



DRAFT ARB ACTION MEMO / MINUTES

Date: May 20, 2024

Time: 1:00 PM

Meeting Room: Lane Auditorium

Members:

Chris Henningsen, Chair: Present
Frank Hancock, Vice-Chair: Present
Frank Stoner: Present
Dade Van Der Werf: Present
Taro Matsuno: Present

Staff:

Margaret Maliszewski
Khris Taggart

CALL TO ORDER: Mr. Henningsen called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

DISCLOSURES: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

CONSENT AGENDA: None.

REGULAR REVIEW ITEMS

a. **ARB2024-35: Dunlora Park Phase II Major Amendment**

Location: Approximately 293 ft southeast of the John W. Warner Parkway and Rio Road East intersection (See Figures 1, 2, and 3.)

Proposal: To construct two blocks of 9 townhomes containing 11 units with associated site improvements.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representative: Chuck Rapp (Collins Engineering) and Genevieve Verlaak (Greenwood Homes)

Khris Taggart summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members had no questions for staff. Chuck Rapp addressed the ARB, summarizing the design and visibility of the project. Mr. Van Der Werf asked if the applicant could pursue strategies to relieve blankness in the northern elevation, for example, windows or other elements. Ms. Verlaak stated that it would be hard given the floor plan, but the upper level could be divided from the lower level and the direction of the siding changed in the upper level. Neil Williamson, representing the Free Enterprise Forum (FEF), said the FEF has no specific position on this project, but suggested that the project should be available for staff-level review. In discussion, ARB discussed the anticipated visibility of the project and noted that landscaping consistent with the previous approval would be appropriate. Mr. Matsuno said a landscape solution would be appropriate for the blankness issue. Mr. Hancock said the added density is positive. Mr. Van Der Werf noted that the end gable will be visible, and that distance and landscape mitigate it. He said the board

often sees blank ends of townhouses; with the Board’s charge for orderly and harmonious development and consideration of historic precedents that show gable ends developed with some frontality; some frontality to the EC for an urban perspective would be appropriate. He said that he hoped that this applicant could take it a step further with greater care and attention to the gable end elevations. He said that this application is suitable, but there is an opportunity to improve character and quality going forward.

Mr. Stoner said that visibility was not enough to require additional landscaping, but concurred with suggestions that developers give more thought to end elevations. Mr. Henningsen concurred and said the proposal is appropriate. He asked about the ownership of the “island” between the site and the ECs (owned by the city). Mr. Rapp stated that the space will become a stormwater facility when the roundabout is constructed at the intersection.

The ARB members reviewed staff’s recommended conditions. Mr. Van Der Werf said the applicant was open to adding detail to the north elevation. Mr. Matsuno clarified in condition #6 that the shrubs shown in the perspective are not shown on the plan. Mr. Rapp pointed out the hollies and magnolias north of the townhouses. He said he could add shrubs along the side of the building. Mr. Stoner asked if condition #7 reflects what the applicant offered. Ms. Verlaak said that she would prefer not to revise the elevation. Mr. Stoner confirmed that there would be foundation planting and said that adding “consider” to condition #7 would be appropriate.

Motion: Mr. Stoner moved to approve ARB2024-35: Dunlora Park Phase II Major Amendment with the conditions outlined in the staff report, amended as follows:

Staff recommends approval with the following changes:

1. Revise the site plan to confirm the locations of the mechanical equipment. If equipment is located along the north end of townhouses indicate in the plans that the equipment screen color must match the color of the parged concrete base.
2. Consider revising the proposed fixture to one that is full cutoff.
3. Revise the light fixture information on sheet 5 of the site plan to specify a color temperature between 2000K and 3000K.
4. Revise the note on the cover sheet to indicate that building-mounted lighting is proposed.
5. Revise the site plan to include the standard lighting note.
6. Consider revising the landscape plan to show shrubs along the north end of the townhouses on lot 32 as illustrated in the perspective drawings.
7. Consider revising the north elevation of lot 32 to change the direction of siding at the upper part of the wall.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 5:0.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. Minutes Approval:

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved for approval of the minutes from the May 6, 2024, ARB meeting.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 5:0.

b. Other items from staff or ARB members: None.

- i. Mr. Van Der Werf mentioned the VDOT Ivy Corridor study and the potential for offsetting the visual impacts of future right-of-way changes with increased landscape buffers and more

stringent application of architectural criteria in the ECs. He said that it emphasizes for the comprehensive plan discussions the comments regarding landscape and rural character and continuity of planting along corridors as key elements, and it raises question whether some further measure is necessary if that character and continuity is to be preserved. Anticipating that other rights-of-way may be growing and buffers that seemed adequate may be shrinking, he encouraged to board to encourage the county, zoning, and planning to incorporate bigger landscape buffers adjacent to the ECs. Mr. Hancock suggested the board consider the right-of-way as not being there when reviewing an application. Mr. Van Der Werf asked if there is a way to assure development that mitigates the impact of the architecture or to think more stringently about the character of the buildings we are approving. Mr. Henningsen asked if VDOT is subject to ARB guidelines (no). Mr. Matsuno noted that visibility changes among seasons, we tend to look at landscape as static but depending on ownership and plans it could change significantly, and that is something to consider when weighing the relative mitigation of distance and landscape.

- ii. Mr. Stoner asked if each of the Entrance Corridors had been addressed in the guidelines addenda work. Staff reported that they had all been drafted, and reported that updates to maps, revisions to some corridor segments, and introductory sections were underway and would be brought to the ARB beginning this summer.
- iii. Mr. Stoner asked what was decided about renderings that were not accurate. Staff replied that the perspective images are not considered part of the final approved plan. He asked if there is any recourse. Staff suggested that we should be looking more closely at that on a case-by-case basis, that we should keep in mind that visibility may be more than what is illustrated, and that the goal is to have appropriately designed architecture that is supplemented with landscaping (not to screen inappropriate buildings from view). Mr. Hancock confirmed that there is recourse (zoning violation, fines, etc.) for discrepancies from approved site plans and elevations.
- iv. Mr. Matsuno asked about the Form-Based Code meeting scheduled for May 30. Staff noted that it is a listening session primarily for property owners and developers working in the Rio29 area, with a goal of gathering feedback on the current code, to inform future updates. Mr. Matsuno asked staff to relay anything that comes up that is relevant to the ARB.

- c. **Next ARB Meeting:** Monday, June 3, 2024, 1:00 PM – Lane Auditorium
All members stated that they plan to attend this meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:40 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Monday, June 3, 2023, at 1:00 p.m.