

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

April 9, 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 Solla-Yates, Chairman Mitchell, Commissioner d’Oronzio, Commissioner Joy, Commissioner Roettger, Commissioner Stolzenberg

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Missy Creasy, April Wimberley

Commissioners gathered at 5pm and following motion was made:

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 related to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA);**
- 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 Planning Commission, specifically, White v. Charlottesville.**

Motion by: Commissioner d’Oronzio

Second by: Commissioner Schwarz

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

Absent: N/A

The 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 Solla-Yates

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

Absent: N/A

The Pre meeting ended at 5:30

II. COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING – Meeting called to order by Chairman Mitchell at 5:35 PM

Beginning: 5:30 PM

Location: City Hall Chambers

A. COMMISSIONER'S REPORT

Commissioner Stolzenberg – We had a LUPEC meeting in March. We had presentations from the statewide trails office, the Virginia Passenger Rail Authority, and the Department of Rail and Public Transportation. It was a general overview over what those bodies do. I also had a meeting of the MPO Technical Committee. That was dominated by a discussion of the Barracks Road project. The 2 options are roundabouts on either side of the underpass under 250 plus a roundabout at Georgetown Road or just sidewalks and limiting turns along the corridor. Since there isn't much room under the underpass, there wouldn't be room for a shared use path the whole way. It was the opinion of many members that there were still ways to make the roundabout design more pedestrian friendly, removing slip lanes, adding a mid-block crossing between Georgetown and the interchange. We conveyed that to VDOT. Following that meeting, the county specifically requested several changes, including removing the slip lanes at the roundabouts at the Rt. 250 interchange. The policy board gave approval to proceed with the pre-application for smart scale.

Commissioner Schwarz – There was nothing of significance from last month's BAR meeting. Next week, the BAR is having a preliminary discussion for a potential hotel use on the Artful Lodger site, which we had given an SUP as a residential project. It might be interesting to find out why that became a hotel versus residential.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – I spoke with Mr. Freas at the Fry Springs Neighborhood Association meeting about the new zoning.

Commissioner d'Oronzio – With the CDBG, due to the extraordinary behaviors of Congress, the money and the approval of the budget is so late that HUD can't tell us the dollar amounts. Those people, who know more, are saying that hopefully by May, which is when it is supposed to come before this body. I am moving forward with the Task Force providing recommendations based on money to be trumped by percentages if it changes the dollar amount in any significant way, except when we are complying with Council directives. HAC is continuing to meet regarding the land bank. We have had 2 extremely productive meetings regarding that. Some of that has garnered interest elsewhere and in other localities looking at us and what we might be doing. The TJPDC met. There was nothing in that meeting that would be of relevance to this body.

Commissioner Roettger – No Report

B. UNIVERSITY REPORT

Commissioner Joy – No Report

C. CHAIR'S REPORT

Chairman Mitchell – We are down one member. Commissioner Habbab resigned based on a principle that he holds very dear. I respect the principle upon which he resigned. I respect the fact that he stood by those principles in the way that he did. He has been a significant contributor to our group, especially as we developed the Comp Plan and the Zoning Ordinance. He will be missed. I am grateful for all the work that he put in with us. I am more grateful for the friendship that we developed the last couple of years. He leaves holes. One of the holes is committee assignments. There are a couple that I have not been able to figure out how to fill. The first is the Tree Commission. The Tree Commission meets every first Thursday at 5:00 PM in the Parks & Recreation Office. The other one is the Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee. That meets the third Wednesday of every other month at 7:00 PM in the Water Street Conference Room. I am looking for people to step up.

Commissioner Roettger – I am happy to fill both of those positions.

Chairman Mitchell – Let's put Commissioner Roettger on the Tree Commission and the Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee.

Parks & Recreation continue to get a lot of work done with not a lot of people. At the last meeting, we talked about a lot of things. The first thing was Jenkins Park. The precipitating event was a lot of dog waste in the park. Jenkins Park is just outside of West Haven. It is a passive park. The residents think that they are having a difficult time relaxing because the dog waste makes it uncomfortable and to some degree unsafe for the kids. The PowerPoint presentation that I sent you walks you through what we are doing to mitigate that issue. It also walks you through things that we want to do to fix up the park and make it an even nicer place for our city residents. The issue around dog waste in the parks has us thinking again. There is some thought about revisiting the ordinance as it relates to dogs and parks. We are thinking through that. As that evolves, I will get back to you guys. There is also talk about needing a couple of dog parks in the city. With the pools, we don't have enough people to cover the pools. We are worried that we may not be able to be open full-time during the coming season. The recruitment efforts are underway. The recruitment efforts are intense. We are hoping to get there. We are worried that we may not be able to have full-time staffing for the parks. We are in the middle of the Parks & Rec Master Plan engagement. Many of you might have received a survey in the mail. If you did get that survey in the mail, please fill it out and send back to us. There are going to be 3 or 4 shots in the next weeks. The first will be at Crow Rec. That is going to be on Sunday, April 21st from 3 PM to 5 PM. The next will be in Jenkins Park 3 PM to 5 PM Sunday, April 28th. The next one will be in Washington Park. That will be Saturday, May 4th 3 PM to 5 PM. The last one will be Saturday, May 11th 3 PM to 5 PM. That is going to be at Forest Hills Park. The last update relates to Oakwood Cemetery. There has been standing water in Oakwood Cemetery. It has been there for a while. There used to be a stream that ran through or around the park. The drain that we built to manage that stream is broken. We believe that we can fix it. The challenge will be fixing it without disturbing the remains that are there. We have experts coming to help us get that fixed and fixed in a way that is respectful to the remains and the families of those people that are there.

