



FINAL ARB ACTION MEMO / MINUTES

Date: March 18, 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 1:02 p.m. and established a quorum.

DISCLOSURES: Mr. Henningsen and Mr. Matsuno stated that they would need to leave the meeting at 2:40.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

CONSENT AGENDA:

a. ARB2024-08: Old Ivy Residences

Location: 2441 Old Ivy Road, and undeveloped land to the west and north

Proposal: Request for final site plan approval for a residential development consisting of 525 dwelling units on 35.37 acres, for a gross residential density of 14.8 units/acre. Dwelling units include a mixture of multifamily units, townhomes, and single-family detached residences with associated site improvements.

Staff Contact: Mariah Gleason

Representative: Pat Hill

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved to approve the consent agenda, approving the Final Site Plan with the conditions listed in the staff report, as follows:

1. Provide revised architectural drawings and elevations that align with color scheme option 1 for the apartment buildings.
2. Provide complete material and color details for the roofs, sides, and backs of single-family detached units 41-59 and townhouse unit 107.
3. Revise the design of the single-family detached and attached units to eliminate the use of arctic white siding on rear and side elevations.
4. Provide information, materials, or notes demonstrating compliance with EC window glass criteria.
5. Revise the dumpster enclosure detail on Sheet C-503 to identify a paint color that is compatible

- with the color scheme of the development and the existing character of the corridor.
6. Provide details for structural features, including but not limited to fencing, shade, and hanging features, proposed within the recreation area west of Apartment Building 4.
 7. Revise the lighting plan sheets to show that the color temperatures for each of the light fixtures is between 2000 and 3000K.
 8. Revise the plan to identify a consistent color for free-standing pole mounted light fixtures within the development. Acceptable colors include dark bronze, black, and dark brown.
 9. Revise the site plan to limit free standing, pole-mounted light fixtures to a maximum of 20 feet in height in areas that are visible from the EC and not obstructed from view by buildings.
 10. Revise Sheets SL101-SL103 to include the standard lighting note.
 11. Revise the lighting plan sheets to include lighting proposed in the recreation area west of Apartment Building 4.
 12. Provide details, notes, and specifications for proposed lighting within the recreation area west of Apartment Building 4, demonstrating compatibility with the EC guidelines.
 13. Provide medium trees planted parallel to the pedestrian way along the northern side of Apartment Building 4 (approximately 110 feet). Trees should be at least 2½ inches caliper and located at least every 25 feet on center.
 14. Revise the landscape plan to use shrub species that align with the county approved planting list.
 15. Revise the common name for the Ilex Opaca species to “American Holly” in the Landscaping Schedules on Sheets L00 and L07.
 16. Revise Note 6 on landscaping sheets L00-L06 to align with the required plant health note: “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.”
 17. Revise notes on Sheets C-141 through C-146 to refer to areas being preserved as “existing vegetation to remain”.
 18. Remove conflicts between areas of disturbance and tree preservation areas on Sheets C-141, C-144, L00 and wherever else conflicts occur.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

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

REGULAR REVIEW ITEMS

a. ARB2024-05: Northpoint Wendy’s Initial Site Plan

Location: Northeast corner of Seminole Trail (Route 29) and Northside Drive

Proposal: To construct a 2,228-sf fast-food restaurant with drive-through and walk-up pick-up windows, with associated site improvements on a 1.01-acre portion of a parcel totaling approximately 64.13 acres.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representative: David Mitchell

Khris Taggart summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members had no questions for staff. David Michell, the developer for the project, represented the applicant (Wendy’s). He said he did not have a formal presentation and planned to revise the plan to address the issues identified in the staff report. He noted that they are dealing with a “tight site” that is constrained by the VDOT designated entrance to the south and property owned by other entities to the north. Mr. Stoner asked for clarification on the relegated parking recommendation. Staff responded that the priority is to move the two parking spaces from directly in front of the building. Mr. Matsuno confirmed that the site wall will be retained and that the parking count equals the minimum requirement. Mr. Mitchell stated that the building footprint is smaller than the company standard. No members of the public spoke on the application. In discussion, the

ARB noted that the site wall is a nice entrance feature, that the side elevation of the building will have prominence for northbound traffic, and that staff comments were appropriate.

