



ARB ACTION MEMO/MINUTES

Date: April 5, 2021

Time: 1:00 PM

Meeting Room: Virtual Meeting

Members:

Frank Stoner: Present
Frank Hancock: Present
Fred Missel, Vice-Chair: Present
Chris Henningsen: Absent
Dade Van Der Werf, Chair: Present

Staff:

Margaret Maliszewski
Khris Taggart
Carolyn Shaffer

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Van Der Werf 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. **ARB2020-112:** Pet Supplies Plus Comprehensive Sign Plan

Location: 1240 Seminole Trail at the northwest corner of the intersection with Greenbrier Drive

Proposal: To amend the Comprehensive Sign Plan (CSP) to replace cabinet style signs with internally illuminated channel letters and to change sign colors.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representative for Project: Beth Robinson

Khris Taggart summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members asked questions about the existing Sprint Signs (there is no application currently under review for replacement signs) and the comment about attachment method (needed for consistency in appearance for future tenants).

Beth Robinson, of Hightech Signs, represented Pet Supplies Plus and noted that staff's comments seemed reasonable and the recommended changes could be made.

Motion: Mr. Missel moved for approval of the revised Comprehensive Sign Plan with the conditions listed in the staff report, as follows:

1. Revise the criteria for the freestanding sign to indicate that graphics must be fully incorporated as an integral part of the overall sign, and graphics must be balanced in size and proportion without overwhelming the text.
2. Revise the CSP to include criteria requiring alignment of signs across the building for a coordinated appearance.
3. If the CSP is approved, the existing cabinet signs must be removed and the wall area repaired.
4. Revise the CSP criteria to limit wall sign colors consistent with the limitations on monument sign colors.
5. Revise the plan to specify one attachment method for the wall signs to the brick sign areas.
6. Revise the plan to limit the backer panels to a single color.
7. Revise the criteria for wall signs to indicate that graphics must be fully incorporated as an integral part of the overall sign, and graphics must be balanced in size and proportion without overwhelming the text.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

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

b. ARB2021-27: 999 Rio Road

Location: At the east corner of the intersection of Rio Road and Belvedere Boulevard

Proposal: To construct the first phase of a mixed-use development including multi-family attached and single-family attached and detached residential units, with associated site improvements. A 5,000-sf office building is planned for Phase 2.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representative for Project: Justin Shimp, Nicole Scro

Margaret Maliszewski summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members asked questions about the location of street trees (in the right-of-way) and the distribution of siding colors for the Habitat units (darker colors at upper stories). Justin Shimp of Shimp Engineering and Nicole Scro, developer, discussed the project. Mr. Shimp noted that the equipment west of Lot 1 could not be moved but landscaping could be added; stated that a fifth street tree could be added at the corner, pending VDOT approval; and noted that the ornamental over the water line could be shifted west of Lot 1. Ms. Scro confirmed that the darker color siding would be oriented vertically; and showed the three options for the landscape buffers.

Mr. Stoner asked how the final decision gets made on the landscape buffer. Ms. Scro indicated that she is discussing the designs with the adjacent homeowners. Mr. Van Der Werf asked if both red and green siding would be used for the Habitat Units. Ms. Scro did not know at this time.

Mr. Hancock expressed some concern over the street trees being in the right-of-way, where the property owner would have less control over them. Mr. Missel supported staff's recommendation for added landscape screening for the equipment west of Lot 1. Mr. Stoner noted that the size of the office building would be limited by the number of available parking spaces.

Motion: Mr. Hancock moved to approve the Final Site Plan for ARB-2021-27: 999 Rio Road with the conditions listed in the staff report, amended as follows:

1. Include brick in the materials list for the Craig Units and indicate the proposed manufacturer and color in the list.
2. Provide a materials list in the Habitat Units architectural drawings.
3. Provide the specs on the window glass. Show that Visible Light Transmittance (VLT) will not drop below 40% and Visible Light Reflectance (VLR) will not exceed 30%.
4. Add landscape screening for the equipment west of Lot 1.
5. Add a note to the screening fence detail on C10 that the fence material is wood. Indicate the finish.
6. Add landscaping on the west side of Lot 1 to establish a cohesive appearance.
7. Add shrubs and a tree along the Belvedere Blvd. frontage of the dog park.
8. Include the standard mechanical equipment note on the architectural plans: "Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated."
9. Add a large shade tree along the Rio Rd. frontage for a total of 5 large shade trees. The location shown in the revised plan is acceptable. If VDOT doesn't accept that location, find an alternate location on site.
10. Revise the planting size of the large shade trees along Rio Road to 3½" caliper.
11. Resolve the ornamental tree/water line conflict along the Rio Road frontage. The location shown in the revised plan is acceptable.
12. Show the landscaping that is proposed in the screening areas on the northeast and southeast sides of the site so that it may be reviewed for consistency with the guidelines.
13. Add trees and low planting in the area between the developed portion of the site and Rio Road to help establish a cohesive overall development.
14. Indicate retaining wall material(s) and color(s) on the plan. A physical sample may be necessary for review.

Mr. Missel seconded the motion.

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

c. ARB 2021-26: Green Clean Car Wash

Location: 3290 Worth Crossing, at the intersection of Rt. 29 and Worth Crossing, south of First Union Bank and north of McDonald's.

