

DRAFT MINUTES

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE

PLANNING COMMISSION

TUESDAY, 8 MAY, 2007 -- 6:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission was held on this date with the following members present:

Mr. Jon Fink (Chairman)

Mr. Bill Lucy (Vice-Chairman)

Ms. Cheri Lewis

Mr. Michael Farruggio

Mr. Hosea Mitchell

Mr. Michael Osteen

Mr. Jason Pearson

Commissioners Not Present:

Mr. David Neuman, Ex-officio, UVa Office of the Architect

Staff Present:

Mr. Jim Tolbert, AICP, Director NDS

Ms. Missy Creasy

Ms. Mary Joy Scala

Mr. Brian Haluska

Ms. Ebony Walden

City Council Members Present:

Mr. Kevin Lynch

Mr. Dave Norris

Mr. Julian Taliaferro

Also Present

S. Craig Brown, City Attorney

I. REGULAR MEETING

Mr. Fink called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

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

Mr. Fink called for matters from the public.

Mr. Jack Horne, of 700 Highland Avenue, expressed concern about PUDs in M-1 zoning which could eventually affect a rezoning of the area to residential requiring businesses which could only locate in M-1 to leave the City of Charlottesville. He stated the M-1 area seemed to be getting smaller and smaller.

B. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS

Mr. Farruggio stated the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee had met; a public meeting was set for 30 May in Carver Recreational Center at 6:30 p.m. to discuss a multigenerational facility. Mr. Farruggio attended the MPO Tech Committee meeting; parking in the City and County had been discussed. Mr. Farruggio had been unable to attend the Federation of Neighborhoods meeting. He had attended the Central Virginia Work Force Housing Forum. He also attended the Citizen Planning Education Association of Virginia's Third Annual Zoning Planning Seminar.

Mr. Pearson had been unable to attend the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission meeting and the Downtown Zoning Committee. He attended a meeting hosted by City Council in the Fifeville neighborhood to discuss Fifeville receiving a National Historic Designation.

Mr. Lucy stated his committees had not met.

Mr. Osteen had not been able to attend the Urban Streetcar Task Force meeting. He stated the Downtown Zoning Committee had a work session with the BAR and City Council. Mr. Osteen had attended the BAR meeting.

Ms. Lewis attended the UVa Master Planning Council meeting; there had been a presentation on the strategy being used by the UVa's Architect's office in order to formulate the grounds plan. Ms. Lewis also attended the meetings of the 250 Interchange Committee; a Peer Review Committee led a two-day meeting. Due to a scheduling conflict between committees, Ms. Lewis had not been able to attend the Housing Advisory Committee meeting.

Mr. Mitchell had nothing to report.

C. CHAIR'S REPORT

Mr. Fink had attended the Board of Zoning Appeals meeting; the Board was seeking legal counsel before handing down a decision. Mr. Fink stated the Eastern Connector Committee would be holding public hearings on 22 and 24 May. Mr. Fink noted the new transportation center was up and running; the Visitor Center, which was designed as a LEED building, was almost complete. He stated work was continuing on the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Fink stated the Charlottesville City and Albemarle County Planning Commissions would hold their initial joint meeting on 15 May at 6 o'clock in the County Office Building.

Mr. Fink stated Item F, ZM—07-03-06, had been deferred by the applicant.

Mr. Fink called for the Department of NDS/Staff Reports while awaiting the start of the Joint Public Hearing.

J. DEPARTMENT OF NDS/STAFF REPORTS

Ms. Creasy brought to the Commission's attention upcoming meetings: 15 May Joint City County Planning Commission Work Session; 22 May Planning Commission Work Session; 12 July Joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting on the CIP.

Mr. Fink called for a brief recess whereupon the meeting stood in recess at 6:51 p.m.

Mr. Fink reconvened the meeting at 7:01 p.m.