Motion: Mr. Hancock moved to forward the recommendations outlined in the staff report to the Agent for the Site Review Committee, with the conditions listed in the staff report:

- Regarding requirements to satisfy the design guidelines as per § 18-30.6.4c(2), (3) and (5) and recommended conditions of initial plan approval:
 - Prior to the Initial Plan approval the following items shall be resolved to the satisfaction of the ARB: Revise the site layout to relegate parking away from the EC, reduce the visual impact of parking and paved areas on the EC, and allow the architecture of the building to be the primary feature of the site.
- Regarding recommendations on the plan as it relates to the guidelines: None.
- Regarding conditions to be satisfied prior to issuance of a grading permit: None.
- Regarding the final site plan submittal:

A Certificate of Appropriateness is required prior to final site plan approval. The following items and all items on the ARB Final Site Plan Checklist must be addressed:

 1. Provide architectural designs for preliminary review with the next submittal.
 2. Provide specifications on the proposed window glass. Provide samples, if tinted window glass is proposed.
 3. Revise the site plan to provide details on the design of the dumpster enclosure.
 4. Update the plans to provide detailed information on all equipment, including design, color, illumination, etc.
 5. Show the location of mechanical equipment (building and ground-mounted) on the site and architectural plans and show how it will be screened from the EC.
 6. Add the standard mechanical equipment note to the site and architectural plans: Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated.
 7. Revise the site plan to provide a complete lighting plan with the next submittal.
 8. Add the standard lighting note to the lighting 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 foot-candle.
 9. Revise the site plan to provide a complete landscape plan with the next submittal. Revisions to provide space for interior parking and pedestrian/roadway trees will be needed.
 10. Add the standard landscaping 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.
 11. Provide architectural designs for review that relegate utilitarian features away from the EC and that presents a fully integrated façade to the EC.

Mr. Van Der Werf seconded the motion.
The motion was carried by a vote of 5:0.

b. ARB2024-09: Home Depot Final Site Plan

Location: 1531 Rio Road East

Proposal: To construct a Home Depot store with garden center and associated site improvements.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski
Representative: Valerie Long

Margaret Maliszewski summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members had no questions for staff. Valerie Long with Williams Mullen represented the applicant and explained that internal confusion led to two of the previous comments not being addressed in the current submittal. She showed images of updated drawings addressing those issues and stated that all issues identified in the staff report would be addressed in a resubmittal. She noted that preliminary VDOT approval was received for the planting along Rt. 29 and clarified that some tree island that previously accommodated two trees are now proposed with a single tree. ARB members asked the applicant about the width of the sidewalk along the building (15') and the material behind the lumber sign (same as above it). No members of the public spoke about the proposal. In discussion, the ARB noted that most of the concerns from the previous reviews had been addressed, and that the greater depth of the canopy was an improvement (though Mr. Van Der Werf noted that more depth and adding columns would reduce blankness). Some members had no preference regarding the original lumber canopy design and the updated design. Mr. Matsuno asked how the process would proceed. Staff responded that with ARB direction on the lumber canopy, staff level review of a resubmitted plan would be appropriate.

Motion:

Mr. Matsuno moved to approve the Final Site Plan with the conditions listed in the staff report, amended as follows:

1. Revise the lumber canopy for greater coordination with the main entrance canopy. The revised design showed in the meeting is acceptable to the ARB.
2. Provide updated color samples for review.
3. Increase the depth of the canopy over the main entrance to add visual interest and human scale and to help reduce blankness. The 6' depth shown in the meeting is acceptable to the ARB.
4. Revise the site plan to identify the locations of fencing in/around the garden center and any other locations where fencing will be provided.
5. Provide fence details in the site and architectural plans.
6. Add the standard mechanical equipment note to the site and architectural plans. "Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated."
7. Add the lighting plans to the final site plan set.
8. Revise the photometric plan to limit illumination in the parking lot to 20fc.
9. Revise the luminaire schedule to show that the color temperature of all light fixtures does not exceed 3000K.
10. Revise the lighting plan to include the color/finish of the poles and fixtures. Dark brown, dark bronze, or black are recommended.
11. Replace the Trident Maple, Dwarf Burford Holly, and Schipka English Laurel with plants found on the County's approved plant list.
12. Revise the plans to account for the five additional trees that will need to be removed to accommodate the development.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.
The motion was carried by a vote of 5:0.

c. ARB2024-22: Rio Point Final Site Plan

Location: 878 Rio Road

Proposal: To construct a multi-family development consisting of 328 units, with a trailhead park and associated site improvements.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representative: Joe Wrege

Khris Taggart summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Van Der Werf asked if a previous design have more varied roof forms (yes). Mr. Stoner confirmed that the renderings had not been updated to match the revised elevations. Shawn Balon with Timmons and Jonathan Beck with Rule, Joy, Trammell & Rubio architects summarized the design changes for the ARB, including the trailhead park, HVAC planting, and elevation changes. Mr. Matsuno asked why the stair towers were not the same on Buildings 100 and 200. Mr. Van Der Werf asked if the two parking spaces near the retaining wall could be moved to allow more space for planting to screen the wall. Mr. Van Der Werf asked if the continuous ridge lines of Buildings 100 and 200 could be broken to help reduce the mass. Mr. Stoner confirmed that the sidewalk could not be shifted due to the grade. The applicants said that the layered landscape between the buildings and the parkway mitigated the wall. No members of the public spoke about the project.

