

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

February 13, 2024 – 5:30 P.M.

Hybrid Meeting

I. COMMISSION PRE-MEETING (Agenda discussion(s))

Beginning: 4:30 PM

Location: NDS Conference Room

Members Present: Commissioner Habbab, Commissioner d’Oronzio, Chairman Mitchell, Commissioner Schwarz, Commissioner Stolzenberg, Commissioner Solla-Yates, Commissioner Joy

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Missy Creasy, Matt Alfele, Dannan O’Connell, James Freas, Jay Stroman, Carrie Rainey, Rob Hubbard

Commissioners gathered at 4:30 and the following motion was made.

MOTION FOR A PLANNING COMMISSION CLOSED SESSION

Pursuant to Code of Virginia Section 2.2-3712, I move that the City Planning Commission close this open meeting and convene a closed meeting for the following purposes:

1. Pursuant to Code of Virginia Section 2.2-3711(A) (8) for consultation with the City Attorney regarding legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice for legal matters related to the offer and acceptance of proffers;
2. Pursuant to Code of Virginia Section 2.2-3711(A) (7) for consultation with the City Attorney pertaining to actual litigation, where consultation or briefing in open meeting would adversely affect the litigating posture of the City Council, specifically, *White v. Charlottesville*.

Motion by: Commissioner d’Oronzio

Second by: Commissioner Habbab

Ayes: Commissioners d’Oronzio, Schwarz, Mitchell, Stolzenberg, Solla-Yates, Habbab

Absent: N/A

Closed meeting was held

CERTIFICATION OF CLOSED MEETING

I move that this Planning Commission certify by a recorded vote that to the best of each Planning Commissioner’s knowledge, only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered in the closed meeting.

Motion by: Commissioner d’Oronzio

Second by: Commissioner Habbab

Ayes: Commissioners d’Oronzio, Schwarz, Mitchell, Stolzenberg, Solla-Yates, Habbab

Absent: N/A

Pre meeting ended at 5:30.

II. COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING – Meeting called to order by Chairman Mitchell at 5:38 PM

Beginning: 5:30 PM

Location: City Hall Chambers

A. COMMISSIONER’S REPORT

Commissioner Stolzenberg – At the LUPEC meeting in December, we talked about a couple of things: environmental resiliency and the ongoing resilient together planning effort for climate change resiliency between UVA, the county, and the city. There was a presentation about the effort to get a handle on all the dams around the county. Most dams are privately owned and there is very little information on these dams that could be potentially dangerous. At the January LUPEC meeting, we essentially discussed the 3-party agreement that is the basis for the existence of LUPEC. It is the basis of cooperation between the 3 entities. We had a great presentation from the county about the history of it. There was some discussion about how it was working. There was some interest in revisiting to an extent to perhaps further define how some of the processes are supposed to work. In many ways, the agreement is vague. It says things like ‘we will submit plans that are submitted to the city for rezonings. We will submit them to the other part.’ It doesn’t say what that process is. Maybe that gets more defined in discussions moving forward. We had an MPO Tech meeting in January. Round 6 of smart scale is not looking good. The criteria were changed to be very restrictive, especially for MPO and PC submissions. We do not have a lot of projects in the pipeline that are submittable. Since the 2045 long range transportation plan was adopted, in the first couple of smart scale rounds, we got a lot of stuff funded. We took a lot of stuff ‘off the plate.’ We are down to the dregs of our 2045 plan. It is good that moving towards 2050 is underway. One of the few projects that we had left was the Hillsdale South project to connect behind Kroger where Hillsdale currently ends at Hydraulic down to Angus or Holiday. Unfortunately, we can’t resubmit that, even though it is close to being scored. The requirements for the interchange justification report have changed. We would need a new interchange justification report. There is no time to do that before the submission deadline. That is a loss. This pipeline study or the Barracks pipeline study might have some projects. The Ivy Pipeline Study is much further behind and probably won’t have projects. There is probably nothing there until the next round. The big one that is likely to be submitted is a diverging diamond interchange on 5th Street at I-64. I have been assured that there are ways to make it bike/pedestrian friendly, so it doesn’t become a barrier for everybody in the southern part of the county. It will take some careful work to make sure that happens. Previously, we had submitted and lost from the city line up to Harris Street. We are not going resubmit as is. We had some discussion about potentially incorporating some number of improvements in that area into this DDI part. If we do make that bike friendly and the county is making shared stuff down there, we can complete that gap to get up to Harris Road.

Commissioner Schwarz – Since I was not here in January, I have 2 BAR meetings to report on. In December, we started our discussion on updating the guidelines. That is in progress. The big application of interest in January was a preliminary discussion for a new 7-story building on West Main Street that would wrap around Mel’s Café. It was an interesting discussion. It was interesting to see how the new zoning code might look on West Main Street. The BAR was supportive of the project and of the massing. We had a lot of discussion about the way the façade was treated more so than the massing. In this instance, the height did not seem to be an issue.

Commissioner Habbab – I had 2 meetings. The first one was the Citizen Transportation Advisory Committee on January 17th. We elected a new chair and vice-chair. We had an update on moving towards 2050 needs prioritization and the smart scale round six. There are 3 projects that are identified and 2 that are potential projects. They have not yet been identified. Those are Hillsdale South Extension and US 250/Barracks Road exchange, Ivy Road/250 Interchange, and something on I-64 and 5th Street. The second meeting was the Tree Commission meeting on February 6th. RX Fire was the consultant that was awarded the invasive plant control for this next round. They did a good job last year. We are working on the state of the forest report towards the end of March to be released to City Council. The city was awarded a grant. A subcommittee was formed to create an RFP for bid regarding the urban forest management plan and training volunteers.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – No Report

Commissioner d’Oronzio – I have 8 meetings to report on. Six of the meetings involved the deliberative process by the CAHF Committee for CAHF and HOPS allocations. We met throughout January to pull those

recommendations together. We are short on money. There are more applications than money. We also decided at the conclusion of this round that we needed to update the methodology of evaluation to meet the new code. There are some things that have been amended. We need to start fresh. The HAC met in January to do a review of the ADU Manual. The next matter for the HAC is going to be taking up the landbank. The Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission met on Thursday. That was a wrap-up meeting for the year and a lot of the financials for the year. There was a lot of turnover on the board. Three matters regarding authorization to spend money to obtain grants to deal with transportation matters including the bridge over Rivanna River. As previously presented, the budget for that bridge had blown to \$40 million. We are working on a way to pre-collaborate and get our contingencies down to under \$30 million. The other 2 had to do with ride-share.

B. UNIVERSITY REPORT

Commissioner Joy – I am happy to report Brandon Upper Class Housing is nearing completion. It is slated for opening this summer. That will bring 350 beds with the opening of that facility. We have the Darden graduate apartment building being brought to the Board of Visitors for final approval later this month. That will shortly begin construction with a tentative projected opening in 2026. That is an additional 350 beds. We have an ongoing collaboration between UVA and the UVA Foundation working on 2 affordable housing projects. The first is in the Piedmont Neighborhood. We are teamed up with the Piedmont Housing Alliance. We are also partnering with PHO with 10th and Wertland. I will be happy to report more as those projects take shape.