Proposal: To construct a 3,700-sf car wash building and associated site improvements on approximately 1.08 acres.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representative for Project: Ryan Perkins, Craig Van Bremen, Carter Baum, Kevin Cieszykowski

Khris Taggart summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members had no questions for staff. Ryan Perkins stated that the additional landscape recommendations could be accommodated. Craig Van Bremen and Kevin Cieszykowski discussed the proposed masonry, noting the various sizes and complications of using scored units. They noted that the color of the pay stations could change from white to gray. Mr. Stoner asked for photos of the block and the applicant provided a link to the manufacturer's information. Mr. Stoner noted that the document had no photographs. Mr. Hancock asked if the product was made of clay (no, concrete masonry). Mr. Van Der Werf noted that the block resembled a jumbo or long brick and seemed appropriate for a car wash. Mr. Stoner and Mr. Hancock agreed. Mr. Hancock noted that the setback and

landscaping helped mitigate the impacts. Mr. Missel confirmed that there was no rooftop equipment. Mr. Van Der Werf complimented the site design.

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved to approve the Final Site Plan for ARB-2021-26: Green Clean Car Wash with the conditions listed in the staff report, amended as follows:

1. Revise the architectural drawings to provide a complete materials schedule, including masonry color and size, and coordinate the schedule with elevation drawings.
2. Provide as part of the site plan detail drawings and color specifications for the vacuum, pay station, and auto sentry equipment.
3. Revise the color for the pay stations to one that is recessive; i.e., one that will reduce visibility and blend with the surroundings.
4. Provide color samples for the vacuum, pay station, and auto sentry equipment.
5. Revise the site plan to add the masonry color and size proposed for the dumpster enclosure.
6. Consider providing additional shrubs along the travelway near the north end of the building.
7. Sign applications are required for all proposed signs. Provide with the sign application samples of all proposed sign colors.

Mr. Missel seconded the motion.

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

WORK SESSIONS

- a. **ARB2021-09:** Caliber Collision: Rooftop equipment, fence design

Location: 1720 Seminole Trail

Proposal: To establish an auto body shop use in an existing 9,200 sf building with associated site improvements on a 1.02-acre parcel

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representative for Project: Melissa Hernandez

Khris Taggart summarized the status of the project in a brief PowerPoint presentation. ARB members asked how many rooftop units required screening (3) and asked about the location of new fencing (on the south side of the site the fence is located near the back of the building; on the north side of the site the fence is closer to the front of the building). Melissa Hernandez represented the architectural firm for the project. She summarized the rooftop screening and the fencing.

Mr. Missel asked if street trees are required (yes, will be reviewed with the site plan amendment). Mr. Stoner confirmed that the north part of the building is existing. Mr. Hancock confirmed that the tops of the rooftop screens do not slope with the roof. Mr. Van Der Werf asked about the longevity of the fence fabric. Ms. Hernandez showed images from the company's web site and noted that the fabric lasts 5 years. Mr. Stoner noted some concern about the durability of the fence fabric. Mr. Hancock stated that the rooftop screens were integrated into the design. Mr. Missel stated that a similar design may have been used on Avon Street.

Motion: Mr. Hancock moved to forward the following recommendation to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors:

The ARB recommends approval of the revised proposal because the screening of the rooftop equipment has a coordinated, appropriate appearance. The fence design illustrated in the revised concept plan is not approved and is subject to ARB review and approval with the site development plan.

Mr. Missel seconded the motion.

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

The ARB provided the following comments for the benefit of the applicant's future site plan submittal:

1. Revise the plans to show a dumpster enclosure that has a coordinated appearance with the overall development.
2. The additional mitigation measures shown for screening the rooftop equipment appear appropriate.
3. Revise the plans show a fence design that relates more closely to the building and the surrounding commercial context. Consider alternative, more durable screening materials.
4. Revise the plans to indicate a compatible color for the vision slats for the chain link fence.
5. No increase in chain link fence is approved.
6. Revise the site and architectural plans to include the standard mechanical equipment note.
7. Note that the site changes that are shown will require a Site Plan Amendment. A complete landscape plan should be provided with the first submittal of that amendment.
8. Revise the plan to show landscaping in the planting areas along the northern and southern perimeters of the site.
9. Provide a complete landscape plan with the first site plan submittal.
10. Include the plant health note on the landscape plan in the first site plan submittal.
11. Sign applications are required for all proposed signs. Note that the number of colors in the wall sign exceeds the guidelines maximum and internal illumination of the multicolor band will not likely be recommended.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. ARB-2020-69: Sleep Number: Building materials

Proposal: To use polystyrene (EIFS) to make up the 2" difference in thickness needed to accommodate the change from composite metal panel to stucco.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representative for Project: Mark Kestner

Margaret Maliszewski gave a brief PowerPoint presentation to summarize the history of the project and the current request. Mr. Missel asked what the EIFS was replacing (stucco to replace metal panels). Mark Kestner explained the request. Mr. Hancock asked for illustrations of the building and asked if you would be able to tell the difference from the street if EIFS was used as a backing material (no). Mr. Stoner said it was not an ARB issue. Mr. Missel noted the potential for longevity of the material to be a reasonable consideration. There was general

agreement that EIFS could be considered an option if durability and scale are appropriately managed.

Motion: Mr. Missel moved to approve the proposal as presented, because the alternative is in keeping with the original design, the scale is appropriate and the applicant has advised that there are no concerns regarding longevity of the material.

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.

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

b. EC Guidelines Discussion: I-64 (west end)

Mr. Stoner gave a PowerPoint presentation describing the western half of the I-64 Entrance Corridor and identifying buildings, structures, landscape features, and other important characteristics along its length, as background information for future guidelines updates.

c. Minutes Approval: March 15, 2021

Motion: Mr. Missel moved for approval of the minutes from the March 15, 2021 ARB meeting.

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.

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

d. Next ARB Meeting: April 19, 2021

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m. to the next Virtual ARB meeting on Monday, April 19, 2021 at 1:00 p.m.