D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. List of site plans and subdivisions approved administratively
2. Site Plan – Arch's Frozen Yogurt
3. Subdivision – Paton Street - Preliminary and Final – 10 Residential Units
4. Subdivision – Cleveland /Naylor – Preliminary and Final – 2 residential lots and a road extension
5. Minutes - April 10, 2007 – Pre meeting
6. Minutes – April 10, 2007 – Regular meeting
7. Minutes – April 24, 2007 – Work Session

Mr. Fink called for discussion of the Consent Agenda. Ms. Lewis asked that the Regular Meeting minutes from 10 April include the notation that the County Planning Commission had turned down the first review of Biscuit Run citing as one reason traffic concerns that affected the City.

Mr. Farruggio moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

In the absence of a quorum of City Councilors, Mr. Fink proceeded to Section III of the agenda.

III. REGULAR MEETING ITEMS (Continued)

F. ZM—07-03-06: (Carlton Road) A petition to rezone from M-1 Industrial to Downtown Extended Corridor, for the property at the corner of Meade Avenue and Carlton Road with a proffer. The proffer limits building height to that permitted in the M-1 Zoning District (maximum of 85 feet.) The application is to create opportunities for uses not allowed within Industrial zoning. This property is further identified on City Real Property Tax Map 56 as parcel 19 having 150 feet of frontage on Carlton Road and containing approximately 27,007 square feet of land or 0.62 acres. The general uses called for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are for Industrial Uses. Report prepared by Ashley Cooper, Neighborhood Planner. Deferred by Planning Commission in April.

This item was deferred at the request of the applicant.

G. SITE PLAN

1. Paton Street PUD -- Portion Two

Mr. Haluska gave the staff report. There are no outstanding Staff comments because this was submitted almost a year ago.

Mr. Fink called for questions of Staff.

Mr. Fink sought confirmation that all ENS issues had been addressed. Mr. Haluska stated the ENS plan has been fully addressed.

Mr. Fink called for questions of the applicant. There were none.

Mr. Fink called for discussion by the Commission.

Ms. Lewis stated there was such silence because the Commission had seen this as a PUD before and it had been back before the Commission in several iterations.

Mr. Lucy moved that the Planning Commission approve the Paton Street Planned Unit Development submitted by Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. Ms. Creasy called the roll; the motion carried unanimously.

2. Chevy Chase Bank -- Corner of Emmet Street and Barracks Road

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant, Mike Tucker of BC Consultants, has submitted an application for approval of a preliminary site plan for a new bank and associated parking to be located at 1200 Emmet Street. This site is located on the north east corner of the intersection of Barracks Road and Emmet Street and is zoned Urban Corridor Mixed Use District. The current use of this property is an Exxon gas station which will be removed. Thirteen parking spaces are required; the applicant proposes 25 including two handicapped spaces. A 15 foot access easement is proposed for a pedestrian/bike trail running parallel to Meadowbrook Road. The applicant is reducing impervious surface on the site and maintaining all vegetation that is adjacent to the Meadowcreek Drainage Channel. This plan does make improvements from the existing gas station and will include a new building that is shifted out to the southwest corner of the site to help to begin to define the street wall along Emmet Street. Staff recommends approval of the preliminary site plan for Chevy Chase Bank at 1200 Emmet Street with no conditions.

Mr. Fink called for questions of Ms. Scala.

Mr. Mitchell expressed concern about increased traffic and wanted to know how it would be alleviated. Ms. Scala agreed there was a certain amount of traffic stacking on site, and stated this could exacerbate that condition. She stated the Traffic Engineer could be advised to consider extending the median sooner rather than later. Mr. Mitchell wanted to know if there was a way to condition approval of this to ensure the median would be extended so that left turns would not be allowed from the site. Mr. Fink clarified that the City was responsible for extending the median and the applicant had not proffered the additional median.

Mr. Fink stated he shared Mr. Mitchell's concern as well.

Mr. Pearson wanted to know if Staff's recommendation for approval stood regardless of construction of the median. Ms. Scala stated she had not been the Planner on this site plan, but she thought that Planner thought the median would happen in a timely manner.