C. CHAIR'S REPORT

Chairman Mitchell – I had one meeting with Parks and Recreation. We talked about things ranging from the CIP updates to dogs in the parks. We are going to be talking about dogs in the parks and in Charlottesville. I will be reporting more on that probably at the next Planning Commission meeting. There is a lot of interest on both ends. We did talk about the Meadow Creek Parkway Trail plan. The objective of that is to connect a lot of the parks throughout the city. The one thing that got my interest is the tree study update. The RFP has been awarded. The objective of that is to look at the state of the trees on Mall. There are about 91 trees that we are going to be looking at. The bulk of these trees were planted in 1976. Most of them are Willow Oak. They are in different states of health. We may have to take a few or many of them out. The difficulty will not be taking the trees out. The difficulty will be managing the root structure under these trees. What happens after these trees are no longer there and the roots will have to be managed.

D. DEPARTMENT OF NDS

Missy Creasy, NDS Deputy Director – We have a new ordinance coming out next week. We have been doing a lot of administrative activities and trying to make that process smooth. We will be ready. We have a coordination meeting on the afternoon of the day after to make sure we can assess what is happening and try to help everyone out to make that work. The final code is online right now. We also have the final zoning map in a PDF form. It is all under Zoning. If you go to the city website and put zoning in the search engine, it is the first thing that you get. This is a clear path. We have a PDF exhibit on the zoning map that takes off the overlays. We are underway with GIS updates. That will be an option too. That is not online yet. When we are live next week, we will still be getting stuff up there. If you see things that look weird, let staff know. We are taking a break from work sessions for the next 2 months. Council has taken our dates for those work sessions. I am going to post those work sessions and Commissioners are more than welcome to attend, whether you do it virtually or in-person. The first work session on February 27th is going to be about the alternative fuel study. On the 4th Tuesday in March, they are going to be talking about the decarbonization study. A lot of people are interested in those topics. We will make sure that you have the information for those meetings.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – With the new ordinance being posted online, will it eventually be on Municode?

James Freas, NDS Director – We are not intending to put it on Muni-Code. Municode, at this point, isn't equipped to handle the formatting and illustrations as presented in the code. We also see an advantage in our ability to update the code more readily as compared to our experience with Municode over the last several years. The PDF document is fully searchable. The table of contents is essentially bookmarked within the document.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Will the existing code, as of today, be archived somewhere where we can see it?

Mr. Freas – Yes. We are looking at 2 options. One is that we believe that Municode has an archive capability. That is the first choice. The second choice is that we convert it to a PDF and put it on our website.

E. MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE FORMAL AGENDA

Heidi Dhivya Berthoud (1206 River Vista) – Last week, I sent you a list of requests for improvements to the Mt. View site plan, along with a list of supportive neighbors. We know that we can do a whole lot better than what has been designed. We persist in caring for our neighborhood and the city and ask for direct and meaningful dialogue with us that you represent before going any further with these plans. I have included a link to a recent article where the mayor and city manager said that they support using community benefits agreements. This is encouraging to us. Last year, a Charlottesville developer allowed a neighborhood association to help them design a new building project in the Fifeville Neighborhood. We did reach out to the Mt. View developer, Bryce Craig. Unfortunately, that conversation was brief. Many Locust Grove neighbors have given input to the city on this project. Many of us do not feel heard or engaged with. We understand the need for increasing housing in the city. We do not object to that. Many of us would like to see more affordable housing than this plan calls for. This plan has taken a mostly green space and almost entirely paved it over. For me, the existing magnificent ancient trees have me 'fired up.' The plans call for complete removal of all trees. Some are 250 to 300 years old. They are historical and biological treasures that are being tossed callously. The design could be altered quite easily without losing any housing. The trees on the northern border should be the focal green space, the part that distinguishes this development and is planned around them. If there is a will, they could be properly cared for. These multi-service trees are our lungs, our shade, our stormwater buffers, the home to many animals, and our beauty. It is not too late. This plan has too much pavement increasing urban heat. The stormwater plans could be improved with more consideration of the nearby Rivanna River. We consider the access roads unsafe.

F. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Minutes – June 14, 2022 – Regular Meeting
2. Minutes – January 9, 2024 – Regular Meeting
3. Preliminary Site Plan – 501 Cherry Avenue

Commissioner d'Oronzio – Second by Commissioner Solla-Yates – Motion passes 4-0 with 2 abstentions. Commissioner Habbab and Commissioner Schwarz abstained from the Preliminary Site Plan for 501 Cherry Avenue.

III. JOINT MEETING OF COMMISSION AND COUNCIL

Beginning: 6:00 PM

Continuing: Until all public hearings are complete

Format: (i) Staff Report, (ii) Applicant, (iii) Hearing, (iv) Discussion and Motion

No Scheduled Hearings

IV. Commission's Action Items

1. Entrance Corridor Review – 2117 Ivy Road

Chairman Mitchell gavelled the ECRB to order.

Staff Report

Jeff Werner, Preservation Planner – The item before you tonight is a certificate of appropriateness for an entrance corridor project. The request is for you to take formal action. The project is within an entrance corridor. Per the ordinance, you all serve as the design review body for projects within an entrance corridor. This project was a result of a PUD that was approved earlier this year. Under the current zoning ordinance (pre-February 19, 2024), the code sections that we are using are from that ordinance. With the new updated ordinance, your purview and the standards for review are all identical. This CoA request is for development of a 1-acre parcel on Ivy Road and Copley. There is an existing 1974 bank. It will be razed. The applicant will construct a 10-story apartment building that is oriented to Ivy Road, have a footprint of approximately 140 feet wide, and 310 feet deep. It is a brick, metal, and composite panel building. It features an 8-story tower that sits atop a 2-story podium. The east side is facing Copley, which is the east façade. Above that 2-story podium is a section of the upper floors that are set back creating an inner courtyard. Facing from Ivy Road above the podium, floors 3 through 8 cantilevers out slightly above the podium and then step back again at the 9th and 10th floors. There is an interior enclosed garage, which is accessed from Copley Road. There is a secondary entrance to a garage area on Ivy Road that is where service vehicles, trash, and recycling will be stored. There are no known historical structures and resources associated with this site. In the 1960s, there was a gas station that operated here. Staff finds the proposed design to be appropriate and recommends approval of the CoA with the conditions discussed. The design is consistent with the design guidelines relative to architectural design, form, and style relative to building place, materiality, and color palette. The design features a variety in the materiality and the color palette. The on-site parking will be concealed within the building, which is a solution consistent with the design guidelines. That entrance is on Copley Road, which is not an entrance corridor. The entrance corridor guidelines were drafted and adopted prior to the current Comprehensive Plan. They are relative to specific corridor recommendations. Things have changed with the Comp Plan and with the new zoning. We are now looking at a maximum 10-story height building that was established by Council's approval of the PUD. The height reflects the revised Comprehensive Plan, which was adopted in 2022 and is consistent with the anticipated trend of buildings that will be taller, larger, and with smaller setbacks than what is existing in this corridor and what was envisioned under the prior Comprehensive Plan. One of the conditions that I noted was to address the street trees on the Ivy Road side. There currently are some existing overhead utilities. Those will be undergrounded. I don't know where. I don't know what the result will be of what is in the ground. I raised the question of whether willow oaks are appropriate spatially for the space that is left for it. I suggested a condition that simply states the tree species, when selected, will be coordinated with UVA's landscape plan. That has been something they have been working on. It will meet the city's site plan requirements and the trees will be trees from the city's tree list and appropriate for the conditions and space above and below grade. In a conversation today with Commissioner Stolzenberg about rooftop screening and where things will be located, it would be fine adding a condition that all rooftop mechanical equipment will be located within an area of the rooftop screening. The equipment will not be taller than that screening. The screened equipment area will be whatever distance from the parapet. There are some transformers on Copley Road and a proposal to use those as a canvas for some public art. They shared a bicycle theme. I don't think they have selected anything. If you have any issues with those, I am comfortable with a decal being used and allowing me some administrative discretion on that. You can account for that however you would like. They also included some information about the balconies. One option showed a hanger rod and a clevis. Whether or not they will use that in the design, is to be determined. I don't think there is a problem if it was done consistently. It is something if you want to address. I asked them about the mortar in the podium brick. There was reference to a dark mortar. It will

