



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

ARB MEETING MINUTES

Date: March 4, 2019

Time: 1:00 PM

Meeting Room: Lane Auditorium

Members:

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

Staff:

Heather McMahon
Margaret Maliszewski
Stephanie Banton
Marsha Cutright
Marsha Alley

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Binsted called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

DISCLOSURES

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Binsted invited public comment. Hearing none, the meeting moved to the next item.

REGULAR REVIEW ITEMS

- a. **ARB-2019-07: Pantops Corner** - Final Site Plan (TM/Parcels 078000000005A0, 078000000005B0, 078000000005G1)

Proposal: To construct a 5-story hotel with associated site improvements.

Location: On the north side of Richmond Road (Rt. 250 East) across from People Place

Staff presented the final site plan for the Pantops Corner Hotel, located on the Route 250 East and Route 29 North entrance corridors, situated on the north end of the site – with the Wawa store at the other end having its own site plan and thus no longer shown on this plan.

Ms. Maliszewski presented that:

- The ARB had reviewed the initial site plan in July 2018, at which time they recommended that four issues be resolved prior to the initial plan being approved, then held two work sessions – one in July, one in August – and they felt the issues had been resolved sufficiently to recommend approval of the initial plan, with several items needing to be resolved with the final site plan.
- There were three primary issues with the building’s design remaining to be resolved after the last work session: material and detailing of entrance bay; design of the three-story end wing; overall design should be refined and simplified to provide greater coordination throughout.
- Entrance bay has been revised so all but the top floor is now faced with brick, which steps up from two to three stories at the bays flanking the entrance, then up to four stories within the entrance bay; coping has been added at fourth story. Entrance bay is faced in brick; three-story end wing is now faced with brick at all three stories.
- No windows have been added since the August work session, but a soldier course, recess, and second-story cap at the piers have been added.
- Applicant has confirmed that the brick sample submitted was what is intended, and it is a thin brick used at 1000 W. Main Street, where it is placed vertically – unlike horizontally as it would be placed at the Pantops hotel. The wood sample and stucco samples were also submitted, as were green-tinted glass samples.
- There are retaining walls shown on the plan that do not have associated plantings shown – the northern wall, with a maximum height of 14 feet and some reduced visibility from the EC; other retaining walls are at the east side and NW corner of the Wawa site. Pantops Corner Way, the streets connecting Route 20 and Route 250 through the site and infrastructure related to that street must be shown on first site plan to be approved.
- Extension of water and sanitary sewer lines to points just south of Route 20 and Pantops Corner Way intersection will limit future planting of EC trees on Parcel 78-580.
- Recommendation is for approval with conditions.

The applicant’s representatives stated that:

- The relocation of the water and sewer was problematic because the sewer was across the front of the adjacent parcel, where VDOT required the manhole location. The waterline has to come in one side, too, because of a fiber line that comes across the road and they don't want to bore through it when drilling for the waterline.
- Street trees were already across the front of the site on Route 20, and those trees would be carried around; all landscaping changes could be accommodated. Shrubs can be planted in the ACSA sewer easement, but not trees – so a portion in the corner of the site would be difficult to get the 35-foot spacing.
- The street trees at 2.5" would go in at 10 or 15 feet tall, and the body of the tree would be in front of the wall.
- The towers would be grounded all the way to the ground, and the three-story building was facing the road. The brick was made lighter and the building façade was kept simple. There would be three colors used in the mix of bricks, with a blend of gray to brown to add dimension.
- It would be difficult to add windows without losing the arch, but a false window could be accommodated. With some windows open and some closed – and some blinds or blackout drapes – it would start to look sloppier – and what was proposed in this plan for the hotel was much cleaner.

ARB members expressed that:

- The street trees at 2.5" would go in at 10 or 15 feet tall, and the body of the tree would be in front of the wall.
- There may be more opportunities for simplification in the design, with the brick and the towers rising out of it.
- The building is long and big, and it may help to break the building up if all the material were the same at the bay.
- The walls will add a lot as a base element; the picket fence and wrap at the corner could be modified for better flow with the rest of the site and less visual interruption.
- They would like the applicant to accommodate four more windows, and the applicant indicated that this could be accomplished.
- They would like the applicant to consider having the arch going to the top and keeping the remainder of the building two stories.
- A work session would be required to address building modifications (items 17-20).

Motion: Mr. Hancock moved for approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for **ARB-2019-07: Pantops Corner** – Final Site Development Plan – with the conditions listed in the staff report, amended as follows:

1. Revise the white picket hand rail for greater consistency with the immediate setting. Include a detail(s) in the site plan for all hand rails. Black metal would be appropriate.
2. Coordinate all drawings with submitted material samples/colors, in particular the EIFS and brick.
3. Clarify the discrepancy between the illustrated brick and the submitted brick sample. Clarify how the illustrated brick will have an appropriate appearance for the EC.
4. Include the wood product in the materials list on the architectural drawings and provide a sample.
5. Correct the labels on the lighting plan for the wall fixtures: change the two "D" labels to "B".
6. Provide on the lighting plan information showing that the light fixtures will have a consistent dark brown, dark bronze or black finish.
7. Coordinate the evergreens/retaining wall note (788' with evergreen screen) with the plants illustrated on the plan.
8. Revise the planting size of interior road trees to 2 1/2" caliper.
9. Consider adding trees along the sidewalks at the north, south and east elevations of the hotel.
10. Specify the perimeter parking lot tree planting size as 2 1/2" caliper.
11. Replace the Franklin tree with a tree from the recommended plant lists.
12. Add a fourth shrub type to the plant list. Limit the number of proposed plants for any one species to 25% of the total proposed for that plant type (tree, shrub).
13. Add trees at the base of the northern retaining wall to continue the EC planting and to mitigate heights over 6'.
14. Include on the landscape plan the plants associated with any retaining walls shown on the plan. Intensify landscaping to compensate for walls over 6' tall that are not terraced.
15. Provide top-of-wall and bottom-of-wall elevations for all retaining walls.
16. Provide additional information to clarify the appearance of the proposed brick.
17. Add windows on the west elevation of the three-story wing (4 total).
18. Consider further simplifications, including removing the intermediate coping of the three-story wing, or moving the coping to the top of the wall.
19. Reconsider the stepping of the brick in the bays flanking the entrance bay (limit to 2 stories) and continue the brick to the top of the entrance bay.
20. A work session is required to address the building modifications.

Mr. Van De Werf seconded the motion.

The motion carried by a vote of 3:0. (Mr. Wardell and Mr. Stoner were absent from the meeting and vote.)

WORKSESSION

a. Guidelines update: Discussion

The ARB held a work session on the Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines. They discussed historically significant buildings as precedents for appropriate scale and massing in the ECs, and they discussed examples of buildings constructed more recently in the ECs, noting why some were examples of appropriate scale and massing in the ECs and others were not.

Ms. Maliszewski stated that they would now take the concepts in the guidelines and discuss each one, including massing and human scale – using historic buildings in the city and county for reference. She mentioned Memorial Gym at UVA and Miller School, the Gander Mountain building, Toyota at Pantops, Queen Charlotte Square, the hotel at Cherry and Ridge streets, and Trader Joe's at Stonefield.

ARB members and staff discussed that:

- The overall objective was to try to introduce language in the guidelines that related to these items more specifically to provide more guidance to applicants per their request.
- This may be better suited to an appendix that provided added guidance and articulation about different approaches.
- They need to expand examples but avoid being overly prescriptive to applicants.
- Buildings with large-scale massing, such as the Gander Mountain building, would have benefitted from more continuity in design and form – including different materials – to break down the mass and provide a more human scale and approach.
- The Regal Cinema building is an example of an interesting façade for a big-box development, and it was well done for a building in the EC, with elements such as material changes used to mitigate the massing.
- Shopping center layouts may work better with improved relegation of buildings and parking, and there were essentially different categories/characters of the corridor. The guidelines currently were more adaptable than if they went in and added a section for Pantops and for Route 29. It may be easier to get certificates of appropriateness if the applications can be reviewed through contextual guidelines and suggested building elements, and the corridors can change over time.
- The North Wing of Barracks Road Shopping Center was an example of how porches and arcades addressed environmental issues and human access to buildings, and was contemporary but provided a connection to local architecture, using elements such as standing seam metal.
- The GE building has a nice simplicity, form and order – and could be virtually concealed behind landscaping, given where it was sited.
- The Hollymead Town Center reflected human elements of scale but not a uniqueness of style in the context of shopping centers.
- Ivy Commons was an adaptive reuse but did not demonstrate any particular characteristics that would warrant its inclusion as an example.
- The Texas Roadhouse building had brick and wood that did not look genuine, and the landscaping was too tight against the building.
- Other examples considered were the Crozet Library, the U.S. Joiner building, 1 Boar’s Head Point, the Virginia National Bank building, Legal Research at Ivy Road, and one of the Peter Jefferson Place buildings.
- The Crozet Library was successful with human scale elements and had the same dual frontage with parking and the main entrance in the back; it sat on the site nicely. The library’s secondary front was

not used for public access and was a fake door, which was a programmatic consideration and had the design capability to be functional.

- The Peter Jefferson Place example was too uniform to provide a good example, and the proportions did not seem quite right. The Legal Research building was not a particularly good structural example and was totally out of context with the old traditional estates nearby, such as Birdwood, Ednam, and White Gables – but it might be viewed differently if it were right on the road.
- The Virginia National Bank building split its site, with the building in the middle of the site and parking on either side – which allowed it to have a frontage. It seemed to be the proper scale and a nod to future development, and it represented a successful example of relegated parking. The walls, plaza and sidewalk were notable positive features.
- Other elements for consideration as concepts in the examples were color and materials, orientation, connecting devices, blankness, and site-related items such as grading, retaining walls, storm water features, and screening.
- Visual examples of these elements in an appendix could provide applicants with guidelines.
- There was a board for gas stations and one for shopping centers to address those particular types of developments.

Next ARB Meeting: Monday, March 18, 2019

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Monday, March 18, 2019 in Room 241, Second Floor, County Office Building at 1:00 p.m.