Mr. Fink wanted to know what environmental concerns needed to be addressed in removing the gas station. Ms. Scala did not know the answer.

Ms. Cindy Lincolns, of 5633 Hogan Hill Terrace, stated Chevy Chase had developed several gas stations sites in the past. She stated they would do soils tests and would excavate down as far as necessary if it shows any contamination and would fill back up with compacted fill and gravel.

Mr. Fink called for discussion.

Mr. Mitchell reiterated his concern about traffic stacking and sought Ms. Creasy's opinion as to when the median might be constructed. Ms. Creasy did not know; however, she stated the Traffic Engineer was very involved in the review of that. Ms. Lewis asked if they could express a preference of Staff that the formal site plan not be signed prior to the median at least being under construction. Mr. Brown, Esq., stated that, not knowing the scheduled construction of the median, they could not delay the final site plan if the construction of the median was far off in the future.

Mr. Farruggio thought the site plan should be considered on its own merit and the City should be pressured to have the median built.

Mr. Osteen recognized the traffic circulation concern was valid, but he thought the site plan was appropriate. He expressed support for the site plan as submitted.

Ms. Lewis stated the applicant had created some nice planting areas and done the best they could with the oddly shaped lot.

Mr. Farruggio moved that they approve the Chevy Chase bank at the corner of Emmett Street and Barracks Road preliminary site plan. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. Ms. Lewis noted for the record Mr. Mitchell's comments asking the City to see if the improvement could be completed forthwith. Ms. Creasy called the roll. The motion carried unanimously.

III. JOINT PUBLIC HEARINGS

E. JOINT PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. SP-07-04-11: (513 Dice Street) An application for a special use permit for an infill development on the property at 513 Dice Street. This is a request to allow for an infill development, with waivers, containing two single family dwellings. This property is further identified on City Real Property Tax Map 29 as parcel 63.1, having approximately 92.7 feet of frontage on Dice Street and containing approximately 9,104 square feet of land or 0.209 acres. The general uses called for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are for Single Family Residential. Report prepared by Ebony Walden, Neighborhood Planner.

Ms. Walden gave the staff report. Infill development is a concept by which the city desires to encourage and permit variation in certain areas within the city's R-1, R-1S, R-2 and R-3 zoning districts, by allowing deviation from the following types of regulations pursuant to a special use permit: minimum lot size and street frontage requirements, dimensional requirements, types of dwellings, density, and yard requirements. The applicant is requesting an infill special use permit to build an additional 1,648 square foot single family residence at 513 Dice Street. This special use permit would allow a density of 9.52 units per acre in an R-1S Residential District where the maximum allowable density is 7.2 units per acre.

As a condition of this special use permit, the applicant is requesting a reduction in: the required lot frontage from 50 feet to 45 feet; lot size requirements from 6,000 square feet to 4,400 square feet; a waiver of off street parking requirements to allow 43 percent of the front yard of the new unit to accommodate off street parking. The property currently houses a recently renovated 1,648 square foot individually protected historic residence and is zoned R-1SH. Staff feels this is a good candidate for an Infill Special Use Permit. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward this application to City Council with a recommendation for approval with conditions, exceptions or modifications to include: a reduction of the required lot frontage from 50 feet to 45 feet; a reduction of lot size requirements from 6,000 square feet to 4,400 square feet; if approved, the new unit be two stories -- or one and-a-half -- rather than two and-a-half.

Mr. Fink called for questions of Ms. Walden.

Mr. Lucy wanted to know if the BAR would have to review the new building. Ms. Walden thought it would have to be reviewed and approved by the BAR as her understanding was the new building would have the same zoning designation.

Mr. Steve Edwards, of Terra Concepts, was present on behalf of the applicant. He stated they agreed with the staff report and recommendation. He was willing to answer any questions from the Commissioners and Councilors.

There were no questions from the Commissioners or Councilors.

Mr. Fink opened the public hearing. With no one wishing to speak to the matter, Mr. Fink closed the public hearing.