be a mortar that will match the brick. I did receive an email from a resident in the Lewis Mountain neighborhood expressing concern about the design, traffic, etc. That has been circulated to you. You are welcome to address that. Given the approvals by Council, I can't recommend a change in the height, setbacks. There were other comments about traffic and parking. Those do not fall under your purview of the ERB.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – With the north elevation, there is a wall labeled 'wall for discussion.' Can you help me understand what that means?

Mr. Werner – This is going back down towards the rail tracks. It is down below street level. Whatever retaining wall will be necessary there will be a board formed, rough formed poured concrete wall. It is not visible. I don't have any problem with that.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – They must have a wall there.

Mr. Werner – Your purview is what is visible from the entrance corridor. This is down behind and below grade. I don't have an issue with a poured concrete wall. It is not stacked block. It has some texture to it. If you think they could use some cascading landscaping, you can certainly address that. What that wall is at the rear there, if it is built and as it is shown, the material is fine. Why it is being built, the applicant can address that.

Commissioner d'Oronzio – With this roof visibility and things being shorter than the screening, why are we doing this? It is a 10-story building with some cantilevers. Basic geometry says you are not going to see anything on the roof of the building.

Mr. Werner – That was my conclusion on that. Your review is what you see from the entrance corridor.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I don't see the need for a condition there. My question wasn't about the screen. I couldn't tell where the screening physically even was. It is not on the roof layout. It is in the elevation.

Mr. Werner – I don't think there is anything wrong with what you asked in adding a condition to it.

Commissioner Schwarz – You can't see it on the street in front of the building. It doesn't mean you can't see it from two blocks away.

Mr. Werner – It is reasonable to discuss with the applicant what could be done.

Commissioner d'Oronzio – I agree. It is a matter of measuring the hypotenuse and seeing where it is reasonable.

Commissioner Schwarz – With the UVA streetscape plan that you referenced, what does it call for on Ivy?

Mr. Werner – I don't know. The notes have said that they have coordinated with UVA on that. I would say: Is it something from our tree list? Will that tree on our tree list fit there?

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Why add the coordinate part and not just the tree list?

Mr. Werner – Because one of the things the guidelines talk about is integration of an entrance corridor. The idea of using elements of that streetscape. UVA has, as you go towards The Lawn, it has a continuous type of light versus the city where we have all kinds of lights. There is nothing unreasonable about suggesting that. That is what the entrance corridor hopes we work towards.

Commissioner Schwarz – If UVA decided all their street trees were going to be 8-foot-tall dogwoods, I might have an issue with that.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – If what UVA proposed was not great, you and the applicant saw fit for a different tree to go there that was on the tree list, does that condition give you the discretion to say that you coordinated well enough.

Mr. Werner – We have requirements of the site plan. That is where the planners and zoning are saying what is required. The option would not be you don't have to put anything here. There is something that must meet the site plan requirements. What species of tree it is at this point would be what is on the tree list and what is appropriate for that location whether it matches what UVA wants. If something could be done that coordinates with UVA, that is great. Their willingness to work with UVA is commendable. When I looked at this a couple of weeks ago, I saw where Council had required the space between the curb and the face of the building. It came down to what will fit there. It is a question I get about a lot of projects. What tree will fit there? I am going to see what they come up with when they know what is underground and overground and what fits in that space, and if it is appropriate and the planners and zoning say that it is appropriate.

Commissioner Joy – I had 2 questions from your evaluation of the drawings. One question regards the transformers that are located on Copley. I know in the entrance corridor design guidelines it is clear to have infrastructural equipment not be in public visible areas. These are both public and visible. Speaking on behalf of UVA, they are prominently visible from the development immediately across the street. There is concern about the location of that. Furthermore, the real concern that I have had reviewing the plans is that there has been public comment and acknowledgement of the challenge of entering the parking deck along Copley and the limited sight lines. I am concerned that these transformers only further encumber and make safety a greater issue. I want to point out that it is interesting in the renderings that they are not included in the visualizations.

Mr. Werner – This is aesthetics. This is not a site plan. These are not the engineered drawings. What they will have to do is complete the site plan, which identifies the line of sight. Brennen Duncan (traffic engineer) won't allow something that has a blocked view. I don't know what is happening spatially, whether these transformers could go somewhere or not. It is an interesting idea. We do allow public art. We put murals and paint just about everything, every wall, and section of wall. From an art standpoint, that could be valid. It is up to you as a body. As far as the entrance in and out of that garage, there was an initial discussion about access off Ivy Road. Staff said that wouldn't work. That is not under your purview. Where cars park and access this is where site plan issues are resolved. It was to move that from Ivy Road to Copley that was a positive. If it can be moved somewhere else on Copley, you can certainly ask. That would have to be based on what the design guidelines say as far as the aesthetics go.

Ms. Creasy – We will take these notes to those who are working on the site plan.

Commissioner Joy – My other comment has to do with the overall interpretation. You mentioned a 10-story submission. This documentation that was submitted calls out a bathroom on the roof.

Mr. Werner – It doesn't matter what the use is. This building could be a solid slab of concrete or one giant empty room. What we look at is the design.

Commissioner Joy – If it is zoning and a 10-story massing as part of the entrance corridor and we are looking at documents that show an 11-story massing, that would impact the perception and whether this conforms.

Mr. Werner – The height, as it is presented to you, is what City Council approved. I don't have the latitude to recommend. A CoA does not equate to a building permit. It doesn't equate to an approved site plan. This is the

design. Designs are conceptual. Sometimes, they are very detailed. Ultimately, we would have to review a building permit. The building permit would be looked at by the planner, engineering, and zoning. If a project did not meet the zoning or what is allowed by this PUD, it wouldn't get approved. The planner knows about this issue. I know the applicant knows about this issue. If you all, as a board, feel that the height should be different, you can do that. I can't recommend that you do it. You have the right to make recommendations in your approval or you can deny the project. All actions by the ERB are appealable to Council. Even if you approve this tonight, it could be appealed to Council.

Chairman Mitchell – You suggested that height is under the purview of the ERB. I don't believe that it is. I don't believe that we can alter the height. That has already been recommended by us and approved by Council.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – The general design of the building is part of the PUD that was approved. Council saw the renderings with the height. That is formally a proffered part of the approved PUD.