D. DEPARTMENT OF NDS

Missy Creasy, NDS Deputy Director – If there is anyone in the audience that is interested in those Parks and Recreation items that Chairman Mitchell has been referring to, I am guessing that they are on the Parks and Rec Advisory Board site. I haven't yet found them. If you are inquiring and having trouble with that, please give me a call or email. I will assist in getting to those resources.

We do not have a work session scheduled for April. We are slowly working ourselves back into that. We were meeting once or twice a week for several months. We will work ourselves back into some work session topics. We are on week 3 of meeting with applicants on pre-application meetings. We have been doing those meetings every Wednesday morning. We have had a good team of people to be able to communicate with people concerning projects. We have found some things that we need to work on to try and see if we can get projects to fruition. It has been very productive. We have talked with several people who are interested in implementing aspects of the current ordinance. We do not have anything that is coming for a hearing. People are still working through the initial phases of that. I anticipate that we will have some things in the coming months. The CDBG and HOME items will be coming forward for a public hearing. We are working with the staff to work through how best to make that advertisement happen in our questionable situation with the timing. That is normal for that funding source. They have given us some ways to be able to maintain that process.

James Freas, NDS Director – I have been appointed to the Deputy City Manager of Operations role. I will remain as interim Director of NDS until we fill that position. That position has been advertised. We should be

shortly advertising our Planning Manager position. We recently filled one of our property maintenance positions. At the next Council meeting, there will be a request for funding for a small project to put together pre-approved stormwater solutions for small scale infill development projects. This is recognizing that our projects that are between 3 and 8 units struggle to deal with the stormwater management issue under our current requirements at the city and at the state level. This is an attempt to see if we can't come up with a pre-approved approach that works out the engineering design aspect of a project so a project can come in and say that they are going to use our formula, our specs, and how it fits on the site. It is a funding request in front of Council to support that work. Commissioner Schwarz brought up the project at the Artful Lodger. That was approved under the previous zoning ordinance. They are now proposing to move forward with a different project under the new ordinance. I have met with the developer and talked about the basis for the decision. It is not about the current ordinance. It is a financial decision.

Missy Creasy has been both Planning Manager and Deputy Director of the department for several years. The idea is to recognize that is 2 roles. Ms. Creasy has done an admirable job of carrying both of those. We are going to carve those out. The Planning Manager will oversee the entire planning division and the development review process. The Planning Manager will be partnering with our partner agencies that we work with on the development review process to achieve the improvements that we are seeking to do that and expediting and resolving several issues with how we approach development review. That will be one aspect. Pursuing that project and overseeing that division is a full-time job leaving aside anything that comes with being Deputy Director.

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

No Public Comments

F. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Minutes – February 13, 2024 – Regular Meeting
2. Minutes – March 12, 2024 – Regular Meeting
3. Minutes – September 12, 2023 – Regular Meeting
4. Minutes – September 13, 2022 – Regular Meeting
5. Zoning Text Initiation – Code Conformity in cases of property acquisition

Commissioner Solla-Yates moved to approve Consent Agenda with changes to minutes – Second by Commissioner d’Oronzio – Motion passes 6-0.

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

1. **ZT24-01-01** – A proposed amendment to the text of the Charlottesville Development Code, Chapter 34, Article 5 Division 5.4.2. for a lot, building or structure established in conformity with this Development Code will not create a violation of this Code as a result of the acquisition, purchase or condemnation of a portion of it by an agency of the federal, state or local government possessing the power of eminent domain.

i. Staff Report

Mr. Freas – This item is addressing a mission from the development code. This is language that recognizes that when the city acquires property from a property owner (let’s say) as part of a street right-of-way acquisition and

because of that acquisition, that property becomes non-conforming or non-compliant with the zoning ordinance, that property owner is held harmless. This is something that was in our previous code. It needs to be carried forward. We have several street right-of-way acquisition projects in the works.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Does acquisition include acquisition for zero cost if someone was to give the city room for a sidewalk?

Mr. Freas – I think it would cover that.

ii. Public Hearing

No Public Comments

iii. Discussion and Motion

Motion – Commissioner Stolzenberg – Based on a finding that the proposed zoning text amendments will serve the public necessity, convenience, general welfare, or good zoning practice. I move to recommend approval of a zoning text amendment as proposed Division 5.4.2 (Compliance with Chapter) of the Charlottesville Development Code. Second by Commissioner d'Oroznio. Motion passes 6-0.

IV. Commission's Action Items

Chairman Mitchell gaveled the Planning Commission out and gaveled in the Entrance Corridor Review Board for The VERVE Entrance Corridor Review.

