

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
April 1, 2013

The Albemarle County Architectural Review Board met on Monday, April 1, 2013, 1:00 p.m., Room 241, Second Floor, County Office Building, Charlottesville, Virginia. Those members present were John Quale, Marcia Joseph, Bruce Wardell, Charles T. Lebo, Vice Chair, and Fred Missel, Chairman. Mr. Lebo arrived at 1:02 p.m. Mr. Quale arrived at 1:04 p.m.

Staff members present were Margaret Maliszewski, Design Planner and Sharon Taylor, Clerk.

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Missel called the meeting to order at 1:01 p.m. and established a quorum.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Missel invited public comment.

Neil Williamson, with the Free Enterprise Forum, apologized for a face book post from someone that hacked his site. The reason for his presence today was for a discussion of the ARB's role in the Comprehensive Plan public hearing coming up tomorrow and how the ARB is being seen in the new and improved Comprehensive Plan. Last week staff provided some cliff notes to Board members and others about changes. However, he was in the process of digging through the entire plan. He was surprised that interior to the natural and historic resources portion of the plan there is discussion of having the ARB serve in an advisory role on all parcels on all site plans, special use permits, and rezonings that occur adjacent to or within historical districts. He did not know how much more work that would be or whether there is the appropriate legislative powers to do such a thing. However, placing it in the Comp Plan he was curious what the ARB's position on it is. In addition, there are three new Entrance Corridors recommended for review. It was the John Warner Parkway, Brownsville Turnpike, and one other suggested for review. He was not exactly sure how the process worked whether it was through the committees, staff or the ARB and how the continual expansion of ARB powers seems to be moving into the Comprehensive Plan. He was in the process of reviewing the previous plan to see perhaps it was there then and it needs to be removed. He just wanted to raise this to the ARB's attention as the time to comment as individuals or as a member of the entire board is tomorrow evening at the Planning Commission. The idea would be beyond Entrance Corridor regulations, which is the way the Comp Plan reads.

Mr. Missel asked staff to review the Comp Plan wording and report back to the ARB.

There being no further public comment, the meeting proceeded.

OTHER BUSINESS

BMW at Pantops: Building colors

The ARB discussed the BMW Phase 2 building colors and provided the following direction: The ARB could consider a proposal for a white paint scheme for both the Phase 1 and Phase 2 BMW buildings in a coordinated presentation resulting in buildings that would appear to be originally designed to be white.

Shadwell Market: Generator addition

The ARB discussed the generator addition at Shadwell Market and provided the following direction: To be acceptable in the proposed location, the screening plants must be tall enough to obscure the equipment on “day one”, the plants must obscure the equipment year-round, and the equipment must be painted green to blend with the plants. The ARB also asked for additional information on the location of the propane tank.

United Rentals: Canopy Addition

The ARB discussed the canopy addition proposed for the United Rentals building and provided the following direction: The proposal was acceptable to be reviewed/approved by staff.

Advance Auto: Window Tint

The ARB discussed the proposed window tint for the Advance Auto remodeling and provided the following direction: Window tinting is not appropriate. No window tinting can be approved.

Price Hyundai: Re-design

The ARB discussed the re-designed Price Hyundai showroom building and provided the following comments:

- The building materials and colors must still coordinate with the existing building on site and the other approved building in the development.
- This building design makes more sense. The colonnade, fascia and roof work well together and they have an appropriate human scale.
- The “blue cube” looks too tall, although a square is probably the appropriate shape. Consider moving the whole cube down to reduce the overall height while maintaining the square shape.
- The language needs to be consistent between the building parts (showroom, parts/service, wash area). The overall building should look less disjointed.

Initial Site Development Plan Review Process: Questions?

Staff offered to attempt to answer any Initial Site Development Plan review process questions the ARB might have, and the ARB made the following comments relative to the Fifth Street Station proposal:

- Mr. Missel indicated he called Valerie Long to discuss the visibility issue and making the process efficient, but he was only able to leave a message.
- Mr. Wardell asked how the upcoming ARB review relates to the approved application plan. Staff indicated that the ARB will review the initial site plan drawings with the understanding

that an application plan and proffers are approved, and with the limitations outlined in the ordinance and reviewed at the last ARB meeting, as well as the highlighted guidelines.

- Some key issues were identified as: grading, retaining walls, building massing and orientation, approved building density, and approved building envelopes.
- Some members thought it would have been more helpful for the applicant to come in with concepts before a full blown site plan, particularly for a development of this scale.
- Layouts other than the one illustrated could be built, but it is a very large site with complex topography.
- Reflecting the traditional architecture of the area can be done by revising scale, proportion, and massing; it should not be done by dressing up the building with applied Colonial or farm-style decoration.
- Mr. Quale asked staff to ask the applicant if a designer (architect or landscape architect) could attend the meeting.
- Mr. Wardell asked staff to ask the applicant if their grading program allows them to provide a 3D model of the site.
- The appearance from distances on the ECs should be considered.

Approval of Minutes – March 18, 2013 and February 19, 2013

Motion: Mr. Lebo moved for approval of the minutes of March 18, 2013 and February 19, 2013.

Mr. Quale seconded the motion.

The motion carried by a vote of 5:0.

Next ARB Meeting: Monday, April 15, 2013

Mr. Wardell may not be able to attend.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:09 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Monday, April 15, 2013 in Room 241, Second Floor, County Office Building at 1:00 p.m.

Mr. Wardell requested that the meeting be reconvened to discuss another matter about the Stonefield landscaping.

Mr. Missel called the reconvened meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

Stonefield Landscaping

Mr. Wardell noted the transformer located near Trader Joe's does not have sufficient screening plants. He stated there is a difference between the renderings submitted for review and the planted site for both the transformer, specifically, and the EC frontages, generally. The ARB asked staff to consult with the applicant on the transformer screening. Mr. Lebo asked for clarification on the detention basin on the north side of the property. Staff offered to bring details on the approved final appearance to the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Monday, April 15, 2013 in Room 241, Second Floor, County Office Building at 1:00 p.m.

Fred Missel, Chairman

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