Commissioner Joy – I saw the 10 stories. I understand that a PUD allows a 10-story structure. I am looking professionally at a building that is an 11-story structure. I just wanted to understand.

Applicant Presentation

Julie Filges, Applicant – I am happy to any questions that you have.

Next Slide

These were the drawings that were submitted for the entrance corridor review.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Why is the top plants?

Ms. Filges – There is a glass railing at the top. We have planting behind. It is difficult to see in the interpretation of it. There is a glass railing there. It is shown on the plans in the roof plans.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – In the roof plans, the plantings aren't all along. They are just in little squares.

Ms. Filges – We are still working on the landscape plans.

Next Slide

On this page, you will see the conceptual street section. I know we had some conversations. There were some questions asked about the trees. When we contacted the UVA Architect, I looked at some documents that were in the public domain. I noticed that with the Emmet-Ivy Corridor Project, there was a very strong visual connection along Ivy Road with all the buildings on the corridor. There was a visually prominent streetscape. I asked the questions: Would you mind telling us what is the width of the green zone? What is the width of the sidewalk? What is the species of the tree? What is the spacing? It would be a shame to halt that visual continuity. At that point, we noticed that our green zone and walk zone were not as wide. We made the change to show a minimum 8-foot-wide green zone and a minimum 10-foot-wide walk zone. That information that we received about the streetscape helped us understand how to continue that visual continuity. We are hoping that we can use the same street tree species. That is why we have the language in the street section saying that we need to coordinate with the site plan, ECRB, and UVA. The intent is to provide a strong visual continuity. With the exact species, we will have to figure that out when we figure out the logistics of burying the underground utilities, how big the root ball needs to be, and what the maintenance issues will be. We need to dig a little deeper and present that information in site plan review.

Next Slides

These are surrounding buildings used as an example of context.

Next Slide

Here is the first-floor plan for some context. The previous site plan that we showed was the roof plan. This gives context of the streetscape and the entrance off Copley into the garage, entrance off Ivy Road, and our amenity spaces. The amenity spaces that you see (the bike room, a café, the mailroom, the main lobby, and on the floor above the fitness area) the intent to activate the corridor by providing some transparency and activity and screen the garage from view.

Next Slide

Here are the elevations.

Next Slide

With the question about the wall, it was labeled as an optional wall. We were in the early design phases. We were trying to decide whether we needed that wall structurally and for drainage. That is why we wanted to leave it there as an optional wall until we have solidified the design. What we are trying to do right now is eliminate that wall and continue the split-faced CMU. We think that drainage will work better if we eliminate the wall.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – It is optional for discussion for you and not for us to discuss.

Ms. Filges – If somebody said that they loved it, that is great. We are trying to figure out the function of the wall and whether it is going to hinder drainage. What we found out, in conversations with our civil engineer, is that we want to make sure that we handle off-site drainage. It is better if we don't have that wall there for the drainage.

Commissioner Joy – Can you explain why? Isn't there a wall behind it?

Ms. Filges – They are going to warp that area for the drainage to flow through. The property line is at that location about 5 feet, 2 inches away. We were showing the retaining wall closer to the property line. Between the property line and the building wall, we were showing that. On the plan, you can see it.

Commissioner Habbab – You are proposing removing the retaining wall and leaving the building wall.

Ms. Filges – That is correct. That leaves us space to handle the drainage from off-site. We can work with the elevation that way.

Commissioner Habbab – Is there any impact on the adjacent property?

Ms. Filges – The main concern is that area.

Commissioner Joy – Why did it show up?

Ms. Filges – We weren't sure about the retaining portion of the building.

Commissioner Habbab – Are you looking to us for guidance?

Ms. Filges – What we would like to do is eliminate it and use the split face CMU. The purpose of this is to have the discussion. Do we have a strong opinion?

Chairman Mitchell – It doesn't impact the aesthetics.

Ms. Filges – It is an additional material that you wouldn't otherwise see.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – You are probably right. We don't have a direct purview over that. The rear is an entrance corridor, in my opinion, for people entering the city by train on the Cardinal see the back. I would like for you guys to consider the aesthetics of that.

Next Slide

Ms. Filges – With the screening, we are assuming, that depending on the placement of the mechanical units, which is something that we must incorporate in the design, if you are standing on the street and we have a parapet, you are not going to see them if they are located a certain distance away from the parapet. We try to place those as close to the corridors as possible and away from the edge of the roof for safety. The plan is to concentrate the mechanical units at the center of the roof. If you are standing on the street and we have a parapet, they are screened from view. We will use our 3D software to verify that. The screening that is there right now is more of a privacy screen. That is screening the amenity space. They don't want students wandering on the roof.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – If I am looking at this west elevation, it looks like it goes right up to the edge.

Ms. Filges – It is set further back from the street.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – You described this glass railing as a pseudo cornice in your contemporary building. Why doesn't it run the length of the building? Why is it slightly symmetrical by cutting off 3 panes on the left side?

Ms. Filges – That is due to function. We are screening off the rooftop amenity. That is for safety.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – You say it is an aesthetic element as your pseudo cornice.

Ms. Filges – It is. If you look at the language of the parapet, we step the parapet in various locations as well. We weren't thinking that it was such a departure to step that or to not show it as a continuous element.

Next Slide

The materials that we are using are a composite panel and a brick. The brick is at the base of the building. It is at the first floor and the second floor at Ivy and Copley. It is a dark brick with a matching mortar.

Chairman Mitchell – The mortar is going to be red?

Ms. Filges – The mortar matches the actual field. If you look at BRK-01, it is manganese iron spot. We will use a darker mortar with that. It appears a bit monolithic with a little bit of texture. That works with the storefront as well. We are going to use a dark bronze or a black storefront. The panels that you see are composite panels. We are using a combination of gray. We have a stacked bond pattern with the texture. The intent of the pattern is that it is stacked. I think there was a slight deviation in the tiling of the rendering. The intent is that we don't want to show something that appears to be faux brick. We wanted to show something that had a texture and a color that works with the context of the surrounding area.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Having that rendering problem made it difficult for me to visualize what this would look like with that grid pattern all the way up. It didn't look like a grid. It looked like a running bond in a lot of ways.

Ms. Filges – The goal was to present texture and to hone in on it here. The goal is to have some texture. It is meant to be stacked bond.

Commissioner Schwarz – The two grays are also a horizontal panel.

Mr. Filges – They are about 18 inches high by 8 to 10 feet long.

Commissioner Schwarz – It looks like they are scoured horizontally.

Ms. Filges – The gray panels are not scoured, only the red panels are scoured.

Commissioner Schwarz – That is another thing with the rendering.

Ms. Filges – That might be the joints between the panels.

Commissioner Schwarz – They look like about a foot tall.

Ms. Filges – They are about 18 inches high. Are you talking about the vertical?

Commissioner Schwarz – I am looking at the rendering that is on page A8. It looks like there is a strong horizontal pattern. This does relate to the joints. It would be an 18-inch high space between horizontal lines.

Ms. Filges – Yes. You will barely notice it. It is a very subtle gap. They use a joint. Somebody asked a question about caulk. The owner endeavors to provide a building that is as maintenance free as possible, also meaning durable. We don't want somebody up there having to re-caulk those joints. They offer a caulk-free joint. It is a very thin reveal. It appears to be the same color as the adjacent panel.