1. Entrance Corridor Review

- a. VERVE – JPA, Emmet Street, Stadium Road, Montebello Circle

Staff Report

Jeff Werner, Preservation Planner – This is an entrance corridor CoA request for 100 Stadium Road (VERVE). It is being reviewed as a PUD request that was approved by City Council. With that, the pre-February 19, 2024 ordinance prevails. This is a 3.3-acre project located within the Fontaine Avenue/JPA Entrance Corridor. You, as the Planning Commission, serve as the Entrance Corridor Review Board and are responsible for the design review of Entrance Corridor projects. The development of the site includes construction of an apartment complex. The current existing structures on the site will be razed. The project, at a street level, presents a continuous façade that I described as starting at JPA and circling counterclockwise along Emmet Street, along Stadium Road, and to the intersection with Montebello Circle. The proposed buildings range in height from 8 to 12 stories and predominantly feature at the first story an EIFS masonry panel. That is what is proposed with the upper stories being EIFS and some metal panels. We will have a continuous sidewalk around the project. It features some stepped walls, terraced public areas, entrances along the facades, a segment of commercial storefront, street trees, and landscaping. The on-site parking will be concealed within the building. There are currently 9 structures on the site that will be razed. Most of the structures were constructed between 1927 and 1961. None of the properties are designated as historic. This is a large project. Looking at the height, massing, scale, and the spacing of the buildings, this project was reviewed at least 2 times when you were looking at the PUD. City Council looked at it twice. Given that review and some of the approvals, I assumed that the heights, spacing, and the scale were appropriate. A lot of what I am talking about is more the design of the buildings themselves. One of the things that I looked at was the building lengths. These building lengths generally fall in the middle. I looked at the project as a city block. It does represent those 4 streets and a building form within it. It is not out of scale with a lot of what is in the city. There is a variation in the building materials, in the color. The wall panels are articulated both physically and materially with the changes. The

buildings do vary. There are streetscape elements that encourage pedestrian activity. The overall perception of visual impact of the height, massing, and scale will be mitigated. A big question for this evening is the EIFS, which is a synthetic stucco material. I realize the guidelines, which were written in 2011, do not recommend this. That material has significantly changed in the last several years. There are a lot of synthetic materials that we allow on buildings. You recently approved 2005 JPA, which had some EIFS. There was a specific condition that was added to the CoA. I have recommended that in the proposed conditions. The question had come up about the wall detail. I included that rendering. The panels can have a joint that is ‘proud.’ By ‘proud,’ we mean it extends above the surface. It can be in the form of a reveal. That reveal could be slender or wide. That is the 2 kinds of themes that we are talking about here. It can be flush in the sense that the reveal can be tight. It is a like a line, so the joint is seemingly flush. I will allow the architect to present the information that they have. I know that they did provide and bring some samples tonight. When you look at this project, I know that Council requested that gap as you are coming down Emmet Street. That achieved a lot visually. What is left here is where you stand on this detail of this material. If you have issues with the material overall, we can certainly explore that. I thought that those were the 2 things that, along with the recommendations that I have made, those can be EIFS. The detail question can be resolved. If the conditions I have offered make sense, I would support approval of the project.

Chairman Mitchell – On my first round with the Planning Commission, John Fink was the chairman of the Planning Commission. His counsel to us was always to insist on the use of noble materials in the entrance corridor area. One of the most ignoble materials in his opinion was EIFS. That was 10 years ago. I hear that it has evolved in a significant way. I am wondering if you can help me get comfortable with the new iteration of EIFS so we can start thinking of it as a noble material.

Mr. Werner – I am not a fan of artificial synthetic materials. I haven’t been a builder for almost 25 years. I can’t comment on that. I believe a lot of it has to do with how something is done. I could show you some masonry projects that are terrible. It comes down to the execution, a quality material, and qualified mechanics. There are materials out there that are generic. The STO product has a good reputation with how far you want to go in specifying a particular product. I am not an expert on EIFS. I certainly learned a lot working with the BAR. If it is done right and done well and it is the right product in the right location, it can perform as hoped for. I feel uncomfortable feeling like I want to convince you to use EIFS. I don’t know enough to say that you should use it versus something else.

Chairman Mitchell – What is the most recent iteration/use of EIFS in Charlottesville?

Mr. Werner – It is in a lot of places such as West Main.

Commissioner Schwarz – If the apartment buildings were done properly, those would be EIFS. The hotel was a weird non-EIFS synthetic stucco that they had to replace with EIFS. They used synthetic stucco. It wasn’t on insulation. I am not sure what they did, but they did have to replace it. It is the apartment building at Ridge and Cherry that is EIFS.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – I have a vast amount of experience with the installation of EIFS and its variations at a detailed and expansive level. What I have seen is that, with EIFS, it is about the installation and the proper monitoring of that installation. I am not sure what should we move forward with? It seems it would come with a stern admonition: “Follow all the directions.” I don’t know how else to handle that. One of the tragedies of earlier EIFS products was in the installation nobody explained how it had to be done. There are a couple buildings in town where the felt underlayment lies against the plywood. From top to bottom, you need to lap each sheet so that you are creating a path for moisture to stay on top and go down between that and the material. All sorts of buildings were built exactly the opposite. That felt was applied in the opposite fashion. Instead of

being overlapping to drive water down, it was underlapping and driving the water into the building. It starts to rot the wood and the termites show up. If it is not installed properly, you have a disaster 15 years from now.