Mr. Fink called for discussion among the Commissioners.

Mr. Osteen had attended both BAR meetings and stated it was the feeling of the BAR that any additional structure be set back from the street. Mr. Osteen stated he would only be supportive of a structure set back from the street.

Mr. Pearson agreed with the staff recommendation for the location of the new structure. He did not see the logic behind creating an open space to look at the back of the historic house.

Mr. Fink expressed concern about putting parking between the new house and the historic structure.

Ms. Lewis stated that relegating the new building to the back of the existing as an accessory house expressed a false historicism.

Mr. Pearson appreciated the low impact development strategy.

Mr. Osteen reminded his fellow Commissioners there were six criteria to consider.

Ms. Lewis thought the application fit all six criteria.

Mr. Farruggio moved to recommend approval of the Infill Special Use Permit in the R-1S Single Family Residential District to allow an additional single family residence at 513 Dice street as represented on the site plan, subject to the following conditions and exceptions or modifications -- a reduction of the required lot frontage from 50 feet to 45 feet; a reduction of lot size requirements from 6,000 to 4,400 square feet; an extension of the parking area northward in order to meet the minimum 18 feet

parking length requirements with one shared 12 foot wide single apron entrance; preliminary Site Plan approval by the Planning Commission; staff approval of the Final Site Plan; Final approval of LID worksheet by the City Engineer totaling at least 10 points; and final BAR approval -- this approval is based on the finding that the proposal meets the criteria for a special use permit and would serve the interests of the general public welfare and good zoning practice. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. Mr. Osteen pointed out the Commission had gone against the BAR on every point they tried to make in their two discussions on this project. Mr. Brown suggested the language be changed to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness from the BAR. Mr. Farruggio accepted that as a friendly amendment as did Mr. Lucy. Ms. Creasy called the roll. The motion passed, 6-1; Mr. Osteen voted against.

III. REGULAR MEETING ITEMS (Continued)

H. ENTRANCE CORRIDOR REVIEW

1. Arch's Frozen Yogurt

The applicant, BRW Architects, for Archer Enterprises, Inc. is requesting a certificate of appropriateness to build a new Arch's Frozen Yogurt restaurant on Emmet Street at the former Donut Connection site. The site plan was approved earlier in the meeting. The ERB previously approved an Entrance Corridor Certificate of Appropriateness for an Arch's Frozen Yogurt design on this site on 11 April, 2006. This is a new application. The proposal is for a two-story building, approximately 56 feet long and 28 feet wide. The roof is flat, except for two projections. The height of the roof is 22 feet. There are outdoor eating balconies. A two-story wall extends 12 feet from the building on the Emmett Street side to partially enclose the dining area and to support signage. The mass and scale of the building is consistent with other structures on Route 29 North. Mechanical equipment will be enclosed from view. The applicant has designed the building and site to convey a theme of natural beauty and sustainability. One projecting sign is proposed and Staff recommends that the sign should be incorporated into the projecting wall, rather than on top. The building is articulated with a variety of building materials. The colors include tan and "earth tone" red. Polygal panels are proposed for the guardrails; Staff would prefer a metal mesh guardrail. The exterior walls are Superior Wall System with concrete exteriors parged with stucco. The north wall will be covered with a stainless steel cable trellis for climbing ivy. The roof panels are SIPS panels with a white membrane roof. The steel columns, guardrails, and storefront window system are painted dark red. Staff opinion is that this building represents a good contemporary design. The different textures of natural materials articulate the building and help integrate the building with the site. Staff commends the site design that integrates the natural buffer area, the pedestrian connection to Emmet Street, and the overall understated design. Lighting fixture designs should be approved by staff. A sign permit is required, and will be approved by staff. Staff recommends approval subject to administrative approval of the lighting fixture design.

Mr. Bruce Wardell, of BRW Architects, was present on behalf of the applicant. He had perspective model drawings with the proposed colors.

