

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
February 19, 2013

The Albemarle County Architectural Review Board met on Monday, February 19, 2013, 1:00 p.m., Room 241, Second Floor, County Office Building, Charlottesville, Virginia. Those members present were Marcia Joseph, Bruce Wardell, Charles T. Lebo, Vice Chair, and Fred Missel, Chairman. Absent was John Quale.

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

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Missel called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and established a quorum. He welcomed Marcia Joseph to the ARB as the newly appointed member.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

REGULAR REVIEW ITEMS

ARB-2013-02: Portico Church Sign - Certificate of Appropriateness for Signs (Tax Map 32, Parcel 41G)

Mr. Missel recused himself from ARB-2013-02 and left the meeting room at 1:02 p.m., turning the meeting over to Mr. Lebo, Vice-Chair.

Proposal: To install signs on the mansard composed of letters and logo cans and to install a panel sign on the wall.

Staff Presentation:

Brent Nelson summarized the staff report recommending the primary points of discussion as follows:

1. The backer panel sign design and its relationship to the mansard roof.
2. The logo can design, its colors, illumination and relationship to the overall sign design.

Staff recommends approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the signs with the conditions outlined in the staff report.

Applicant Presentation:

Caitlin Byrd Schafer, with Gropen Signs; Brandon Wooten, designer of sign; and Justin Conger, a lead Pastor for Portico Church, represented the application. They provided a general overview of the proposal, as follows.

- Given the unique challenges with this building's frontage and the mansard being behind the bank and gas station, they are trying to be creative with the sign wrap and respect County guidelines.
- The first option is with a clear coated corrugated metal backer, but they are willing to do a black metal backer so it would stand out better with the lighting.
- Regarding lighting, they left out the lumens in the application. The three gooseneck fixtures are going to be 10 watt halogen bulbs, which were about 600 to 700 lumens. The can lighting will be a maximum of 15 watt LEDs, which is around 600 to 900 lumens. Therefore, they should still be within the 3,000 lumens if they are able to keep all of the lights.
- Regarding the recommendation of moving the sign between the columns, if they just had the sign on the 29 side they would not have any visibility at all. Their frontage is facing Airport Road. So to center the sign is not really giving them the visibility and it is not an architecture that is really visible anyway.
- Speaking to the logo itself, one of the recommendations was that the Portico part would be illuminated and not the round part since only the logo itself can be illuminated. It was not included in this set, but the logo is actually round. The whole round part is the logo. It would be more visible to have that part illuminated and it would give more of a contrast between the dark backer and the lit sign itself. Because the letters are smaller they have to light those with goosenecks, which won't be as visible at night. They wanted to have some kind of visible beacon, which would be the logo itself.

Board Discussion:

The ARB discussed the sign proposal with staff and the applicant noting the following issues:

- The sign wrap and how it respects guidelines.
- Signs should have a coherent relationship with the adjacent architectural elements.
- Center the sign over the architectural elements it relates to.
- Backer panel sign design and its relationship to the mansard roof. If the backer panel should match the roof material - black versus dark green – black would be okay.
- Uniformity of signs & lighting
- Sign logo and graphics - round can with a white circle inside
- Logo can design – use opaque, non-illuminated background
- Side wall color is not in the ARB's purview.

Motion: Mr. Wardell moved to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for ARB-2013-02 Portico Church Sign as proposed with the conditions listed in the staff report, amended as follows:

1. Revise the sign proposal by dividing signs 1 and 2 and centering them over/within architectural elements. Provide a return on the backer panel to give it a finished appearance from Airport Road.
2. Reduce the logo can(s) diameter to 2'.
3. Revise the sign drawings to include a bulb type and wattage (emitting less than 3,000 lumens) for the gooseneck style light fixtures.
4. Revise the sign drawings to indicate an opaque, non-illuminated background for the logo can(s). A white ring inside the can may be illuminated.

5. Revise the sign drawings to indicate whether or not wall Sign 3 on the side elevation is to be illuminated. If illumination is proposed, external illumination with the gooseneck fixtures is preferred.

Ms. Joseph seconded the motion.

The motion carried by a vote of 3:0. (Missel recused.)

Mr. Missel, Chairman, returned to the meeting at 1:40 p.m.

ARB-2013-01: Price Hyundai at Northtown Center - Advisory Review for a Special Use Permit and Conceptual Site Plan and Architectural Design (Tax Map 45, Parcel 111)

Proposal: To construct an automobile showroom and service center with outdoor sales/storage/display of vehicles.