Commissioner Schwarz – The STO products are a complete system. That is one of the things that you use the complete system, you follow their instructions. They are built in with a drainage plane that is behind the installation. The problem with EIFS is either water got in through infiltration from cracks or people didn't understand how water vapor worked. It would either come from inside the building or from the outside. It was stuck in there. That has been resolved. EIFS is a better product than stucco. Stucco is more problematic. That is my opinion.

Chairman Mitchell – The 'devil' is in the insulation details. When we start talking, we can talk about what we can do to mitigate this to make sure that the installation goes well.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – From an aesthetic perspective, are we talking about installation making it look worse or will it make the building rot inside? As an entrance corridor board member, I don't care about the building rotting.

Mr. Werner – The last house I built; the owner wanted a maintenance free house. We had to explain that there was no such thing. You are looking at aesthetics. There is an assumption that quality materials build a quality building. Something wrong can still be done. We are seeing this proliferation of artificial materials. The jury is still out over what it is going to be in 50 years. The Code Building was supposed to be brick. When they value-engineered it, it was a brick tile. You can't tell the difference. From the aesthetics perspective, if it is the STO product, we have specifications for materials. From what I understand, with this STO product, that is the line. If you are going to do it, you will need to do it right. What that building is going to look like in 20 years, I don't know. If it is built right, done right, and maintained, the owner has a built-in interest to keep that building standing and looking nice.

Applicant Presentation

Neil Reardon, Applicant – This is the view as we approach from JPA. There is a street view along JPA at the southeastern corner of the building. You can start to see the major materials; both the STO brick at the base and the STO metal panel, 3-color champagne. You have seen this before in previous presentations. This is the direct east elevation at the northeast corner of the project. You can see the keynotes there on the site plan. This is the northeast corner. You have already seen this. Zooming in to understand some of that materiality of the charcoal STO brick panel. We are looking to achieve this material by using this EIFS product. You can see these 2 major volumes and much of the base of the project. It does have that charcoal masonry material. The 2-story volume turns into a 1-story volume. With the brick base, what we are trying to convey is the depth and materiality you have already seen and approved through the PUD process. At the walkups, there are some accents of metal panel that you see in the tan color and the light fixtures. Another shot of the north side of the building showing those active uses of the walkups and that same materiality. Moving around to the commercial space, there is a question here on the materiality of the decking that we are proposing there at the landscape terrace where this outdoor gathering area would happen in front of that market. What we are proposing there is simple material decking to handle some of the verticals and possibly some of the horizontal changes in that grade change. It will be a nice dynamic piece in front and near the main entrance for people to congregate. The simple decking material will be a tan and earthy colored tone that compliments other things we are doing on the design. On the northwest corner of the building, this landscape triangle is out in the right-of-way where Stadium and Emmet bisect each other. This is the view of the main corner of the building. You can see that charcoal brick volume holding that main entry of the western building. The tricolor panel majority material in 3 modules on the north building. We have a view pulled back from the same corner. You can see the massing of the north and west buildings. We wanted to show a few more renderings. This is the drop-off zone primarily at level one. At the

main entry, there are the storefront windows. We have the relationship at the public right-of-way with bike lanes, sidewalks, and some of the retaining walls.

We have the front and side elevations. We have the masonry panel with the STO brick, the dark charcoal color. The other major material is the 3-color blend of the champagne colors. This is a metallic finish EIFS product. We do not have any concerns on the water envelope. EIFS has come a long way in the last 15 to 20 years. It is a much different product. We would never do something without a drainage plane. The thermal properties of the EIFS panel and the wall system that you get with the envelope has been significantly enhanced. While many architects were not comfortable specifying this product 20 years ago, it is now something that we are comfortable doing. It allows us to have much more variation in the façade. When we designed this, we wanted to allow for some flexibility with the jointing and the patterning we did here. A key here is having the masonry look at the dark charcoal and having the modularization and jointing pattern on the tricolored champagne be varied and dynamic on these large façades. That was intentional. These products in front of you are allowing us to carry that out.

The applicant did pass around physical samples of the materials to be used.

There is a 4th color of this metallic. That is a dark charcoal version of it. This primarily exists on the upper levels of the floor as we step back. The façade usually changes towards the top of the building. That is representational of some of the texture. What we are not able to do is get an exact sample of the color. It has the thickness of the product itself. The backing and the wall envelope would be much thicker than that. The mortar variation and that texture is improved from that. The photo representing the masonry/mortar color is more representational. It is closer to the actual brick color, which is a key for us to have in these charcoal zones. The photos you see here as supplementary to the material board are conveying the materiality and the depth of that mortar. This is a project in Nashville built by Subtext. It has, while a different masonry color represented in the red brick and a more standard mortar color, the quality there is representational of having a texture on the brick. If this was to be a stenciled brick without any variation, texture, or depth to the mortar, we wouldn't want to do that product because it is not achieving what we are looking for. The climate of cost escalation with the construction market is the spot we are at to achieve the design aesthetic we have set forth on the project.

You can see on this straight-on view the built form of that different color of masonry and a different color of mortar. That conveys what this would touch and feel like from within 10 to 20 feet at the street presence. As we go up the building, you wouldn't need this level of texture and articulation.

Chairman Mitchell – I love The Lawn. I want to make sure we protect the views from The Lawn. You did a pretty good job of 'walking me' through what this is going to look like. This suggests that I will not be able to see this from The Rotunda.

