is added, add the standard plant health note to the plan: *All site plantings of trees and shrubs shall be allowed to reach, and be maintained at, mature height; the topping of trees is prohibited. Shrubs and trees shall be pruned minimally and only to support the overall health of the plant.*
21. Ensure that the proposal includes the necessary amount of open space to fulfill the Code of Development requirements.
22. Note that additional pedestrian and bicycle amenities and connections, as well as the provision of open space on this lot, will likely be called for during the site plan review process to meet Code of Development requirements
23. Provide adequate tree protection fencing on site plans for future review.

Mr. Wardell left the meeting at 2:18 p.m.

**b. ARB-2018-161: Dogtopia - Special Use Permit Advisory Review (first review) (TM/Parcel 04500000010900)**

**Proposal:** To establish a commercial kennel in a portion of an existing retail building with interior daycare, grooming, and boarding services and an exterior 16-foot by 72-foot play area on the south side of the building.

**Location:** On the east side of Rt. 29, across from Northside Drive.

**Staff Presentation:**

Heather McMahon summarized the staff report and recommended the following as the primary points of discussion:

1. Degree of visibility of the proposed fence's south elevation;
2. The proposed fence material and its appropriateness for the EC;
3. The fence design and detailing;
4. The amount and character of the proposed landscaping.

Staff recommends that the ARB forward the recommendation in the staff report to the Planning Commission and offered the comments listed in the staff report to be addressed with the future site plan submittals.

Mr. Binsted invited public comment. Hearing none, he invited the applicant to speak.

**Applicant Presentation:**

Valerie Long, with Williams Mullen, was present on behalf of Nikki's Furry Friends LLC. Mr. Hastings, the contract purchaser, and Mary Voss represented the request. Ms. Long presented a PowerPoint presentation to discuss the following primary issues.

- Visibility of fence from EC – northbound approach existing trees and southbound pass before see fence.
- Distance from EC is 90'.
- Fence materials and color.
- Landscaping changes proposed- supplemental landscape plan.
- Utility plan – shows no problem with storm sewer pipe with proposed fence.
- 3 wall mounted fixtures proposed – lighting plan – submitted revision and lighting plan on that and can provide as well as the additional grading.
- Can show additional grading.
- No film on windows facing EC.

**Board Discussion:**

The ARB held a discussion with staff and the applicants, focusing on the following issues:

- Proposed grading
- Visibility from EC
- Landscaping
- Fence location
- Fence design, height, materials and color; relationship to the building

After discussion, the ARB took the following action.

**Motion:** Mr. Hancock moved to forward the recommendations outlined in the staff report to the Planning Commission, amended as follows:

**The ARB has no objection to the proposed use with the following conditions:**

1. The fence shall not conceal any part of the triple window on the southeast corner of the building.
2. The fence material and detailing are subject to ARB review. An 8-foot-tall fence shall incorporate a two-foot base that relates to the building architecture or provide a two-foot decorative element at the top. The fence color shall be coordinated with the existing building colors and is subject to ARB approval.
3. Landscaping shall be provided on the east and south sides of the fence to the satisfaction of the ARB.
4. No tinted or reflective films or similar materials shall be applied to windows visible from the Entrance Corridor. Window glass visible from the Entrance Corridor shall remain transparent.

**The ARB offers the following comments to be addressed with the future site plan submittals:**

1. Note that a Letter of Revision application will be required to update and amend the current site plan.

2. A County-wide Certificate of Appropriateness application for Equipment, Fencing or Lighting is required prior to approval of the LOR.
3. Provide a grading plan for review.
4. Provide a landscape plan that includes denser, layered landscaping on the east and south sides of the fence, and particularly at the southeast corner. Include evergreen shrubs that will mature to a height between 4 and 6 feet.
5. The fence shall not conceal any part of the triple window on the southeast corner of the building.
6. No tinted or reflective films or similar materials shall be applied to windows visible from the Entrance Corridor. Window glass visible from the Entrance Corridor shall remain transparent.
7. Consider breaking the 72-foot length with material variation, surface relief, detailing, breaks, or projections/recesses.
8. Revise the elevations to show the fence in its true configuration, with vertical posts and caps and horizontal members.
9. If the SimTek material is used, choose an alternate color that is better coordinated with the building materials. Provide a fence detail.
10. Provide information confirming that the SimTek material is durable and colorfast over time.
11. Provide a utility plan for review.
12. Provide standard mechanical equipment note to future site plans: *Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated.*
13. Provide a lighting plan that includes photometric values, manufacturer's specifications, and luminaire schedule for review. Include the standard lighting note on the lighting 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.*
14. Provide the standard plant health note on the landscape plan: *All site plantings of trees and shrubs shall be allowed to reach, and be maintained at, mature height; the topping of trees is prohibited. Shrubs and trees shall be pruned minimally and only to support the overall health of the plant.*
15. Provide a grading plan that shows all grading outside the drip line of all trees to remain.
16. Provide adequate tree protection fencing on future site plans submitted for review.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

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

The meeting moved to the next item.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **a. Pantops Flow Renovation**

After viewing the standard trademark design for the Porsche dealership, the ARB determined that the proposal should be reviewed in a work session.

### **b. ARB-2018-77: Northtown Center CSP**

In consensus, the ARB determined that:

- Red, white and blue are approved colors. Black can be used as an accent color.
- Internal illumination of graphics is not approved, except for the ULC graphic that is being moved from an existing location. External illumination of graphics is acceptable.
- The 4' letter height for Goodwill is acceptable.

The ARB also noted that:

- Red Harbor Freight letters will be difficult to read on the brick background. White letters would be more legible.
- Blue Goodwill letters will be difficult to read on the brown background. White letters would be more legible.

The meeting moved to the next item.

**c. Guidelines Update**

The ARB postponed the design guidelines discussion to the next meeting.

**d. Next ARB Meeting: TUESDAY, January 22, 2019, 1:00 p.m.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Tuesday, January 22, 2019 in Room 241, Second Floor, County Office Building at 1:00 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Stan Binsted, Chair

(Recorded and transcribed by Sharon C. Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission & Planning Boards)

Approved by ARB
Date: 2-19-2018
Initials: sct