Commissioner Schwarz – We will see a thin vertical reveal in all these fiber cement panels. With the horizontal joints, that is a lap.

Ms. Filges – It is not a lap. It is a rain screen. There is flashing at the floor. Every 18 inches, it is a t joint.

Commissioner Schwarz – It is going to be the exact same joint horizontal and vertical.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – With this middle black square situation, it seems to me, especially on that right side where it runs a little longer than that vertical line from the edges of the windows, it is creating the symmetry in the front of that. Is that an intentional aesthetic choice? Is that driven by a building need?

Ms. Filges – Your comment is very astute. It would look better if we took the gray at the right of that center mass and carried it down. We can make the plan work. We have shown some articulation with the building by varying the thickness of the studs and the locations of the windows. What you were suggesting is that center mass looks odd where it stops at the third and fourth floor and does not connect. We would be happy to continue that. That is a very astute observation. The intent was that we would show, if we were going to favor one side of the window in terms of showing that massing in that recess with the darker panel, we would do it to the right. If you look as it moves around the building, it is shown on the right. We simply didn't carry it through there. I can't give you a good reason. It would look better if we did.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – When you say that, would you make the windows on the left? Would you put the black along the whole length?

Ms. Filges – It is a stronger elevation if we continue the black down, alongside the windows as we have done in the other locations. We have created a pattern in a language and a movement where we have the recessed black panels to the right. This would be down there. That part is recessed further back than this part. That creates some interest and some shadow in that center portion. I would pull the gray down. The black is recessed but not the entirety of it. It is just that area versus the mass in the middle. All the gray is recessed the same amount. That entire mass in the middle is all recessed whereas we have these smaller locations and smaller masses where you have the pairs like the twos. There is a pair and a pair and a pair. Suddenly, we change the language in the middle for some interest and then you go back to it when you get back around the side elevation. You have the pairs that are joined. It would be stronger to carry the language through and add that recessed panel, that black on the third and fourth floor.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – If you did that, you would have that same problem of breaking the vertical line up here. I want to emphasize that I am not suggesting a change.

Ms. Filges – We are here for conversation. I don't think there is any architect that would say they would never change anything when they are finished with it. The idea of the upper band is that it doesn't continue. We were trying to come up with the base body cap reference to classicism. It is intentionally broken horizontally. It would be a stronger vertical line in that one little area.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Would that be an administrative modification if they wanted to do that?

Mr. Werner – This is one of the most detailed discussions I have experienced with the ERB. There are a couple of learning things moving forward. I would prefer, given the attention that this is getting, that you be very clear about what you mean. I would be much more comfortable with that. My suggestion is that you sketch it, draw it, and determine what is best so that the 3 of us agree.

Ms. Filges – We feel that is a minor suggestion and an improvement.

Mr. Werner – What I am hearing is that on the right-hand side, there is a triple window. On either side of the triple window is a vertical band of black that will be extended down.

Chairman Mitchell – Commissioner Stolzenberg will be very articulate when he puts together the motion. You have enough people saying that it is a good idea that you might want to get that included in the motion.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Why not get rid of that whole line to the right of the window? That would make it symmetrical. Maybe, you are intentionally making it not symmetrical.

Commissioner Schwarz – The red banding is the same width on each side. It stands out more than the dark.

Ms. Filges – If you look at the other elevations, it is a language and a pattern. See how it hits the right on the other elevations. It is a continuation with the theme on all the elevations.

Commissioner Schwarz – Since it is recessed, it is going to read dark. The windows will be dark.

Ms. Filges – That is why we selected the darker material too.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – In this solution, even though you are right, this top is the cap, and it is different. I feel it still draws you to that break in the vertical line. It is doing something on that top that isn't necessarily the same material. I think the articulation is terrible.

Mr. Filges – I neglected to mention that they are recessed as well. The top stories are recessed back several feet. You are not going to make that visual connection.

Commissioner Habbab – Since it is not red brick, what are staff's thoughts on that material instead of brick?

Mr. Werner – The Code Building is a good example. That was going to be brick. They came back with a brick tile. Aesthetically, the results are identical. Since it is not stucco, I am happy. I hate it when I see something like that. The material is a durable material. I don't know how any of those things are going to age. We have brick buildings that age poorly. I am Ok with it.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – What made you guys go with that stacked bond? That is going to distinguish it from brick, which might be a good thing because it is not brick.

Ms. Filges – I am a purist when it comes to brick. It is either brick or it is not. The idea was to impart some texture to the building reminiscent of brick. We did not want to mimic the traditional UVA brick and fail. The idea is that there is some texture applied. We are using the stacked bond look so that it is not trying to mimic it so closely. If you try to do faux brick panels, it will be a horrible failure. The idea is that, visually, you still see a little bit of the color and a little bit of the texture. I don't think that it appears as brick. I have seen larger portions of this texture. It really reads more textural.

Commissioner Schwarz – Let's also remember that although the joints will be small, it is going to be tiled. They wouldn't be able to successfully do a running bond pattern. This will camouflage the joints more.

Ms. Filges – Maintenance has come up. If we were to use traditional brick, there would be some maintenance involved with that as well and structural issues. We are using it down on the first and second level where you can experience the brick at a pedestrian level. That is why it is used down there.

Commissioner Habbab – My other question was on transformers and the three transformers on Copley. Is there an alternative location for them that is out of view?

Ms. Filges – It is a very tight site. There is not a great location for that. A generator is required by code. One of the best locations for the generator room is close to that. That needs to be in close proximity. There is not really any room on site. You want those functions nearby. In terms of access, Virginia Power wants good access. They want 10 feet clear in front of there. They want to be able to come in and do what they need to do. It would be a challenge if we placed it somewhere else in terms of servicing them. The intent is to apply artwork.

Commissioner Habbab – Have we ever accepted transformers without screening? If you could make it a nice public art piece, it is fine with me.

Mr. Werner – We have problems where we put a lot of things, including trees. Dominion Power doesn't let you put its transformers inside a building. These were shown on the early drawings. The transformers are there. These didn't pop up out of nowhere.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – There is a valid point that is UVA's project over there that has that green way that opens up to this building. Right in the middle are the transformers. I agree that is less than ideal. There is not much to do about it. The art idea is a great idea. You must execute it well.

Ms. Filges – We thought it would be fun to do something referencing bicycles or multimodal transportation. It has been such a huge topic of conversation. We have the bike room located in close proximity.

Commissioner Schwarz – How graffiti-proof or graffiti-cleanable are they? Do we know that?

Ms. Filges – We have not specified the manufacturer. I know of manufacturers that produce those. They call them ‘graffiti-proof.’ I am not sure how ‘graffiti-proof.’ They have been tested for that reason.

Commissioner Joy – With the wrap, has that been confirmed with Dominion that they allow wraps on their equipment?

Ms. Filges – We are in the process of having those conversations. It was noted on the PUD.

Commissioner Joy – I have been clear about the desire to not have those on the location. There is also concern about the adjoining trees and potentially the one immediately to the left that is shown in the site plan, whether that would be possible given the proximity to the equipment.