Staff Presentation:

Margaret Maliszewski summarized the staff report and recommends the following as the primary points of discussion:

1. The location and extent of display parking in the parking lot and under the showroom canopy
2. General character/appearance of the showroom: canopy, glass, metal panels
3. Appearance, compatibility of the entrance element (materials/colors)
4. Visibility of the parts/service building, wash/alignment building, rooftop equipment
5. The illumination of display parking areas
6. General character of the proposed landscaping, landscaping in areas adjacent to the building

Outdoor sales, storage and display require a special use permit in the Entrance Corridors specifically due to the potential visual impacts on the Entrance Corridors. The ARB is being requested to take two actions on the proposal.

1. Staff recommends that the ARB forward the recommendation to the Planning Commission on the Special Use Permit request as referenced in the staff report.
2. Staff offers the comments on the conceptual site plan and architectural design as referenced in the staff report. The design issues can be worked out at the site plan stage.

Other issues staff noted, as follows:

- Entrance element that has the blue ACM panels – lack of coordination with the rest of the building
- South elevation of the Parts and Service Building – size of the windows and the utilitarian appearance – Distance from the Entrance Corridor and visibility could be mitigating factors there
- The wash and alignment building elevations were not included in the submittal – Distance from Entrance Corridor and visibility could be mitigating factors
- Grading proposed in the dripline of trees indicated to remain

- There are a number of trees shown located over or very near pipes. There are other conflicts with the proposed shrubs.
- It looks like there is more parking proposed than is allowed. It will have to be worked out at the site plan stage.

Applicant Presentation:

Bob Anderson, architect representing the owner, and Wendell Wood were present. Mr. Anderson pointed out there is a list of 27 staff recommendations and there are only five of them that he can't agree with.

- **#22 Consider adding trees at front of the building.** He has never met a car dealer who wants a tree in front of his building. The owners would not like to consider that. There are trees planned for across the street in the park behind the bank, which will partially block the front of this building.
- **#21 Add trees in the western half the parking row adjacent to biofilter #2.** What area is that? (Ms. Maliszewski pointed out the area referred to.)
- Landscaping and lighting concerns can be taken care of. They will reduce the level of lighting in the overhang in the vehicle display.
- **#2 Revise south elevation of the parts service building to improve the window proportions.** That is a parts building and the windows are shown up high because they want to use all of the walls on the inside for shelving. One of the landscaping comments is to put some evergreen trees in front of that building along that strip, which they can do. The building is so far back and drops down the hill. At that point that floor level is approximately 6' below the floor level of the show room itself. They can put a different type of window in there, but they are going to be up high. It is not going to be that visible from the EC.
- **Revise the entrance element to increase coordination of the show room building design. Consider size, shape, color, detailing and overall character.** The entrance element is the logo that comes down from the corporate executives and that is what they would like to see. They have agreed to change a lot of the building from what they would normally require due to EC regulations, but request to have the logo and the signage (blue panel) at the main entrance. The building is 250' back from the highway. The logo and name would be illuminated and not the blue box itself.
- Mr. Anderson agreed with staff's recommendations on the special use permit.

Board Discussion:

The ARB reviewed and discussed the proposal with staff and the applicant concerning the special use permit request and potential visual impacts on the Entrance Corridor on the following concerns.

- Signage out front – Clarify the panel is not illuminated. The color of the letter and the logo.
- Reduce the parking if too much on the conceptual plan
- An aerial photo would be helpful
- Visibility issues from Route 29 for vehicles, display parking and buildings – change in elevation

- Landscaping Plan – add trees in excess of regulations to mitigate impacts of the proposed use. Some landscaping shown is not attached to this particular project. Consider planting islands in front.
- Partially completed rain garden which is shown on the plan – ARB concerned about when will it be completed and asked applicant to consider planting and cleaning up the area in front.
- Lighting levels must meet guidelines.
- For the blue color to be appropriate it needs to be integrated into the building more coherently. Is blue storefront too much?
- The scale of the parts building needs to be broken down and coordinated (tie in) with the showroom building. Consider smaller windows.

Mr. Wardell left the meeting at 2:16 p.m.

