



---

## ARB ACTION MEMO MINUTES

**Date:** July 6, 2021

**Time:** 1:00 PM

**Meeting Room:** Virtual Meeting

**Members:**

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

**Staff:**

Margaret Maliszewski  
Khris Taggart  
Carolyn Shaffer

**Attendees:**

Brandon Blake  
Kyle Redinger  
Valerie Long  
Jessie Wilmer  
Bruce Wardell

### 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

**a. ARB-2021-63: Shentel (Beam) Fixed Wireless – PWSF Tier 2**

**Location:** North side of Patterson Mill Lane, just south of I-64.

**Proposal:** To construct a telecommunications facility consisting of a 98.5' monopole tower and associated structures and equipment.

**Staff Contact:** Khris Taggart

**Representative:** Jessie Wilmer

**Motion:** Mr. Missel moved to approve the consent agenda and forward the recommendations outlined in the staff report to the Agent for the Site Review Committee, as follows.

Regarding the Certificate of Appropriateness for the ground equipment and base station:

Because the ground equipment and chain link fencing are not expected to be visible from the EC, staff recommends approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the ground equipment and base station.

Regarding visibility of the monopole:

Staff recommends that the ARB forward the following recommendation to the Agent:

1. The ARB finds that the proposed location will sufficiently minimize the visibility of the monopole from the I-64 Entrance Corridor.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

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

## **Regular Review Items**

### **a. ARB-2021-59: Albemarle Business Center Office Building**

**Location:** At the west corner of the intersection of Wahoo Way and 5<sup>th</sup> Street.

**Proposal:** To construct a 4-story office building with a footprint of approximately 17,000 sf and associated improvements.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representative: Bruce Wardell

Margaret Maliszewski summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members had no questions for staff. Bruce Wardell shared images of the architectural drawings and discussed various aspects of the design, including: the façade that follows the curve of the street; the glass corner with sloped roof; the topography mediating the building height; the potential to use a wood material for the ceiling of the top floor, which would be visible from the exterior; breaking down the scale of the building with materials and colors; the glass allowing the building to read as a more traditionally-scaled building; the plinth that reinforces the scale break-down; the black horizontal spandrel glass and the dark Nichiha panels that allow the window openings to be layered and contribute a secondary scale/rhythm; and the potential to use colored glass. Kyle Redinger added that using clear glass would be a challenge in terms of privacy and noted that interior solutions like blinds would result in a less appealing view. Mr. Missel asked if there would be brick detailing. (There would likely be soldier courses and/or rowlocks, and brick sills, and a goal of having an 8" deep window jamb depth.) Mr. Henningsen noted that solar heat gain is another potential issue with clear glass. Mr. Wardell noted that there may be horizontal detailing added at the glass corner. Mr. Stoner commented that it was an intriguing design; that the scale was appropriately broken down; that a view of a cluttered interior would be distracting; and that a dark, black color for the window panels would appear too stark. Mr. Hancock asked if stairs to the parking lot could be added on the east side of the

building. (The change in topography is greater there.) He noted that the glass volumes are important. Mr. Van Der Werf asked how the roof form related to traditional architecture of the area; and recommended a programmatic solution to the glass/privacy issue and further exploration of adding texture to the glass corner. There was discussion about the retaining walls, landscaping and mechanical equipment. Mr. Henningsen said that the design is compatible with the historic architecture of the area. Mr. Missel noted that additional detail could bring warmth to the design and that the design fits well in the context. Mr. Stoner said that the building design is an example of how good design should be a part of what we celebrate on the corridor. Mr. Hancock noted that the glass elements help lighten a building that is set close to the street. Staff noted that the colored glass issue had not been resolved. Mr. Redinger offered to return to the ARB at a future date with multiple glass samples for consideration.

The ARB offered the following comments on the proposal for the benefit of the applicant's next submittal:

1. Consider changes to the building design to establish a greater connection to the historic architecture of the area. Provide additional information on the brick detailing at the windows and more documentation on the detailing of the glass corners.
2. Provide additional information to clarify the use of fiber cement panels in the window openings.
3. Provide material samples, including glass samples and specs, for review.
4. Revise the elevation drawings to include more complete materials identification.
5. Revise the site plan to label the symbol shown on the EC side of the building.
6. Show the locations of ground- and building-mounted equipment and show how visibility from the Entrance Corridor will be eliminated.
7. Revise the drawings to clarify the rooftop structure.
8. Add the standard mechanical equipment note to the architectural plans: "Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated."
9. Add two interior parking lot trees, 2½" caliper at planting.
10. Add a row of shrubs along the east side, and along the eastern end of the south side, of the parking lot, 24" high minimum at planting.
11. Add shrubs to help integrate the retaining walls into the landscape.
12. Add shrubs along the east and south sides of the parking lot.
13. Revise the plan to provide more coordination among the retaining walls, screening trees, parking lot trees, and additional landscaping along the south side of the site.
14. Indicate retaining wall material on the site plan. Provide coordination with the material of the building's base.

**WORK SESSIONS:** None

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **a. EC Guidelines Discussion:** Discussion

The ARB discussed the template for the guidelines addenda and Mr. Stoner's work on the template for the Rt. 151 corridor. It was the consensus of the ARB that the template could be modified for corridors that are less developed, that the addenda for the less-developed corridors might focus more on landscape and layout than architectural details, and that there might be an opportunity to create an addendum that addressed multiple rural corridors or segments that shared the same characteristics. It was agreed that each characteristic called out in the outline did not necessarily require a single page in the template, and that working on a more complicated corridor might be the best next step. The members agreed to work on one segment of the Rt. 250 West corridor, with staff to send a follow-up email with assignments and supporting information.

**b. Minutes Approval:** June 21, 2021

**Motion:** Mr. Henningsen moved for approval of the minutes from the June 21, 2021 ARB meeting.

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.

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

**c. Next ARB Meeting:** July 19, 2021, 1:00 PM – VIRTUAL MEETING

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:25 p.m. to the next Virtual ARB meeting on Monday, July 19, 2021 at 1:00 p.m.