I have noticed in the rendering along the bike storage that there appears to be a window wrap or a decal of a bicycle shown in the rendering. I know keeping clear glass as a preference. I wanted to make a note. It is unclear how much of the storefront is being proposed to have a wrap in the documents that we were provided. When I look at the ground floor, there are other elements situated there. In the renderings, it appears to be all glass. In the programming, it appears to be a mix of some program. It is hard to know what we are approving here.

In the site plan, this is another discrepancy with the renderings and uncertainty with the elevation. In the site plan, you can clearly see exterior piers at the corner of Copley and Ivy. They don’t appear to show up in the rendering. Similarly, as you go around the bridge, there are additional piers that are shown. Are they intended to be concrete? Will they be brick clad?

Ms. Filges – We are in the early design phase. We are still working with the structural engineer on the cantilevers. The intent is to cantilever as much as possible. I am sure we are going to end up having to some sort of columns. The intent is that they would be clad in brick.

Commissioner Joy – The texture is not there. There is no specific call-out tag. I know you have board form concrete as one of your elements. I wanted to confirm that those piers, if exposed, if they end up staying in the project that they would be clad in brick.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Are you talking about the north elevation?

Commissioner Joy – It shows up in a couple of places. I don’t think you can pick them out in the elevation. It is best to look at the site plan, which is on page A5. If you look to the right of the garage entry, you can see that there are four exposed piers along the property line. If you go along to the south, there is another one right by the primary entrance to the retail commercial space. They don’t appear to show up in the renderings. I wasn’t sure what the intent was with those exposed structural elements. They don’t look wider in the plans. It didn’t appear that they had cladding on them.

Ms. Filges – We are still working on the actual calculations. The intent is that they are wrapped in brick. We will remove the board form concrete from that materials board. The only intent for that was the wall, which we will be removing. We are happy to say that there is no board formed concrete finish.

Commissioner Joy – With regards to the hanger rod and clevis at the balconies, it would be preferred to not express the hanging rod and clevis. I will defer to the voting members of the Commission whether they have a

specific concern about that. I appreciate the improvements. The University appreciates the improvements to the streetscape, the intent to match and align the sidewalks. That is going to be a great asset to the local community and to the students that are here. It will make it feel like a cohesive extension of Grounds. That has been a great improvement. As we move up that façade on Ivy, there was a step back that was proposed when it went back for its PUD approval. Having spent some time on West Main and looking at other recently approved entrance corridor projects and the language that is in the entrance corridor design guidelines, it is unfortunate that the step back isn't more pronounced. What is being shown here is more of a surface articulation and not a true step back. I look at a similar 10-story property at the Draftsman and the successful step back that happens lower in the building does wonders to tying it into existing lower-rise context. This project is surrounded with 3 of the sides. It is something that I wanted to point out. The last comment was about the west façade. It appears to be the least articulated as far as architectural interest. Some would argue that it might be the most visible as an entrance façade coming into the city. It doesn't seem to have the same level of architectural interest and variation that you see on the other facades. That will be many peoples' first moments when they feel like they are starting to enter the city because you will start to see a higher scale of development.

ERB Discussion and Motion

Commissioner Schwarz – Our guidelines are less strict than the BAR guidelines. I don't have many concerns with this project. I believe that it is well done. For future applications, something to request from an applicant when have material like this, I would like to see the joint pattern on the façade even if it is not going to be visible when it is complete because the joints are so tiny. That would have been helpful on this one. I have a concern about the trees. I would like to see them there. I would like to see them be as big as possible. I think that is everybody's goal. I want to make sure that we don't get to the end of this and there are 4 crepe myrtles or 4 dogwoods that is pathetic because of site plan issues. I don't know how we craft that into a motion. I am always optimistic about how large a tree you can cram next to a large building. I do feel that you see this in urban areas all the time where people put large street trees and they grow away from the building. They end up growing over the street, which we are trying to achieve. Whatever language we can come up with to make it more forceful that they try to find something large would be preferable. With staff's recommendation about lighting, we need to include that. The applicant has answered all my questions.

Commissioner Joy – I feel that I have covered my comments. I do want to acknowledge the opportunity to revisit some of the step backs along Ivy and how that would be positively received by the neighboring community and the University. It would make for a more compatible project to the existing context and add architectural interest into the design that is proposed here.

Commissioner Habbab – I agree with all of staff's recommendations. I am Ok with leaving the tree language the same way as it is in staff's recommendation, knowing that we will try to get as big of a tree as we can. I am also looking at that façade driving down Ivy towards the city. It is a big, blank, white clad portion of the building. I am not sure what I would change design-wise.

Commissioner d'Oronzio – I don't have any serious queries or questions about this project. The variations that we have been talking about don't seem to be driving any sort of aesthetic concerns that I have.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – I am excited about the project. Burying the powerlines is going to be a big deal. I am thinking about the approach from the west. I think that we are going to see infill in that area from adjacent property owners. I suspect that is a temporary issue. I appreciate it being raised.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – One concern we heard from Council was this idea that this building is top-heavy with the cantilever. When you agreed to step back the upper portions further from the road, I wish that you hadn't also moved the first floor back. You keep the cantilever even though you lost all that space. I like the

additional room for seating and clear walk space. I wonder if having something like a column at the corner would give it a sense of substantialness that makes it look like it is not suspended by ‘modern magic.’ On the upper portion step backs, from a purely aesthetic perspective, it detracts from the building. It would detract more if it was greater. I look at a building like The Kenworth, a great traditional building, where that upper cap is distinguished by color. It is not stepped back. It looks better. The idea of upper story step backs makes me think of the Waterhouse building, which is one of the ugliest buildings in the city. I get that people are asking for step backs. I can only see it being detrimental.

Do we want to get to a conclusion on the idea of the vertical lines and asymmetric situation? I have a few choices of what you may have been talking about.

(Commissioner Stolzenberg shared his screen to the applicant and other commissioners)

Commissioner Habbab – It seems minor enough of a change on the elevation that they could just change it.

Ms. Filges – We have had great conversations with everyone with the city and are happy to continue this conversation.

Chairman Mitchell – I am relying on you (Commissioner Stolzenberg) to organize the motion.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Do we want anything beyond staff’s proposed conditions?

Chairman Mitchell – We have a debate on trees, the rooftop screening that we need to think about.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – It sounded that was a bit mute given where they’re planning on putting the rooftop apartment stuff.

Mr. Werner – I don’t think there is a problem with you having the condition.

Ms. Filges – We put a note on the drawings that the equipment will be screened from view. The intent is exactly what you are talking about. If you are on the street, there is a parapet. They are located at the center of the roof so that you can’t see them. We are happy to look in 3D, in terms of the effects.

Chairman Mitchell – The only remaining debate is tree size.

Commissioner Schwarz – I don’t need to push that if everyone understands that is the goal.

Mr. Werner – It didn’t come out of anything other than that we keep making spaces smaller and we want to put trees there if a tree won’t go there. I am not going to say, ‘let’s put a shrub there.’ I want it as big as we can get.

Commissioner Schwarz – My fear is after all the site plan stuff is finished, there is a big water line running under all 4 trees and we get nothing, except for something that is shrubbery. That would be a problem. I don’t know if we have, as entrance corridor review board, an ability to prevent that.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – The condition presented explicitly says ‘from the city tree list.’

