

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
September 16, 2013

The Albemarle County Architectural Review Board met on Monday, September 16, 2013, 1:00 p.m., Room 241, Second Floor, County Office Building, Charlottesville, Virginia. Those members present were Marcia Joseph, Bruce Wardell, John Quale, and Fred Missel, Chairman. Absent was Charles T. Lebo, Vice Chair. Mr. Wardell left the meeting at 3:19 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 1:02 p.m. and established a quorum.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

REGULAR ITEMS

ARB-2013-103: Crozet Water Treatment Plant GAC Upgrade - Preliminary Review of Site Development Plan (Tax Map/Parcel 057000000029B0)

Proposal: To construct a Granular Activated Carbon facility at the Crozet Water Treatment Plant, including a pre-engineered metal building.

Staff Presentation:

Margaret Maliszewski summarized the staff report noting the primary points of discussion as follows:

1. Utilitarian appearance of the GAC facility/loading and service areas
2. Blankness of the building
3. Color of the building
4. Appearance of the translucent wall panels
5. Visibility of equipment
6. Lack of new trees/shrubs
7. Landscaping along the EC

Staff offers the comments on the preliminary plan as listed in the staff report.

Applicant Presentation:

David Briley and Maggie Hennessy, with Albemarle County Service Authority and Justin Weiler, with Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority, represented the request.

Board Discussion:

The ARB discussed the proposal with staff and the applicant on the following concerns:

- Consider significant screening or a change in the building material;
- Alternative travel layout and building location;
- Concern with the width of the entrance and truck traffic to loading dock; and
- Consider scale, massing and composition of the building.

The ARB offered the following comments on the preliminary plan:

1. Consider alternate travelway layouts and building locations and/or orientations to reduce visual impacts and overall area of paving/gravel drive visible from the EC, and to increase landscape opportunities along the EC.
2. Identify for review, and on the plan, the color of the metal panels for the walls and roof. The wall and roof color shall be compatible with the primary color of the existing water treatment plant.
3. Consider the guidelines under “Structure Design” items 9-19. The next submittal shall describe how these items have been addressed.
4. Revise the plan to include the new location of the existing shed. Consider moving the shed to a less visible location than the current one.
5. Provide a fence detail in the plan. Indicate fence material, height, and design. The black finish is more appropriate for the EC. Revise the fence location so that it does not cross in front of the proposed building.
6. Clarify which new equipment, if any, will be visible from Rt. 240.
7. Confirm that no new site or building lighting is proposed, or show the proposed lighting on the plan and provide all related details.
8. Add tall shrubs among the group of trees identified as to remain in the area north of the GAC facility. Ensure that the shrubs are planted in a natural, informal pattern and that they provide low level screening for the site.
9. Clarify the level of tree/shrub removal proposed for installation of bio-retention area #2. Add new plants to achieve a natural, informal appearance along the EC.
10. Provide a plant schedule in the site plan with all standard information.
11. Add the following note to the site 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.”
12. Provide verification from a certified arborist that the proposed fill, grading, and digging required to install the piping and other site work will not be detrimental to the health of the trees designated to remain. Provide an arborist’s plan outlining measures to ensure the health of the trees throughout and after the work. Include the arborist’s measures on the site plan drawings.
13. Identify on the plan the size and species of the trees to remain in the area at the middle of the gravel drive and in the area west of the driveway along the EC.
14. Provide a tree conservation plan and checklist. Provide tree protection in the areas impacted by the construction of bio-retention area #2.

WORK SESSIONS

Northside Library/Storage Facility

The ARB held a work session on the Northside Library/Storage Facility, receiving an overview of the project from staff and the architect.

Ron Lilley, Project Manager with the Office of Facilities Development, noted others present were Peter Ballek, from HBM Architects in Cleveland, who would walk them through the basic plan of development thus far; Eugene Ryang and James Moore of Water Street Studio, consultants on landscape architecture; and Trevor Henry, Director of Office of Facilities Development. Mr. Lilley asked for initial feedback from the ARB on the proposal before they develop the concepts.

Peter Ballek, HBM Architects, provided a quick overview of the proposal.