Motion: Mr. Lebo made a motion to forward the following recommendation to the Planning Commission regarding the special use permit request for ARB-2013-01, Price Hyundai at Northtown Center:

The ARB has no objection to the request for the Special Use Permit with the following conditions:

1. Vehicles shall not be elevated anywhere on site.
2. Vehicles shall be displayed only in areas indicated for display shown on the plan entitled “Architectural Review Board Submission for Phase 1 Northtown Center – Jim Price Hyundai” by Dominion Engineering and dated 1/14/13. Display parking in the parking lot shall be only in designated striped parking spaces, as identified on this plan.
3. Final site plan approval is subject to ARB approval of the lighting plan (submitted with the site plan). Maximum light levels shall not exceed 30 footcandles.
4. Final site plan approval is subject to ARB approval of the landscape plan (submitted with the site plan). Landscaping shown on the plan may be required to be in excess of the minimum requirements of ARB guidelines and/or the Zoning Ordinance to mitigate visual impacts of the proposed use.

Mr. Wardell seconded the motion.

The motion carried by a vote of 4:0.

The ARB offers the following comments on the conceptual site plan and architectural design:

Architecture:

1. Include the wash/alignment building in the elevation drawings.
2. Revise the south elevation of the parts/service building to improve the window proportions, relieve the utilitarian appearance, and coordinate more with the showroom.
3. Provide a roof plan.
4. Include building dimensions and the drawing scale on the elevation drawings.
5. Provide a perspective view of the development as seen from the EC to clarify the extent of visibility and the impact of the parts/service and wash/alignment buildings.

6. Revise the entrance element to increase coordination with the showroom building design. Consider size, shape, color, detailing and overall character.
7. Add the following note to the site plan and the architectural drawings: "Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated."
8. Provide wall sign information with the ARB site plan/architectural applications. The review of entrance element signs will be closely tied to the review of the entrance element.

Lighting:

9. Revise the lighting plan so that light levels do not exceed 30 footcandles anywhere on site.
10. Indicate on the plan if the light poles are to be installed on bases. If they are, clarify on the plan that the 20' height includes the bases.
11. Add the following note to the lighting and/or site 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."

Site/Landscaping:

12. Indicate the scale on the site plan drawings and include a north arrow.
13. Increase the size of the QC Willow Oak at the north end of the EC frontage to 3½" caliper minimum at planting.
14. Add LN to the plant schedule.
15. Correct the plant schedule to indicate that Quercus Phellos is Willow Oak and that Quercus Coccinea is Scarlet Oak.
16. Verify and correct the QP, PL, LN, IC, JV, PT, PO, and LB quantities.
17. Ensure that the number of proposed plants for any one species is limited to 25% of the total proposed for that plant type (tree/shrub).
18. Include the biofilter plant schedule in the current plan for reference.
19. Provide trees and shrubs in the area west of the west end of biofilter #2.
20. Ensure that all utilities and utility easements are clearly identified on the plans. Resolve all tree/utility conflicts without decreasing the amount of planting proposed.
21. Add trees in the western half of the parking row adjacent to biofilter #2.
22. Consider adding trees at the front of the building.
23. Add evergreen trees along the south elevation of the parts/service building to help relieve the utilitarian appearance.
24. Resolve the shrub/sidewalk/planting strip conflicts near the wash/alignment building.
25. Add the following note to 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."
26. Indicate wall heights and proposed materials for the retaining wall in the parking lot.
27. Revise the landscape plan to clearly show trees to be preserved, grading held outside the dripline of trees to remain, the limits of clearing, and the location and type of protective fencing. Coordinate proposed tree locations with undisturbed buffer limits.
28. Consider planting the partially completed rain garden #3 with the Price Hyundai proposal.

ARB-2013-08: Gander Mountain at Northtown Center - Review of a Final Site Development Plan (Tax Map 45, Parcels 110, 110A, 111)

Proposal: To construct a Gander Mountain retail store as Phase 2A of the development in the Northtown 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 January 7, 2013 work session:

- The upper part of the end bay walls on the west, north and south (west end) elevations have been revised to the darker color used at the middle of the west elevation.
- Trees along Rt. 29 have been revised to meet EC size and spacing requirements.
- The paired log supports on the front (north) elevation have been given stone bases.
- Some of the wall pack light fixtures have been revised to more decorative fixtures.
- The back of the entrance gable is shown in a darker color than was previously proposed.
- Emergency exit doors are colored to match the surrounding wall color.

Staff recommends the following as the primary points of discussion/questions to consider:

1. Final building materials and colors (Is the distribution of EIFS colors appropriate?)
2. Integration of decorative wall fixtures (Does the change from wall packs to decorative fixtures on the piers satisfy the ARB's wall light concerns?)
3. Visibility of rooftop equipment and related information required on the plan (Must the rooftop equipment be shown on the elevation drawings, or is the applicant's description of the size and location sufficient?)
4. Tree species at the building (Are Dogwoods an appropriate species for planting against the EC elevation, or would an evergreen be more appropriate?)
5. Final landscape plan (Is the quantity and general character of planting appropriate?)

