

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
August 5, 2013

The Albemarle County Architectural Review Board met on Monday, August 5, 2013, 1:00 p.m., Room 241, Second Floor, County Office Building, Charlottesville, Virginia. Those members present were Bruce Wardell, Marcia Joseph, Charles T. Lebo, Vice-Chair; and Fred Missel, Chair. Absent was John Quale. Staff members present were Margaret Maliszewski and Sharon Taylor.

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. There being none, the meeting proceeded.

REGULAR ITEMS

ARB-2013-78: Final Touch Tree Service Contractor Storage Yard - Site Development Plan
(Tax Map/Parcel 05600000008600)

Proposal: To establish a contractors storage yard to park tree service vehicles.

Staff Presentation:

Ms. Maliszewski summarized the request and the staff report. She recommended the following as the primary points of discussion:

1. Visibility of the storage yard from the EC.
2. Visibility of parked vehicles.
3. Visibility of the chain link fence from the EC/green vinyl coating.
4. Viburnum mature height/vehicle height.

Applicant Presentation:

David Anhold, representative for the request in the absence of Mike Umstarter, noted the following:

- The project will not have any impact to the Entrance Corridor due to the distance the site is set back and the existing woodlands in front of the property and Route 240.
- They would be willing to change landscape material as recommended by staff for screening.

Board Discussion:

The ARB discussed the proposal and noted the following issues:

- Provide plantings around to the sides since it does not appear the applicant has control of site immediately next to road and can't depend on that for any of the screening.

- Concern with plantings and requested more indigenous species or a combination. Add taller height plant materials that should be native for screening. Grouping of plantings might be helpful.

Motion: Mr. Lebo recommended approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for ARB-2013-78 Final Touch Tree Service Contractor Storage Yard with the conditions listed in the staff report, amended as follows.

1. Replace the viburnum with an alternate screening plant with a taller mature height and indicate a taller planting size. Plant material should be native species and a mix of species.
2. Carry the screening plants around the front corners of the storage yard, approximately 10'-15' down the sides of the yard.
3. 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."

Ms. Joseph seconded the motion.

The motion carried by a vote of 4:0. (Mr. Quale was absent.)

ARB-2013-86: Stonefield Blocks F and G Initial Site Plan, Variations, Rezoning - Initial Site Plan review, advisory review of requests for variations and a rezoning; conceptual review of massing (Tax Map/Parcel 061W00300019B0)

Proposal: To construct the northern phase of the Stonefield Town Center, including a big box retail store with a fuel pump canopy, and five buildings for retail/other uses.

Staff Presentation:

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

1. Building F1: size, scale, location, impact on the EC
2. Are trees required along the blank wall areas of Building F1?
3. Revised arrangement of Block G buildings
4. Impact of fueling station on the EC
5. Planting area along the EC frontage
6. Enhanced pedestrian corridor

Staff offers the following comments on the Initial Site Plan:

Staff recommends that the ARB forward the following recommendations to the agent:

- Regarding requirements to satisfy the design guidelines as per § 18-30.6.4(2), (3) and (5):
None.
- Regarding recommendations on the plan as it relates to the guidelines:
None.

- Regarding recommended conditions of initial site plan approval:
 - A Certificate of Appropriateness is required prior to final site plan approval. The applicant is advised that:
 - The standard lighting, landscaping and mechanical equipment notes are required on the site and architectural plans.
 - The quantity of trees required along the EC frontage may be greater than the guidelines minimum to compensate for the tree size limits imposed by the existing utility easements.
 - Details on screening wall design will be required with the final site plan submittal. Screening walls should be compatible with the appearance of building designs determined appropriate for the ECs.
- Regarding conditions to be satisfied prior to issuance of a grading permit:

None.

Staff offers the following comments on the Variation requests:

A double staggered row of trees along the portion of the pedestrian corridor between the bus stop and District Avenue would have a more appropriate appearance than the single row of trees shown in that location.

Staff offers the following comments on the Rezoning request:

1. There is no objection to the addition of the fueling facility use if the canopy is added to the layout as illustrated in the Initial Site Plan. The addition of the fueling facility use is not recommended with the layout illustrated in the Code of Development Modification Exhibit, which shows no buildings between the fueling facility and the EC.
2. The fuel pump canopy shall meet all EC Design Guidelines, including those for height.

Staff offers the following recommendations (based on the site distance and massing studies) for the future review of the architectural designs of Building F1:

1. ARB review of the architecture of Building F1 (as presented in the Site Distance and Massing illustrations) shall be limited to the east and south elevations.
2. ARB review of the architectural elevations of Building F1 (as presented in the Site Distance and Massing illustrations) shall not include materials or details.