Board Discussion:

The ARB held a discussion with staff and their representatives. The ARB indicated that the project was moving in the right direction and noted the following issues:

1. The book drop-off area needs more attention.
2. The relationship between the interior program and the exterior appearance is appreciated, as is the re-use of the existing building.
3. The project is moving in a good direction. Positive features include: marking entry, differentiating activities and adding scale.
4. There were questions about the appearance of the front loading/dumpster area.
5. There were questions about landscaping, and about materials and colors.
6. The book drop-off and canopy on the EC side of the building will “identify” the building.

The ARB took a break at 2:24 p.m. and the meeting reconvened at 2:29 p.m.

Mr. Missel noted a change in the order of business to review ARB-2011-93, Hyatt at Stonefield: Copper Panel which was item a) under Old Business.

OTHER BUSINESS

ARB-2011-93: Hyatt at Stonefield: Copper panel

Mr. Missel noted a change in the order of business to review ARB-2011-93, Hyatt at Stonefield: Copper Panel which was item a) under Old Business.

The ARB discussed the status of the appearance of the copper panels installed at the Hyatt in the Stonefield development with various representatives of the design and construction team.

Representatives present were Neil Bhatt, NBJ Architects; Charles and Granger MacFarlane, developer and owners of the project; Jim Gasnail and Ben Jones, contractors; Jim Walas, representative for the copper; Jim Moses, panel manufacturer; and Paul Sharp, subcontractor, fabricator and installer for the panels.

Mr. Missel invited public comment.

Paul Wright, former member of the Architectural Review Board, noted concerns about the installed panels not matching what was submitted and approved by the ARB. He felt the installed panels were not acceptable and must be replaced.

Neil Bhatt left the meeting at 3:06 p.m.

Steve Blaine, attorney, spoke regarding the guidelines.

Mr. Missel noted that they needed to address the timeframe since Mr. MacFarlane indicated that they would continue working on the issue.

Then Mr. Quale made the following motion:

The Alpolic copper composite panels installed on the Hyatt at Stonefield are not the copper panels that were approved with the Certificate of Appropriateness issued on November 1, 2011 and upheld by the ARB's action on November 21, 2012, and they do not have the appearance of un-aged copper that will weather to aged copper, as approved. The ARB, therefore, withholds approval of these panels at this time. However, the ARB is willing to wait up to one (1) year to allow the aging process to continue. If the panels still do not have the anticipated appearance of aged copper or un-aged copper that will weather to aged copper, then the panels shall be removed and replaced with an ARB-approved panel, or, at the ARB's discretion, the existing panels shall be treated to achieve the appearance of aged copper. The ARB asks that this be made a condition of the Certificate of Occupancy and that the County hold a bond to ensure that this work will be completed.

Ms. Joseph seconded the motion.

The motion passed by a vote of 3:0. (Lebo and Wardell absent)

Mr. Wardell left the meeting at 3:19 p.m.

The ARB took a break at 3:25 p.m. and the meeting reconvened at 3:29 p.m.

WORK SESSIONS

Costco at Stonefield

The ARB held a work session on the Costco building at Stonefield, with the applicants, Chris Haine, Brian Kendall, architect; and Brad DuMont, presenting on architecture, lighting and signage. In summary, the ARB had the following comments:

1. The ARB expressed concern about the visibility of the building due to its size and the topography, even though the distance between the building and the EC is great.
2. The "unblocked" view of the Costco building will be considered if there is no assurance that the buildings fronting the EC will be constructed at the same time.
3. There is concern about the "sea of parking" and its impact on the EC.
4. Landscaping in excess of EC minimums will be needed to offset the expanse of parking and the blank walls.

5. The entrance looks like an addition to the building. Greater integration is required.
6. The large blank walls are out of character for the development. Take architectural cues from the rest of the development. Break down the massing more. Reduce the visual impact.
7. Colors, mass and landscaping are primary issues.
8. Views should be presented with and without planting and other buildings.
9. Be accurate with grades and building heights.
10. To better understand the visibility of the building, it would be helpful to fly balloons at the building corners, at proposed building height.

OTHER BUSINESS

Approval of Minutes – 8-5-2013 and 11-19-2012

Motion: Mr. Quale moved for approval of the minutes of August 5, 2013 and November 19, 2012.

Ms. Joseph seconded the motion.

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

Next ARB Meeting: Monday, October 7, 2013

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:06 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on October 7, 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)