Mr. Reardon – That is correct. These exhibits were submitted in a prior submittal and various points along the project's history. I don't think we have explicitly had them up in front of this body. We are happy to go through them. That is why we included them in the packet.

Chairman Mitchell – There is a lot of concern from the community, especially the University community from people who love the institution. A lot of people are worried about this looming over The Lawn. This suggests that it will not.

Mr. Reardon – This is the view from The Rotunda. We go south in subsequent pages/slides. We tried to pick views where we thought it would be visible. We can say that it isn't visible from anywhere on The Lawn. What we did hear with the views shown in these exhibits was to pick spots where we thought it could be visible. This is the worst possible scenario for visibility. It was not viewable from there mostly due to the buildings that do

surround The Lawn and their proximity and closeness to The Lawn. Additionally, our project is down in grade significantly. That is the major reason why it is not seen from much of Grounds.

Commissioner Joy – Can you expand about the process in which you were able to do this montage? I have seen these typically done. You usually see the 3D model of the surrounding environments. It seems that the dashed lines you have identified in each of these images is shockingly close to being visible. There is not a lot of buffer. Knowing that these are crude, photo representation exhibits, how can you ensure the accuracy of what is being shown?

Mr. Reardon – You are not wrong. It is difficult to ascertain the exact specificity of an angle from a half mile away, considering vegetation on trees and the tops of buildings. We know that the buildings do hide it. We specifically chose depictions here where there were no leaves on the trees. We are not counting on that. What we can verify to an extent level of accuracy is that we know the grades exist. We know what grade our building is at and the height of our building. The viewsheds are relatively close to the treetops. The accuracy of the depiction is there to a level. I don't know what kind of level we could do more than this without significant survey work and other items.

Commissioner Joy – Was GIS used to model this? Was it an extrapolation from a 2-dimensional representation and an approximation from a photo point?

Mr. Reardon – We have a 3-dimensional model with accurate grades. On Google Earth, that is public knowledge. There also is GIS public knowledge to buffer it on what those points of elevation are. We didn't randomly pick a viewpoint and assign it a grade-point elevation that we didn't know. We did know what the grade-point elevation was.

Commissioner Schwarz – I am not sure that you gave us the specific products. When I go on STO's website, you look up architectural panel and there are different products. Have you narrowed that down?

Mr. Reardon – We haven't narrowed it down to a specific product for you. If that was to be something this body would want, we can do that. We were not under the impression that was a requirement for this presentation or your review. Specifying an exact material in many of these cases would be early to commit to something. We want to make sure that product doesn't change in price. We want to make sure that product is available when this project is built. Committing to specifying exact materials is a difficult thing to do.

Commissioner Schwarz – You list these as architectural panels. When I think of a panel, I think of something that is prefabricated and put on the building. Is that what it is? Or are you going to do it with the traditional system where you put up the EIFS and you spray everything?

Mr. Reardon – These would be field finished; not completely panelized in a factory. It is a field finish for both major materials for the tricolor champagne as well as the STO brick. At the time of the submittal, we were considering a panelized version. One of the reasons we are using this process is that there is a lot of constraints out here, which drives up the labor. That is one of the reasons other materials had that cost price point that didn't work for us.

Commissioner Schwarz – You have the 3 different champagne colors, and you are going to field finish those. Does that mean you must go around the building 3 times?

Mr. Reardon – I don't know the exact process that the contractor would use. It would be quartering off two of the three, finishing one, and subsequently doing that with the other two.

Commissioner Schwarz – That is not really our purview. I was curious how that was going to work. You are showing some deep reveals and profiles on the faux masonry. Are we going to get what we are seeing?

Mr. Reardon – There is a rendering at the northeast corner where you are referring to some brick details in prior renderings. Those renderings from last time are where we were looking to achieve some dynamic things towards the base of the building.

Commissioner Schwarz – You are carrying it all the way up on the renderings. Is that not the case anymore?

Mr. Reardon – Is there an inset or these types of brick details that were conveyed in the renderings? We would love to achieve those. I don't know they will be achievable at all locations using this product. At the base, where you see it between the 2 windows, that would be an instance where we would want to give it some depth to achieve what we have already presented to you as the exterior design.

Commissioner Schwarz – The renderings are a guide at this point.

Mr. Reardon – With a building this big, as the process goes, we are conveying an overall design aesthetic. The execution of those individual details must happen later. I do understand your question and the value that brings to the overall design. Perhaps, if none of those were executed, this doesn't 'sing' in the same way.

Commissioner Schwarz – Without the specific products, you don't have any warranty information. We don't know how long the color is going to last.

Mr. Reardon – We don't know that. I don't think anyone would know that even with a warranty for certain. From a maintenance perspective, operationally, we must have a lifespan here that is nearly equivalent to a more expensive material. I could not speak to an exact warranty date or lifespan. We are comfortable that this is not going to fail like you have seen from EIFS products from 20 years ago fail with either water infiltration or other issues. We use this product in extreme weather conditions. We are comfortable with the technical envelope of this material on a building that is rather large.

Commissioner Schwarz – This is an entrance corridor. It is not an architectural design control district. At the same time, this is going to be the tallest building in Charlottesville on a very prominent location. This is why I am nervous. What is the wood product that you are trying to use on the concrete?