Mr. Werner – If there is something underground there, you can’t put a tree on top of it. You can make them move the building. You can’t require that they put a tree on top of where it can’t go. There is a lot going on tonight that is going to be carried forward. This zoning ordinance is going to bring things like this. There is a lot to think about.

Commissioner Schwarz – As you have done your site plan process, how far have you dug into the burying the power lines and knowing how much room you have for utilities?

Ms. Filges – The owner has engaged with a consultant for the purpose of determining that. They are having conversations with Dominion right now about that. We have also had conversations with the civil engineer, the landscape architect, and the entire design team discussing those specific trees and the intent behind them. As we mentioned on the drawings, the intent is to coordinate with site plan review, entrance corridor review, and with UVA to try to provide a consistent streetscape. The intent is to provide the largest tree we can. There is the street tree list, which dictates a certain size there. We can only go so small. We're not going to. We want big trees. We can't put tiny dwarf crepe myrtles. They are not on the approved street tree list.

Commissioner Schwarz – I guess it is maybe less distrust of you as it is the site plan process.

Ms. Filges – We had a pre-meeting with utilities. It is not 100 percent designed. We are thinking about every aspect at this early phase.

Motion – Commissioner Stolzenberg – Having considered the standards set forth within the City's Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed design for 2117 Ivy Road is consistent with the

Guidelines and compatible with this Entrance Corridor, and that the ERB approves the Certificate of Appropriateness application as submitted, with the following conditions of approval:

- All exterior lighting and all interior garage lighting visible at the garage entrance will have lamping that is dimmable, have a Color Temperature not exceeding 3,000K, and have a Color Rendering Index not less than 80, preferably not less than 90. Additionally, the owner will address any reasonable public complaints about light glare by either dimming the lamp or replacing the lamps/fixtures.
- Any ground-level mechanical equipment and/or utility boxes will be appropriately screened. That screening will be subject to approval by design staff and must be memorialized as an amendment to the site plan.
- Meters and panel boxes for utility, communications, and cable connections will be located preferably within the garage; if not, then in non-prominent locations on the side elevations only and appropriately screened. That screening will be subject to approval by design staff and must be memorialized as an amendment to the site plan.
- The street tree species, when selected, will be coordinated with UVA's streetscape plan, will meet City site plan requirements, and, most importantly, will be from the City's Tree List among the largest varieties available within the list, and appropriate for the conditions/space above and below grade.
- All rooftop mechanical equipment will be located within the area of rooftop screening. The equipment will not be taller than the screening. The screened equipment area will be no closer than 10 feet from the parapet.

Second by Commissioner Schwarz. Motion passes 6-0.

The meeting was recessed for 5 minutes.

2. Preliminary Discussion – Entrance Corridor Review – VERVE Charlottesville

Staff Report

Mr. Werner – What do you want to see when this project comes to you possibly in a month? It was instructive earlier. There are a whole lot more walls involved with The Verve than the 4 or 5 walls at 2117 Ivy. This is where renderings serve a purpose. I use them to illustrate the project. When something comes in for the building permit, I am looking at the building elevations and the wall sections. The rendering is artwork and goes by the wayside unless it conflicts. For The VERVE and 2117, there is almost an optical illusion. You see some bending of the walls. They are imperfect and needs to be understood that way.

We normally don't do preliminary discussions. This is going to have to be something that we work into it, particularly if we do get the projects that we are anticipating. We are due to review our design guidelines.

This is a PUD approved project under the prior zoning. References are to that zoning. This project is in an entrance corridor and requires a CoA. This is a multi-parcel project. Three of those parcels are not within the entrance corridor. Since this is a single project, the entire entrance corridor provisions apply to everything. If there had been a historic project on this site, this entire project would have been reviewed by the BAR. You last saw this project in October/November. City Council saw a version of it in December. There have been some changes to that design. I asked the applicant to summarize what has changed. When they come forward with a formal submittal, what level of detail do you want to see? You don't have to respond. It gets to where renderings versus elevations versus construction drawings. There is a lot happening at The VERVE. Now is the time to set the table for what they are going to prepare and bring to you. I use the word for a successful submittal. That doesn't mean we are going to do this so that it is guaranteed an approval. That is the goal; to get a project that can be approved by the entrance corridor. That means something that is complete relative to what you want to see. There is no formal action tonight. You can thank them for their time. I will leave it to Chairman Mitchell to guide the discussion.

Applicant Presentation/ERB Discussion and Feedback

Neil Reardon, Applicant – It is helpful for us to show you what has changed, answer any questions you have, and get any feedback on what you might want to see. Our intention is to be there next month in person and present to you in a similar scope as to the previous project. We were in front of you in October of 2023. This project was heard in front of City Council as a modified version based on your input in October. That was heard in December. The PUD was approved by the City Council.

Next Slide

What we are looking at here is the main view from the northwest of the project. This is the October version that you saw and offered input on.

Next Slide

We revised the building in dramatic ways. We now have two buildings. On the site, we have a west building, which you see on the right-hand side, which bends around the curve where Stadium Road and Emmet meet. There is a void where the building is joined at the first 2 stories with a mini-market and a main entrance to the complex. There is a building on the north, calling it the north building. It is 11 stories. That is the building you see on the left-hand side of this image. We created this void and significantly modified the exterior materials from what you saw in October. This is the update.

Next Slide

This view is from the northeast of the site. This view captures the angle and the 'pork chop' at the road at where JPA and Emmet meet. JPA is on your left and Emmet is on your right as it proceeds west. Before, this option had quite a lot going on. There were lots of different volumes and lots of different materials.

Next Slide

What we did when we made some moves elsewhere on the site that you have already seen is simplify that massing and materiality. This is the 11-story building. That is the north building that fronts Emmet. What we did was regularize that rather than have so much going on. On the left-hand side of this, you see what has mostly remained the same. The material cladding and design choices have changed. The massing was very similar. We are calling this the east building. This is the building that fronts JPA. As JPA lowers in grade, this part of the project is anywhere from 6 stories up to 8 stories. That is because JPA slopes down as it goes south.

Next Slides

This view is from the southwest of the project. This would be looking north on Stadium Road. You can see our end profile of the west building located here. This was the previous version. We did make some significant massing changes to this part of the west building. The building is essentially the same size up top. What we did is contextually match some datum lines across the street and taper a step back where you see the black massing change to the gray and gold tone massing. That was intentional to try to align better with all the things we have going on along Montebello. The goal on Montebello was to hit at the 3-story datum line. Montebello has a higher grade than the rest of the site. The buildings that front the Montebello side are around 3/3.5 stories. What you see there above that is the 12-story portion of the west building that fronts Stadium Road.

Next Slide

That is the summary for us tonight. What you see there lastly is a straight-on view of the JPA side.

Part of the project is within the entrance corridor review scope. The part that is applicable to the entrance corridor is the JPA side. We wanted to make sure we had some other angles. We will bring forward imagery, next month to you.

Chairman Mitchell – Are we going to be able to see the top of this building from The Lawn?