Mr. Fink asked Mr. Wardell to address Staff's concerns about signage. Mr. Wardell cited drawing 2.2 to explain the placement of the sign.

Ms. Lewis wanted to see a sample of the tinted glass. Mr. Wardell stated he had a sample of the frame but not the glass.

Mr. Pearson sought clarification from Ms. Scala about signage. Ms. Scala stated she was seeking help in determining where the bottom of the sill of the second story window would be to determine the proper location of the sign as it must be placed in the lower of either no higher than 20 feet or the bottom of the lower sill of the second floor window. Mr. Wardell stated he thought the bottom of the sill was the top of the ivy; however, that would hide the signage in the eating terrace.

Mr. Robert Archer, the applicant, of 645 Meadow Court, stated that he had wanted the sign to be simple and elegant.

Mr. Farruggio asked if red maples would work that close to the sidewalks. Mr. Wardell stated he could not speak to that with any authority but would ask the landscape architect. Mr. Farruggio expressed concern that the tree had a tap root rather than a surface root. Mr. Wardell stated they could change the species if necessary.

Mr. Osteen wanted to know what kind of vine material was proposed for the north side of the building. Mr. Wardell stated it would be Boston Ivy.

Mr. Fink called for discussion among the Commissioners.

Mr. Farruggio welcomed the height and felt it was appropriate to the property. He suggested they give the Polygal panels for the guardrails. Mr. Farruggio expressed concern about the tree. A shade tree would shade the sidewalk, offer protection, and make it friendlier.

Ms. Lewis stated the guidelines state clear glass windows are preferred. She wished there had been a sample of the proposed glass. Mr. Wardell stated the glass would be transparent. She expressed concern about the privacy wall as it made it seem the building was hiding something. She thought the materials needed to be approved as they were. Ms. Lewis also expressed concern about the height of the sign.

Mr. Osteen concurred with Ms. Lewis. He felt it was a nice design. He did express concern about the concrete wall. He felt the sign would be better lowered and integrated into the wall.

Mr. Fink reiterated comments that had been expressed. Staff should see a sample of the glass. The sign should be lowered and made flush with the wall or having the sign protrude from the wall. Regarding the signage, Mr. Fink felt it was necessary to respect the ADC guidelines. Mr. Farruggio felt a contemporary building design did not have a 32 or 42 inch sill. Ms. Lewis thought they were interpreting a sill where it did not exist in a building.

Mr. Pearson expressed concern about the wall which would be covered by ivy. Ms. Scala noted the north wall was solid because it was so close to the property line that it could not have windows.

Mr. Farruggio moved to approve the Entrance Corridor certificate of appropriateness subject to administrative approval of the lighting design as well as the shade street tree with uninvasive [sic] roots, the top of the sign to be below 20 feet, and for a proven stainless steel system for allowing ivy growth. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. Ms. Lewis offered a friendly amendment that the material of the windows, which are not supposed to be tinted but may be tinted in this case if it's appropriate by staff, be brought back to staff and that staff can determine whether they are appropriate. Mr. Farruggio accepted the friendly amendment as did Mr. Lucy. Ms. Creasy called the roll. The motion carried unanimously. Mr. Pearson commended the applicant for the quality of the submittal.

Mr. Fink called for a brief recess whereupon the meeting stood at recess at 9:14 p.m.

Mr. Fink reconvened the meeting at 9:19 p.m.