Mr. Reardon – It has not yet been honed in on specifically. We would probably go with a composite deck that would be complimentary. The idea here is that the color of it and the use of it is complimentary of that major champagne color. We have not honed in on the specific texture of it or the exact color of it. We want to compliment what is happening at the lobby on the inside of the building; giving that as a thing that carries through the building. We will also have some of it in the courtyard on the interior of the building and the private side.

Commissioner Schwarz – It is like a trex-like product to laminate the concrete.

Mr. Reardon – It would not be something that would be refinished on a year-to-year basis. That level of maintenance is not what we want. We want it to be given some hard use by people using that space, residents or public accessing that market.

Commissioner Schwarz – I know that staff flagged this. What is your thinking now for the reveal?

Mr. Reardon – One of the things we showed of a zoomed in view of a rendering was an outboard joint, vertically and horizontally. We are not committed to that being an outboard. If it was inboard, that is probably more likely detailing scenario of those joints. The joints were aligned when we didn't know for certain what material we would be proposing to you in this packet. The pattern and the color summary that you get is meant to be shown to you tonight. With the outboard/inboard question on the detail and the way it is detailed, we are open to how you might see it.

Commissioner Schwarz – Currently, are you thinking it is a typical EIFS detail where you use thicker or thinner insulation?

Mr. Reardon – It will be the thickness of the material. The insulation will probably be varied at that detail. I couldn't draw that exact detail here.

Commissioner Schwarz – It sounds like it is not a metal extrusion.

Mr. Reardon – I don't believe it would be a metal extrusion in this detailing scenario. A fiber cement panel might have a metal extrusion.

Commissioner Schwarz – Do you have any lights that you are planning for the rooftops? I know you have some rooftop decks and the pool.

Mr. Reardon – The pool is in the lower courtyard. Operationally, there is nothing like that on the roof. There is one roof space. It is on the east building at the east end at JPA and Emmet. There is a small exterior roof deck at that location. That would have an exterior roof terrace. There would be some wall-pack lighting associated with that but nothing major. There is no overhead structure that exists on there right now. If we were to do that, that would be set back against the building and nonvisible. The lighting in those areas is not an airport lighting situation. It is minimal. It is creating a comfortable ambiance.

Commissioner Schwarz – Nothing is going to be spilling out onto the street from up there.

Mr. Reardon – I don't anticipate any lighting other than what has already been depicted at the storefronts.

Commissioner Schwarz – You have a transformer that is located on the plan at the corner of Emmet and JPA. It doesn't look like it shows up in the renderings. What is it? How big is it? What are the plans for screening it?

Mr. Reardon – It is shown on the site plan. If you look at the northeast part of the site, there is a transformer location there. It is near the secondary entry. There are some bike racks there. We plan to screen that with vegetation. We plan to screen that as much as possible. We don't love the location of that and why it must be there. This is a big project that requires numerous screenings. We would want to screen that. I would welcome your thoughts on how you see that best being screened out in the right-of-way. Some people like vegetation for that screening.

Commissioner Schwarz – Is there room for vegetation?

Mr. Reardon – There is room for vegetation. It is currently not on the site plan as depicted. We intend to screen that either way with something robust with vegetation or a combination of a structured fence with vegetation on it in the growing season. I don't think the guidelines had anything specific; just that it needed to be screened. Contextually, the other 2 are just different than that one. They are on the side of the building towards the right-of-way. It will be a major entry to the building for residents. Because we have been stuck with that location, we

would do an enhanced version of screening. They are 6 feet high. Whether it is a structured fence with vegetation on it or vegetation that grows 6 feet, we are open to both of those things.

Commissioner Schwarz – Six feet is what you are thinking for the typical height.

Mr. Reardon – Yes. You want your screening to be 6 feet. The piece of equipment is 4 to 5 feet. The specific piece of equipment is specified by the utility provider. We would have to make sure we have that. I don't see anywhere around the country that are more than 5.5 feet tall. We plan for our screening to cover 6 feet, especially in these front facing locations.

Commissioner Schwarz – You list mechanical louvers on your elevation materials. Where are they?

Mr. Reardon – We have several of them. The major sized louvers would be at the garage. Because of the way the garage faces, any that were on the façade would be in the lowest level of volume along JPA in the dark charcoal panel. There are walkout units there. There is a break, where there is a break or a mechanical room. If we did exhaust the garage from the sidewall, that would be the location.

Commissioner Schwarz – It would be in between some of those units.

Mr. Reardon – It would be. If there is space on the wall, what is more likely, is the garage is ventilated vertically because it is mostly buried. There would be an area well. That grate that is horizontal is coming up that way. The western half of the garage would be ventilated that way. In these zones where we don't have a walkup condition, we would locate one of those area wells and have that exhaust happen from that arrangement.

Commissioner Schwarz – For the faux masonry, what type of control joints do you need for those? How often are we going to see something that is like a break in the masonry pattern?

Mr. Reardon – It is probably going to be at around 20-foot intervals. We would locate those strategically with the window pattern. In the charcoal brick, you can see that there are not huge zones of that. There are the sidewalls that end up being about 60 or 65 feet total. Each of those would have a strategic vertical joint; 2 or 3 of them amongst that longest façade that is 60 feet.

Commissioner Schwarz – With the brick, you can wrap all your details with it so that it looks like it is solid.