Mr. Reardon – I can summarize that for you. We have produced diagrams. We would be happy to bring them next month if it is helpful. We have produced diagrams that illustrate that this building is not seen from The Lawn. That was a request when we reached out to UVA. That was the dialogue we had with them. We have those diagrams. I believe they might have been brought up during a portion of one of the previous public hearings. We can certainly bring those diagrams again next month.

Commissioner Joy – I want to thank you for taking us through the ‘before’ and ‘after.’ It is very helpful. I wanted to commend the team on the marked improvement that is being proposed. It is a commendable change. I appreciate the willingness of the team to listen to the concerns that came out of the community and from City Council and to be willing to adjust the design. Since we have limited materials to look at here and we are primarily looking at renderings, it seems like there is still a lot of development happening. I am going to focus my comments on overall massing. As we went through the slides, the slide of the northwest corner, that transition is tremendous. I appreciate the scaling down and the articulation of these 2 buildings with the gap in between. That is a successful move at helping to make this building feel more contextual. With the next slides (4 and 5), we are looking at JPA and Emmet Street. For many people in town, this will probably be their first visual contact with the building. The design is improved. In the new scheme, I am little remiss that there is a lack of step back in any capacity. In slides 6 and 7 where you have made a thoughtful adjustment to bring some datum line and contextualization to Montebello, I see an opportunity for a similar type of articulation at JPA and Emmet to help mitigate that initial articulation with the adjoining buildings as you scale up to the full height of the development. I look forward to seeing more about the articulation, the material palette, the elevations, and plans so I can delve in deeper to provide feedback.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I agree that it is much better than what it was before. The massing now looks very good. A building looks better when it is taller than it is wide. I appreciate that the building was split into

two, but that you also have these different segments of that building with these full height recesses that differentiate them. The shape of the buildings looks much better. I am very happy with that. I don't like all the cladding choices. I hated all the old cladding choices. The whole alternating the cladding from one side to the other, as you go up, I am talking about the light-colored cladding. I like how you have that horizontal bar every 2 stories, which makes it visually look shorter. Those vertical elements between the windows and how those are alternating, it is not nearly as bad as how you were alternating it the last time with the black and white. Does that serve a purpose? Is this an architecture technique? Why did you do this alternating sides?

Mr. Reardon – The alternating aspect that you're talking about in the gold that we are seeing on the screen is in a 2-story configuration. The reason we do that in the 2-story configuration is to break down the scale of that 12-story volume. The pairing of 2 floors together helps break down the scale. The eye of the audience or the person experiencing it from the street, it lessens the height that they must perceive from that angle. That is the intent of arranging them in two stories.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – It seems like they are already arranged in a 2-story configuration by those horizontal lines. Why does the gold and silver pattern alternate?

Mr. Reardon – It creates a module of 2 horizontal levels together. The dark black banding in between the windows spans the gap or creates that. What you are mentioning is why does it not align purely vertically? That is intentional so the 3 tones of gold or gray here change to create that 2-story volume.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I would like to see more renderings from the street level, especially standing next to the building, in front of it, especially along JPA. That is the most important part of how a building is experienced. If you are looking at the main entrance and you have the large building to the right and the second pseudo building, it looks like it is a blank wall there at ground level. Where there are blank walls, I want to see renderings of it.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – The word that came to mind when I was looking these changes was 'lucid.' This is a more lucid design. I understand more clearly what you are trying to do. It makes more visual sense. I agree with Commissioner Stolzenberg's comments about understanding the pedestrian experience. This is a heavily trafficked area for pedestrians, especially JPA and Emmet. Understanding that experience would be helpful. What do you want from us? What would be helpful for you to hear from us?

Mr. Reardon – Hearing the discussion on the previous project was helpful. We have notes from that with site elements, site lighting, the clunky things on the site such as transformers and generators. We have plans for all of those and articulating how we are addressing those things sounds like an important thing to discuss with you next month. It is the public realm pieces and the details of those to a higher degree than was scrutinized at the PUD level. If there is anything that is project specific to what I mentioned, we would love to hear it now.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – Overall, it makes sense. I am not concerned about the materials. I agree with the 2-story chunking. I agree that makes visual sense.

Commissioner d'Oronzio – I am agreeing with the comments I have heard thus far.

Commissioner Habbab – I like it more than the previous design. It feels less of a jumble highlighting the verticality like Commissioner Stolzenberg said with the materials and the recesses, the 2-story levels with the horizontal banding. I like the alternating panels because I feel that they help break down the scale. If it was repetitive all the way up, that would highlight a bigger, solid block, and keeping them in the same shade of color is nice. It doesn't look too much of a mess. Do you know what material you are using? It looks like it is

black brick with black storefront windows. With the panels, I couldn't tell if it was cement or metal paneling. What are you thinking there?

Mr. Reardon – We are exploring a few things. On the 3-tone material, we are exploring a couple different material types. We plan to bring that to you next month and clearly state what that is. We have always thought about it as a metal panel. The charcoal volume is a masonry at the base. We are looking at how to articulate the best version of that as it goes up. We will bring that next month. In terms of colors and tones, we plan to stick with and not alter from what these renderings are here today. A more detailed version of materiality and jointing pattern is something you guys expect and asked for in the last project. We will plan to show you some of those details in our upcoming submittal.

Commissioner Habbab – On that masonry, I really think the way you have the coursing and the soldier coursing, and the different coursing between the windows is very nice. We talked about trees in our previous application. If you have more information about that when you come back to us, it would be nice to see. On page 3 of the site plan, there is a picture of a car right on that corner. Is there a driveway there?

Mr. Reardon – It looks like there is a car coming out of the building. There is a port casare here where we pull in off JPA and exit where that car is coming out. That is a drop-off zone intended for leasing, arrivals, visitors, deliveries, and all those functions to bring those off the street.

Commissioner Schwarz – I want to echo a lot of the comments that have been said. I appreciate the color variation if you keep it subtle. It is breaking down the mass in the way that you had suggested. I am going to be interested in the materials that you choose. The brick is a rich material. The way that you are using it is being used with a whole lot of detail. Although you are using it sparingly in some small thin towers, that goes a long way in adding some richness to the building. With these metal panels, I would love to know how the joints are detailed. I would hate to see this thing turn into a large fiber cement building. If you did that, I would be concerned about wanting to know what the joints are. I don't think it is your intention. We have seen some fiber cement buildings where you see a lot of flashing everywhere. That doesn't seem like anything you are going to be doing. If it comes down to it, that would be sad. I agree with Commissioner Joy's comments on the JPA side. It is the smallest side. The buildings are much shorter on that side. It might look a lot wider. It does feel in some of your renderings to be massive for its context. If you could look at that, and make sure that you are still breaking down the mass efficiently for the JPA side, which is a more residential side.

Commissioner Joy – You have a clear, activated base. We have talked about the sort of success of the articulation in the middle. In certain areas, you have a nice transition to express a top. I know looking at the entrance corridor design guidelines, there is a desire to have a clear delineation of a top of a building. I would ask, as you begin to refine the design, in some of these instances, particularly where you have the 2-tone gold panel, that the parapet condition doesn't seem like it has as much attenuation that the brick masses have. There could be an opportunity to think about how this building meets the sky.

Chairman Mitchell – I applaud the revisions. I like what you have done here.

Chairman Mitchell gaveled the ERB out and gaveled in the Planning Commission.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:24 PM.