In discussion, Mr. Van Der Werf noted the scale of the roofs and suggested that the ARB develop standards for treating overall building mass, including roof form. He said that the care taken in the design of the elevations was undone by the mass of the roof. He appreciated the layered landscape concept and asked about the existing vegetation to remain and what would need to be there in the future to be consistent with the approved plan. He acknowledged the current vogue for cool colors and noted that they don't relate to traditional colors and materials of the area. Mr. Stoner agreed with Mr. Van Der Werf's roof comments, noted the benefit – and expense – of a stone base, said that the retaining wall/sidewalk configuration could be addressed with a little effort, and supported staff's comments. Mr. Hancock said that the proposal benefits from the pocket park and a large amount of green space between the buildings and the corridor. He agreed that the retaining wall "wasn't there yet" but could be resolved with some creativity and a detailed visualization. He mentioned the form and scale of barns as a consideration when reviewing buildings of the size proposed in this development. Mr. Matsuno said that the elevations located at the three-bedroom corner units are too blank, most prominent, and require additional detail to be consistent with the rest of the buildings.

Staff presented the comments listed in the staff report with four additional comments based on the ARB's discussion. Mr. Van Der Werf said that he thought that comment #14 regarding wooded area to remain might be handled by noting quantity, species and caliper.

Motion: Mr. Stoner moved to approve the final site plan with the conditions listed in the staff report, amended as follows:

1. Revise the site plan to coordinate the building footprints with the ones shown in the architectural plan.
2. Revise the architectural drawings to show where the shake siding is used or remove it from the material palette.
3. Consider revising the white used for the upper portions of the apartment buildings to Site White SW7070 or provide a color sample for High Reflective White SW7757 for review.
4. Provide a window glass sample for review.
5. Revise the site plan set to show the mechanical equipment locations.
6. Revise the landscape plan to show mechanical equipment-related landscaping.
7. Revise the lighting plan to note the intensity of illumination at the ground for the building-mounted fixtures.
8. Revise the site plan to clarify the symbols for the bollard and building-mounted lighting.
9. Revise the lighting plan to confirm that no decorative lighting is proposed.
10. Revise the plant schedule to note the tree species proposed southwest of Buildings 3 and 4.
11. Revise the plans to ensure that the retaining wall between Buildings 1 and 2 will have no negative impact on the EC.
12. Revise the projection of the stair towers on Building 100 to match those on Building 200.
13. Consider breaking up the continuous ridge of the roofs on Buildings 100 and 200.

14. Add notes to the plan to further describe the contents of the wooded area to remain to ensure continuity of character into the future.
15. Revise the elevations of Buildings 100 and 200 to address the blankness of the walls at the 3-bedroom units.

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.
The motion was carried by a vote of 5:0.

WORK SESSION

- a. **Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines Addenda – Rt. 20 South**
Staff: Margaret Maliszewski

The ARB members agreed that the addenda was well done and noted their appreciation for the ongoing work. They commented on the similarity of the overall character to that of the western corridors, the focus on landscape, and the landscape as a defining feature along the corridor. They questioned the extent to which ARB review would occur along the corridor and noted the few existing commercial properties and the more recent rezonings, both of which the ARB has reviewed.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. Minutes Approval:

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved for approval of the minutes from the February 19, 2024, ARB meeting.

Mr. Matsuno seconded the motion.
The motion was carried by a vote of 5:0.

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

c. Next ARB Meeting: Monday, April 1, 2024, 1:00 PM – Lane Auditorium

Mr. Henningsen, Mr. Matsuno and Mr. Van Der Werf noted that they would not be able to attend the April 1 meeting. A quorum could be assembled on April 8 and April 15. Staff will contact the applicants to determine if moving the items to the regularly scheduled April 15 meeting would be a possibility, the staff will update the ARB members.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:31 p.m. to the next ARB meeting in April 2024 (specific date to be determined), at 1:00 p.m.