Mr. Reardon – Compared to a 4-inch masonry with a cavity wall, the brick joints here are easier to deal with. They are easier, less often, and less visible.

Commissioner Schwarz – All your corner conditions are going to look like a full brick.

Mr. Reardon – That is correct. The corners look pretty good. That was a concern of ours with this STO brick panel and had to come far enough to convey actual corners, so it appears as a 4-inch brick.

Commissioner Schwarz – Each brick isn't stuck on the building. Is it sheet applied?

Mr. Reardon – It is like a sheet applied. There is a factory version of it too. With the field applied version, I am still looking for the exact specifics of how they do that. All I know is that it is field applied. I know what the end-product looks like. I don't think it is one at a time. I think that it is more efficient than that out in the field.

Commissioner Schwarz – You have located streetlights around the building. We have changed our lighting standards. Are we going to get new city streetlights that are 3000 Kelvin instead of being 4000? It would be great if we could do that. Maybe start every time we put in some new poles, and they are the right color.

Mr. Werner – I know they are changing Dominion Power lights.

Commissioner Schwarz – At one point, the Belmont Bridge lights were going to become the new city standard. I don't know if that is now the case.

Mr. Werner – I know that they were developed in the Standards and Design Manual in the past. I urged them to incorporate something relative to the color temperature.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – When you were talking about the dark brick and the patterns that you have there, you have soldier coursing on each floor. You have that thing between windows. Were you saying those might go away?

Mr. Reardon – They will be executed differently than those previous renderings. We were giving ourselves flexibility and conveying overall design aesthetic in the PUD process. That is where those images are from. Through the site plan process here, we will submit updated elevations of those areas. Our intention would be to have some level of depth in between the windows as generally outlined in those renderings. I couldn't say for sure how that is executed. With the specifics on this product, we want it to be that way. Can it be executed like the depth on the inboard of the joint detail and the champagne? Can we convey that thickness change with the efficiency of having one solid wall behind that and not altering the exterior wall?

Commissioner Stolzenberg – What about the soldier coursing? That is at the same depth. It is a change in pattern.

Mr. Reardon – It is a change in pattern. If we can convey it with depth, we would. In any instance, it would be turned, soldiered, and represented that way at the spots where we have done that. It does appear in some zoomed in renderings with that soldier course. On this elevation, you don't get into that level of depth there. Through the site plan review process, I believe we will be continually submitting elevations at each of the iterations of the site plan. That elevation can be updated as we go to clarify what we are doing.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – You note in your material selection you are using U-shaped bike racks. That is good. Your renderings have wave-shaped bike racks.

Mr. Reardon – We would be happy to change those to what is recommended. The renderings were somewhat aspirational.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Overall, I was focusing on how your streetscape is interacting with the public. You did a pretty good job overall. Where you have the private porches for these walkup units, it would be helpful for defining that private realm if you had a ledge wall.

Mr. Reardon – That is a level of detail we didn't define in these renderings. Your suggestion would be, rather than a privacy railing with a gate, more of a built wall condition.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – A gate would serve that purpose of defining the space. Here, you don't have anything. A wall would be more practical.

Mr. Reardon – We do see walkups around that have 2 walls on the 2 of the 3 sides as a level of privacy. Your comment is not security related. It is the defining of space related. These are public facing. We want to do contextually the best version of them. They change as you go around the building. The ones on Emmet are different than the ones on JPA. They are also at different heights as they go. Through the site plan review process, we did add a few things like this. You will see that come through with those drawing sets.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – Thank you for responding to the public concerns. I see a lot of changes and improvements.

Commissioner Roettger – My first thought was the reflectivity of the windows. That might have been addressed through some other forum. That is also in renderings that might need to be updated. Has that been discussed?

Mr. Reardon – We haven't gotten into the specifics of that. It is in the renderings depicted in a very reflective way. With our first pass of renderings, they were quite blue. One of the ways to make the windows not so flashy and distracting is to change that and make them grayer. The lighting changes all of this. We haven't specified exact reflectivity at this point. If there is something that is valuable to convey from this body, we would love to know that.

Mr. Werner – With glass, the number we have settled on is VLT (Visible Light Transmission) as a percentage with 100 percent being clear. Clear glass was the term we used. Anything that is 70 percent or higher is considered clear glass. That is primarily important in a commercial setting such as the Mall. We want that visibility into the street through the storefronts. There is a note in the drawings about using clear glass. That is something that I would check with the construction drawings. The question gets, as you start going up into residential space. I have never looked at the VLT of glass on residential windows. It is in your purview to request a certain level and even a certain color. A good example would be Dairy Central. That front building was reviewed by the BAR. On the east end, there is the glazed cube that has some variation. I think we went as low as 62 percent. There was some tinting of that glass allowed so it didn't end up looking like a big flash bulb. The fact that they have specified that they will be using clear glass hits the threshold for me. From a design side of things, if you have some additional views on that, it is in your purview to ask.

Mr. Reardon – At the ground plane, this is where this is important. It is perhaps less applicable to the upper levels. Even more applicable would be the common area spaces during the major entries where we do have storefront glazing. We did note the clear glazing specifically in this presentation.

Ms. Roettger – The massing is great. I know there has been a lot of work to try to break down the number of units getting put on that site. I was asking for the upper levels. I know there is a privacy thing. You don't want to let the metallic paneling be too office building.