Applicant Presentation:

Chris Haine, represented the request for Edens. Others present for Edens were Brad DuMont and Steve Teets. Those present for COSTCO were Jeff Rutler, Brian Kindell, and Steve Blaine.

Board Discussion:

The ARB discussed the proposal and noted concerns with the following issues:

- Cohesiveness and thinking about the remaining part of the development being complimentary to the current development is important.
- Parking and building massing. Human scale and blank walls would be issues for standard trademark designs. Concern with the view from the Entrance Corridor.
- Why are the parking spaces shown larger in size than normal?

- Do we know if the amount of parking shown is responding to the requirements of the site plan ordinance? Are they overparking in anticipation of needing more parking?
- Concern initial plan did not show fueling. Objections to fuel pumps in general.
- Question regarding retaining walls since the plan excludes materials and details. Will the ARB get information on the color of retaining walls? Staff noted that it was intended for the ARB to look at color but not material of the retaining walls.
- Location and configuration of structures, landscape area and existing trees: –There is a concern with the view from Entrance Corridor.
- Building Mass.
- Concern that they will get only a trademark building.
- Question of how to deal with the sea of parking, tall retaining walls and how it will relate to the roads.

Taking their concerns into consideration, the ARB took the following actions:

Motion: Mr. Lebo made a motion to forward the following recommendation on the Initial Site Plan to the Agent for ARB-2013-86: Stonefield Blocks F and G.

- Regarding requirements to satisfy the design guidelines as per § 18-30.6.4(2), (3) and (5):
None.
- Regarding recommendations on the plan as it relates to the guidelines:
None.
- Regarding recommended conditions of initial site plan approval:
 - A Certificate of Appropriateness is required prior to final site plan approval. The applicant is advised that:
 - The standard lighting, landscaping and mechanical equipment notes are required on the site and architectural plans.
 - The quantity of trees required along the EC frontage may be greater than the guidelines minimum to compensate for the tree size limits imposed by the existing utility easements.
 - Details on screening wall design will be required with the final site plan submittal. Screening walls should be compatible with the appearance of building designs determined appropriate for the ECs.
- Regarding conditions to be satisfied prior to issuance of a grading permit:
None.

Ms. Joseph seconded the motion.

The motion carried by a vote of 3:1. (Mr. Wardell voted no. Mr. Quale was absent)

Motion: Mr. Lebo made a motion to forward the following recommendation on the variation requests for ARB-2013-86: Stonefield Blocks F and G.

A double staggered row of trees along the portion of the pedestrian corridor between the bus stop and District Avenue would have a more appropriate appearance than the single row of trees shown in that location.

Ms. Joseph seconded the motion.

The motion carried by a vote of 4:0. (Mr. Quale was absent.)

Motion: Mr. Lebo made a motion to forward the following recommendation on the Rezoning request for ARB-2013-86: Stonefield Blocks F and G.

1. There is no objection to the addition of the fueling facility use if the canopy is added to the layout as illustrated in the Initial Site Plan. The addition of the fueling facility use is not recommended with the layout illustrated in the Code of Development Modification Exhibit, which shows no buildings between the fueling facility and the EC.
2. The fuel pump canopy shall meet all EC Design Guidelines, including those for height.

Ms. Joseph seconded the motion.

The motion carried by a vote of 4:0. (Mr. Quale was absent.)

Motion: Mr. Lebo made a motion based on the site distance and massing studies for the future ARB review of the architectural design of Building F1 in the Stonefield development.

1. ARB review of the architecture of Building F1 (as presented in the Site Distance and Massing illustrations) shall be limited to the east and south elevations.
2. ARB review of the architectural elevations of Building F1 (as presented in the Site Distance and Massing illustrations) shall not include details.
3. Building heights remain a subject for review.

Mr. Wardell seconded the motion.

The motion carried by a vote of 4:0. (Mr. Quale was absent)

OTHER BUSINESS

Hyatt at Stonefield: Copper

Brad DuMont, with Edens, explained that they were working with the owner of the hotel to come up with a solution for the appearance of the copper panels since they were targeting to open in December.

The ARB discussed the appearance of the copper panels installed at the Hyatt in the Stonefield development and stated that the installed copper shall be reviewed again after more time has elapsed but before the CO is issued. The ARB also indicated that the hotel owners or their representative should apprise the ARB of any additional steps that will be taken to speed up the aging process or otherwise change the appearance of the panels.

Approval of Minutes – July 15, 2013

Motion: Mr. Lebo moved for approval of the minutes of July 15, 2013.

Ms. Joseph seconded the motion.

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

Next ARB Meeting: Monday, August 19, 2013 (Mr. Missel to be absent.)

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:26 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Monday, August 19, 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)