

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
JANUARY 07, 2013**

The Albemarle County Architectural Review Board met on Monday, January 7, 2013, 1:00 p.m., Room 241, Second Floor, County Office Building, Charlottesville, Virginia. Those members present were Bruce Wardell, Charles T. Lebo, Vice Chair, and Fred Missel, Chairman. Absent was John Quale. (Note: Paul Wright resigned on 12-31-2012.)

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

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Missel called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. and established a quorum.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

WORK SESSIONS

ARB-2012-162: Gander Mountain – Work Session #2 (Tax Map 45, Parcel 111)

Proposal: To construct a Gander Mountain retail store as Phase 2A of the development in the North town Center.

Staff Presentation:

Margaret Maliszewski summarized the staff report noting the concerns listed in the staff report, as well as some questions for the ARB's review and comment, as noted below.

Changes to the proposal since the previous review:

- Changes to the brick and the cultured stone, some of the material colors, piers have been added along intervals along the north, west, and south elevations.
- The entrance gable has been reduced in height bringing it to a total height of 40'.
- A low gable has been added to the center of the Entrance Corridor elevation and it is faced with log siding that is also found on the front elevation.
- The canopies that flank the main entrance have been extended in length.
- There have been changes to the cornice and some of the planting.
- An additional site section has been provided and wall lights are now shown on the elevation drawings.

Since it is a work session it would be useful to have answers to the questions, which might create the need to add additional recommendations. Material samples, which included the brick and the mortar, and photographs of the bank were available for review.

Questions for the ARB:

1. Does the proposed design sufficiently reflect the traditional architecture of the area?

2. Are the proposed forms, features, materials, colors and scale compatible with those of the significant historic buildings in the area?
3. Are the features with logs and log siding appropriate for the EC?
4. Does the proposed design sufficiently relate to the surrounding context of buildings?
5. Is human scale integral to the building design? Is human scale sufficiently evident in the building design?
6. Is the log-sided gable an appropriate element for the EC side of the building?
7. Does the architectural design represent a cohesive whole?
8. Has blankness been sufficiently relieved?
9. Is the proposed treatment for the back of the entrance gable appropriate?
10. Is additional planting required along the south property line? If so, how much should be added, at what sizes, and how far should the planting extend?
11. Is the proposed design unified with the development?
12. Is a “natural” finish for the Redi-Rock retaining wall appropriate at this location?

Staff Recommendations:

1. Provide increased coordination between the canopies and piers on the front elevation. Consider alternate canopy supports that relate to local architecture.
2. Revise the color of the emergency exit doors to minimize noticeability.
3. Increase and extend the landscaping at the western end of the southern property line. Provide a mix of evergreen and deciduous trees, with evergreens being the primary component. Extend the planting to the location of the proposed tree line.
4. Consider a darker color for the back of the entrance gable, to reduce noticeability.
5. Revise the elevation drawings to show the location and height of rooftop equipment. Ensure that all equipment will not be visible.
6. Include the following note on the architectural elevation sheet: “Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated.”
7. Label the elevation drawings (north, south, east, west).
8. Revise the landscape plan to show large shade trees along the Entrance Corridor spaced 35’ on center. Ensure that all EC landscaping guidelines are met.
9. Reduce wall light height to a more standard pedestrian level mounting height.

Applicant Presentation:

Scott Collins, representative for the applicant, pointed out they had Allied Concrete go out and match the brick on Stellar One, which is what they submitted for the review. The brick and mortar should match. As far as the Redi-rock wall, they plan to match the Redi-rock wall that is on the site unless there were suggestions they should make changes. They would be happy to discuss those. They will provide a sample at the final review. There will be a replacement for the cobblestone. They will come back with a landscape plan. He asked for ARB comment in order to move forward with the project for a final review.

Others present were Wendell Wood, owner/developer, Nena Harrell, and Nicholas Macena. Mr. Collins reviewed staff’s comments.

Board Discussion:

Following questions and answers about materials and colors, the ARB discussed the proposal with staff and the applicant focusing on the issues raised in the staff report, as follows.

- Human scale in building design - The scale of the building has been reduced to be more appropriate in terms of pedestrian scale. The pilasters help.
- The height of the front gable – from the north elevation it looks great in terms of its scale. There is a challenge when they face it from the west elevation regarding the cohesive whole and the blankness. Suggestion made to lower the gable on the front elevation on the north side.
- The blank walls - would the landscaping help. The stucco color of the uppermost portion of the (lateral) side bays on the west elevation should coordinate more effectively with the middle bay. The doors should be the same color as the wall.
- Lighting concerns – Lighting should accent the building, but not create a visual impact on the roadway. Need it to be more in keeping with decorative fixtures and they be shielded if above 3,000 lumens. The Guidelines suggest that it be full cut off.
- Landscaping concerns - There should be a mix of evergreens as much as possible to help define and soften the view from the Entrance Corridor.
- Traditional architecture of the area – The Board discussed the brand vs. locality issue, referencing the log, brick and stone.
- The appropriateness of the gable and logs/ log siding – questioned whether the finish was glossy and how it tied into the Charlottesville area.
- Concern with the color of the Redi-rock – Staff indicated the color would match the existing color, which was not the color originally approved by the ARB.