Staff recommends approval of ARB-2013-08 Gander Mountain subject to the conditions referenced in the staff report.

Applicant Presentation:

Scott Collins, representative for the applicant, reviewed staff's comments and discussed two concerns, referencing a site plan with highlighting.

- The existing storm sewer area along Route 29 is tight due to the easement. The storm sewer is mainly taking drainage around the building to the rain garden. They moved the storm sewer down the middle of the drive aisle and had a little stub-out over the inlet, which took out the easement that affected that area. That is what Ms. Maliszewski was talking about with all the trees being affected by the double drainage easements. The area or strip left shown in green is where they are going to plant all of the trees, which are outside all of the easements. They do have some bushes and some other landscape features, but those are in the easement. With that one change to the storm sewer they are able to accommodate the same landscaping proposed in the submittal.

- The second comment was about saving the two main trees in the back and assuring that the buffer and everything else would be intact. They had 38' in the alley way behind the building, but then they narrow it just pass the loading dock to 26'. By moving the wall they are able to keep the trees and stay outside the 20' undisturbed buffer.

Others present representing the application were Wendell Wood, owner/developer, and Nena Harrell.

Board Discussion:

Following questions and answers about the proposal, the ARB discussed the proposal with staff and the applicant, focusing on the issues raised in the staff report, as noted and addressed in the conditions.

- Lighting - Affirm the size of the light fixtures are as specified.
- Landscaping - Recommend larger trees to be more in keeping with the size of the building since Dogwoods appear small.
- Extend the street trees to the biofilter.

Motion: Mr. Lebo moved to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for ARB-2013-08 Gander Mountain with the conditions outlined in the staff report, amended as follows:

1. Provide dimensioned architectural elevations (black and white line drawings) with all standard information: the visibility note, materials/color schedule, materials identification keyed to the drawings, the drawing scale, drawing/revision date, etc.
2. Revise the elevation drawings to show the location and height of rooftop equipment. Ensure that all equipment will not be visible.
3. Provide samples of the proposed EIFS colors (other than SW6150 and SW6151) for review. Revise the Sherwin Williams "sandtrap" to a color with less pink and more khaki.
4. Ensure that the visibility note will appear on the architectural drawings submitted with the building permit application.
5. Provide cut sheets on the plan for the wall pack fixtures. Include the wall packs in the photometric calculations. Ensure that the decorative wall lights meet the scale and proportion shown in the elevations.
6. Revise the luminaire schedule to include the wall packs and the decorative wall fixtures.
7. Revise the photometrics using an LLF of 1.0.
8. Revise the luminaire schedule to specify the flat lens for the shoebox fixtures.
9. Revise the luminaire schedule to include the lamp type and catalog numbers for all proposed fixtures. Ensure that the lamps will provide a consistent appearance throughout the development by specifying a consistent lamp type. (Metal halide appears to be a common lamp type in the development.)
10. Indicate if the entrance element is illuminated. If it is, add the information to the photometric plan.
11. Revise the lighting plan to eliminate lighting/utility conflicts.
12. Indicate whether or not the parking lot pole lights will be placed on bases. If bases will be used, indicate this on the plan and clarify on the plan that the 20' height includes the base height.

13. Clearly identify all utilities and easements on the site plan. Provide all landscaping on site and outside of easements without reducing the quantity of plants or the general character of the planting illustrated on the 1/15/13 plan.
14. Provide a grading plan.
15. Maintain all grading on site.
16. Clarify and coordinate the grading and planting near the existing individual trees to remain on the south side of the site. Show tree protection fencing and related relevant details.
17. Consider replacing the dogwoods at the building with an evergreen species or other scale appropriate tree with visual interest for year-round effect.
18. Extend the street trees along rain garden #3.

Ms. Joseph seconded the motion.

The motion carried by a vote of 3:0. (Wardell absent)

OTHER BUSINESS

Brooks Brothers Signs

The ARB discussed the Brooks Brothers sign proposal and provided the following direction: The features of the proposed signs that do not meet the established criteria are not expected to have a negative impact on the Entrance Corridor and may be reviewed/approved by staff.

Jarman's Sportcycles Building: porch enclosure

The ARB discussed the Jarman's Sportcycles porch enclosure proposal and provided the following direction: The design of the porch enclosure should not look like a filled-in porch. It should look like an integral part of the building architecture. It is likely that more windows will be needed than what currently exists.

Next ARB Meeting: Monday, March 4, 2013

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:07 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on March 4, 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)