2. Chevy Chase Bank -- Corner of Emmet Street and Barracks Road

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. She provided the Commissioners with a sample of the trim and the updated sign. The applicant, Chevy Chase Bank, is requesting a certificate of appropriateness for a new commercial bank building at 1200 Emmet Street. There are two drive-through lanes on the east elevation. ATM machines are located at the drive-through area, and also on the "main entry" elevation that faces north to the parking lot. There is no entrance facing Emmet Street. There is a "secondary entrance" facing Barracks Road. The proposed building will be similar in height, mass and scale to most of the other structures along Emmet Street. Some of the 18-pane windows and nine-pane clerestory windows above them are real; some are not. Most of the windows facing Emmet Street are real. All the windows on the back side are false. The walls and pilasters are brick veneer. EIFS -- Exterior Insulation Finishing System -- is used on the triangular pediments, entablature, cornice, and columns. Windows are aluminum-clad wood. The windows are glazed with clear glass; the false windows include a grey Plexiglas behind them. Two wall signs are proposed above either pedestrian entrance. At night they would be lit with a white light. The ATMs will be not internally illuminated. The building is located close to Emmet Street and Barracks Road, with parking relegated to the rear as much as possible, which is preferable. Staff concerns are with the false windows and the use of EIFS. The signage will require separate approval. Staff recommends that brick niches may be more appropriate than false windows. No public comments have been received relative to the design. Staff recommends the use of painted synthetic material other than EIFS for the entablature, cornice, and columns that approximates the appearance of painted wood.

Mr. Fink recognized the applicant.

Ms. Cindy Lincolns, of Leo Daly Architects at 1201 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, DC, provided the Commission with photographs of a recently completed branch in Falls Church, Virginia.

Mr. Fink sought clarification behind the preference for EIFS. Ms. Lincolns stated EIFS entablature was very well detailed and very classically proportioned. She stated it had almost zero maintenance.

Mr. Farruggio sought clarification of the tree species for the landscape plan as only one was depicted. Mr. Michael Tucker, of BC Consultants, stated the large trees were only Silver Lindens and the designation TT1 or TT2 referred to how many trees were to be planted in an area.

Mr. Osteen wanted to know how many buildings had been built like this. Ms. Lincolns stated there were many tweaks and varieties to this building but there were approximately 60 of this floor plan throughout Virginia, Delaware, and Pennsylvania. Mr. Osteen wanted to know how many of the buildings had requested a variance to EIFS. Ms. Lincolns stated there had only been one; the Georgetown branch had required actual capstone. Mr. Osteen wanted to know how many had required variance of the false windows. Ms. Lincolns stated it had been an issue with the Hollymead branch.

Mr. Fink read a paragraph of a letter received from the project architect, Ms. Kyung Nunemaker: "The architecture of the proposed Chevy Chase Bank naturally blends with the neoclassical influences that are present in the architecture of Charlottesville. Its classically proportioned entry porticos, red brick facade

and traditional window and cornice detailing will allow the Chevy Chase Bank to integrate seamlessly with Charlottesville's refined architectural history and the tradition of Jefferson's Monticello and University of Virginia." Mr. Fink felt that was a big statement given the University uses noble materials in new construction. Ms. Lincolns stated if EIFS would not be acceptable, her preference would be to go to capstone.

Ms. Lincolns stated she had misunderstood the sign guidelines and would be submitting a new signage plan.

Mr. Fink called for discussion.

Mr. Farruggio expressed concern about the styrofoam backing of the EIFS and about the false windows. He expressed a desire for diversity in the planting schedule and for trees of a caliper larger than two inches.

Mr. Mitchell did not like the EIFS and expressed a preference for more noble materials.

Ms. Lewis concurred with Mr. Mitchell. She stated false windows had been approved before in the district. She preferred this solution to bricked in niches.

Mr. Osteen stated he was conflicted with the windows. He stated he did not like false windows. He stated he would appreciate further scrutiny of the design to eliminate some of the false windows entirely in favor of the brick facade. Mr. Osteen expressed a preference for precast stone over the EIFS.

Mr. Fink agreed with Mr. Farruggio that larger caliper trees were needed as well as multiple species. Mr. Fink stated he could not support any Entrance Corridor application with the extensive use of EIFS.

Mr. Pearson stated he did not have a problem with the use of EIFS.

Mr. Fink reminded the Commissioners this was an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness. He asked the Commissioners if this application was appropriate for the Entrance Corridor.

Mr. Pearson cited the Vision section of Sub-Area B of the Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines: Building designs that reflect community character are preferred over franchise design and corporate signature buildings. He also cited from Sub-Area C: If possible character defining architecture should be incorporated into redevelopment plans. Mr. Pearson thought that, as proposed, this application was far from either of those.