In summary, the ARB in the work session on the proposed design of the Gander Mountain store, provided the following recommendations:

1. Add stone bases for the log supports on the front elevation.
2. Revise the color of the emergency exit doors to minimize noticeability.
3. Increase and extend the landscaping at the western end of the southern property line. Provide a mix of evergreen and deciduous trees, with evergreens being the primary component. Extend the planting to the location of the proposed tree line.
4. Consider a darker color for the back of the entrance gable, to reduce noticeability.
5. Revise the elevation drawings to show the location and height of rooftop equipment. Ensure that all equipment will not be visible.
6. Include the following note on the architectural elevation sheet: “Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated.”
7. Label the elevation drawings (north, south, east, west).
8. Revise the landscape plan to show large shade trees along the Entrance Corridor spaced 35’ on center. Ensure that all EC landscaping guidelines are met.

9. Revise the light fixtures to integrate their design with the design of the piers and wall composition.
10. Revise the stucco color of the uppermost portion of the (lateral) side bays on the west elevation to coordinate more effectively with the middle bay.

ARB-2012-122: Verizon Lynchburg – Work Session

Staff Presentation:

Margaret Maliszewski noted there was a telecommunications facility that was submitted for review a while back. It fell under the category that requires a special use permit. Special use permits are not automatically forwarded to the ARB for review; however, the ARB can provide comment on special use permits. There was an unusual aspect to that particular proposal.

On December 5, 2012 the Board of Supervisors approved the Special Use Permit in question -- a proposal to modify an existing telecommunications installation on a Dominion Power transmission tower. As with most special use permits, the proposal was not forwarded to the ARB for review or comment; Design Planner comment was provided to the lead planner. The requested modifications were not typical of most telecommunications proposals and a board member asked for the issue to be brought to the ARB informally to see if there is agreement with staff's recommendation and to see if the ARB would like to provide any additional comment or direction for staff for future reviews.

The tower in question is located on the south side of I64, east of Sunset Avenue Extended. The proposed change would remove the three existing antennas, install a 10' extension at the top of the pole, install a 14' wide platform at the top of the extension, and install 9 antennas on the platform. Dominion Power has changed its policy so that they can no longer have the antennas below the power line. So this required a retro-fit to move the antennas above the lines, and to add up to six more antennas. The platform type mounting is not typical.

The tower currently has minimal visibility from the I64 EC. A balloon test was not conducted for safety reasons.

ARB staff provided the following comment to the lead planner for the SP:

“The existing facility is not visible when traveling westbound on the I-64 Entrance Corridor. The existing facility is visible from the eastbound lanes for a very brief period in the immediate vicinity of Sunset Avenue Extended. Visibility may increase somewhat when the leaves have fallen from the trees. A balloon test was not conducted to determine the visibility of this proposal because an existing facility is in place. However, the additional 10' height and the antennas mounted on the platform at the top of the existing tower are not expected to significantly increase the visibility of the facility or its impact on the Entrance Corridor.”

The questions for discussion at the January 7, 2013 ARB meeting are:

1. Do you agree with staff's recommendation? If not, what are your comments?
2. Do you want to provide any direction for staff for future reviews of this type?

3. Do you want to establish specific criteria for the review of telecommunications proposals?
4. Do you want to establish specific parameters for when staff should bring these items to your review?
5. Do you want to establish a specific process for notifying you of staff's recommendations on this type of application?
6. Is there anything else you want to say or do relative to this application?

Board Discussion:

The ARB discussed the proposal with staff and answered staff's questions in the following summary. The ARB indicated the platform mounting seemed to be the better way to go.

Regarding the Verizon Lynchburg proposal, the ARB:

1. Agreed with staff's original recommendation on the proposal.
2. Indicated that this type of proposal is a judgment call for staff. If the proposal would not exacerbate the visibility, then it is OK.
3. Staff could provide the ARB with a list of projects and recommendations made, perhaps on a quarterly basis.

OTHER BUSINESS

Blue Ridge Mountain Sports: Sign at Stonefield Town Center

The ARB discussed the Blue Ridge Mountain Sports Sign proposal for the Stonefield Town Center and provided the following direction: The proposal consisting of a pan sign with letters is not appropriate; the letters should be used alone. The general design of the proposal consisting of externally illuminated letters with the open graphic, which allows the materials of the building to show through, would be acceptable. There was no opposition to the use of borders on the letters.

Election of officers for 2013: Chair, Vice-Chair

Election of Officers for 2013:

Motion: Mr. Lebo nominated Mr. Missel to be Chairman for 2013.

Mr. Wardell seconded the motion.

The motion carried by a vote of 3:0.

Motion: Mr. Wardell nominated Mr. Lebo for Vice-Chair for 2013.

Mr. Missel seconded the motion.

The motion carried by a vote of 3:0.

Adopt 2013 schedule

Motion: Mr. Lebo moved to adopt the 2013 schedule as presented by staff.

Mr. Wardell seconded the motion.

The motion carried by a vote of 3:0.

Approval of Minutes – December 3, 2012

Motion: Mr. Lebo moved for approval of the minutes of December 3, 2012.

Mr. Wardell seconded the motion.

The motion carried by a vote of 3:0.

Next ARB Meeting: TUESDAY, January 22, 2013

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:22 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Tuesday, January 22, 2013 in Room 241, Second Floor, County Office Building at 1:00 p.m.

Fred Missel, Chairman

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