Mr. Farruggio stated if he made a motion it would be severely conditioned.

Mr. Osteen thought it would be in the applicant's best interest to defer.

Ms. Lincolns stated they needed to consider some of these concerns and come back to the Commission with some new elevations that incorporate these concerns. She stated they wanted to work with the Commission and not against them. **She asked to defer.**

I. PRELIMINARY DISCUSSIONS

1. Carver at Preston -- 701 Preston Avenue

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicants were present. The application had been deferred at the April meeting. The main issues were the pedestrian entrance and the starkness of brick and white cover over the side entrance door, stepping down the scale, articulating the mass. The building materials in general were very appropriate.

Mr. Alex Dotson, of 2025 Woodburn Road, and Mr. Floyd Sobolski, of nbj Architecture, Mr. Neil Bhatt, also of nbj Architecture of 11537-B Nuckols Road, were present. Mr. Bhatt gave a brief presentation. He stated they needed to understand what the Commission was looking for.

Ms. Lewis apologized that the matter was being taken up so late in the evening.

Mr. Lucy thought the use on this site is perfect; the City didn't need a mixed use building here. He thought the applicant was right not to intrude on the steep slope. Mr. Lucy stated some shade on the sidewalk would be good.

Mr. Farruggio thought this was a good use of this site. He thought shade trees between the curb and the sidewalk would be great. He discouraged the steps.

Mr. Osteen thought the staircase had some merit.

Ms. Lewis felt the staircase area could be a common place.

2. Holiday Inn -- 1901 Emmet Street

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The applicant, Robert Greenberg, is requesting a preliminary discussion to determine the potential requirements for an entrance corridor certificate of appropriateness to build a seven-story addition for the Holiday Inn with 30 suite units. The first two levels consist of enclosed parking and a drive-through opening to access surface parking on site. In the future the applicant will be submitting a complete EC application for approval. A pedestrian environment can be encouraged within the development. Individual building designs should complement the City's character and respect the qualities that distinguish the City's built environment. Staff recommends the applicant provide presentation materials which should include several color perspectives showing the proposed building within the context of the other buildings on the corridor; a materials board; details on the windows; details and colors of all materials -- and materials should be indicated on the elevation drawings; signage and landscaping details are needed. The site plan should indicate how pedestrians will navigate this site. Staff has concern about the proposed extensive use of EIFS. Either brick or real stucco would better complement this building and the corridor. Samples of the proposed masonry stone base materials are needed to determine if they are compatible with the building and corridor.

Mr. Bob Greenberg, of Gordon and Greenberg Architects was present with Mr. Craig Marshall, the building owner of 2605 Soapstone Drive in Reston. They had a large scale photograph of the proposal.

Mr. Farruggio wanted to know why the architect had chosen EIFS rather than brick. Mr. Greenberg stated it was hard to match the 30 year old brick and this would allow them to complement the existing building.

Mr. Fink stated he had recently matched older brick and wanted to know why the applicant did not choose Hardiplank. Mr. Greenberg explained Hardiplank did not work with the scale of the building.

Ms. Lewis stated the guidelines ask the Commission to stay way from corporate design as much as possible.

Mr. Fink cited the guidelines which the Commission must consider: Design for a Corridor Vision; Preserve History; Facilitate Pedestrian Access; Maintain Human Scale in Buildings and Spaces; Create a Sense of Place; Create an Inviting Public Realm; Mask the Utilitarian; and Respect and Enhance Charlottesville's Character.

Mr. Osteen stated he had a problem with this design. He stated it was not appropriate for the building that the new project is being attached.

Ms. Lewis stated the mass and scale is great. She suggested the applicant bring a different set of elevations as well as a Photoshop study of the building in context with other buildings.

Mr. Fink asked if there was a motion to adjourn until 12 June. Mr. Farruggio stated he would make that motion. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 11:32 p.m.