Mr. Reardon – One of the things that often comes into play is that these are residential units. Many of these windows are bedrooms. There are shades and those shades are closed. To depict the building as never having a shade closed behind a window would not be realistic. Sometimes in night renderings, we can turn some windows with shades and some not, so you can see it both ways, especially when that is more apparent in the dusk light condition.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – What are you thinking for those walkup units? I can see it going both ways.

Mr. Reardon – Completely clear glass isn't good from a safety perspective. We are not going to frost that glass or do anything like that. That would feel non-residential. As a walkup, we want these to feel residential. The side lights there would have maneuverable shades on each of those. Sometimes, even the door does have those

in a public situation because you need that level of privacy on the inside. It speaks to the functionality and operations of those walkup units. We do a lot of those. Most of the time it is controlled on the inside by the resident with a different type of shade than would exist on a higher level of the building.

Commissioner Roettger – My only comment on the materials is that it looks better on paper and the renderings than the sample.

Mr. Reardon – The grout color matters in this. I think it matters in all masonry. I trend towards mortar color being close or complimentary to the actual clay or other masonry product. In this case, it is far better depicted. Our sample maker couldn't get the grout nearly dark enough or have some variation in that grout so that it looks real. Hopefully in the images conveyed on the screen and the digital version of the material sample board, it does come across that way.

Commissioner Roettger – On the bike lane, what is going on in terms of the JPA bike lane versus this bike lane coming into the sidewalk? It looks fine.

Mr. Reardon – The framework is off-street bike facilities. We are taking the curb coming out with it. That bike lane where it is mostly striped becomes a raised curb. What we wanted to do in most cases, best practice, is locate the tree and green zone between there in the sidewalk for a point of delineation for different users. That is generally the framework. It does swing in and out. One of the places it swings in and join on the east side on JPA would be the spot where the new bus facility would be placed. Right now, there is just a bus sign there. We understand, through the transit agency, that needs to be enhanced. That is one instance where we swing it to make sure that the bike lane comes behind that transit facility. There are a couple other instances where we have curb cuts. One came in the first round of site plan review. It was along Stadium on the west side. It made more sense to combine them. It was a better usage of space if they did combine and stayed consistently that way as to not weave in and out too much. We still do the tree planting canopy. We do it deeper off the curb. The big picture goal is to have these facilities for each user and have good solid boulevard trees in the right-of-way.

Commissioner Roettger – In terms of the prow, is that still the prow versus the flush reveal? Is that still up in the air? I like, on the rendering, that there is a nice shadow line.

Mr. Reardon – We are open to it being outboard or inboard. It creates a shadow line either way. I don't know which one is better. It will come down to the best way to detail each of those joints. What we wanted to convey here is the overall color texture and the varying 3 colors and what those look like in the general jointing pattern. We are not overly committed to an outboard or inboard joint detail. It might be dictated by the contractor working with us to detail the building.

Commissioner Roettger – I would hope that it remains at least what is shown here in terms of the shadow line.

Mr. Reardon – That is the best version of the exterior façade.

Commissioner Joy – What is Wolf-Ackerman's role in this project?

Mr. Reardon – We have a design team, which includes Wolf-Ackerman. Fred Wolf has been consulting as our local architect on the project. We also have Timmons as our civil engineer. They have been active on the project for the entirety of it. Our landscape architect is AJC, a design firm from Atlanta.

Commissioner Joy – Can you confirm the bed count?

Mr. Reardon – It was specified in the PUD. There was a maximum range given in the PUD. It was 550 DUs (Dwelling Units) and around 1200 beds.

Commissioner Joy – On page 55, there is a dusk rendering of the VERVE signage. It appears to be nonilluminated in the dusk rendering. I wanted to confirm whether the intent was to have it be nonilluminated.

Mr. Reardon – It is not lit in this rendition. The signage is noted here as a thing to be defined later in terms of its size and illumination. I couldn't tell you for sure if we were going to illuminate that right now. It is over the major entry. I think there will be a sign in that vicinity. There is a process here to articulate that.

Commissioner Schwarz – It is above the 2nd floor windowsills. In our old code, it wasn't allowed. I think that sign can't be there.

Mr. Reardon – With your dictation of height on the 2nd floor storefront window, there would not be space for that sign.

Commissioner Schwarz – The regulation is that it must be below the sill of the 2nd floor windows.

Mr. Reardon – We will take that back and apportion signage.

Mr. Werner – It is in the staff report that any signage must meet the ordinance. It is a separate permit. Entrance corridor signage can be illuminated. You all have purview over this. If there is something related to the illuminating, you certainly could address the lighting relative to signs if you wanted to put something in the conditions. I don't want to close the door on it if there is a concern about lighting.

Mr. Reardon – If there is anything you want us to take as a note here tonight, we will comply with the signage ordinance. This rendering does not depict compliance with that. We will make that alteration.

Commissioner Joy – We talked about the EIFS, which is a disappointing development from a durability standpoint. In looking at STO's recommendations on maintenance, it seems like inspection and regular repair is not uncommon. What roofing infrastructure is being proposed to maintain these significant facades? Will those pieces of infrastructure be visible that currently aren't shown in these renderings? How would one go about servicing this façade?

Mr. Reardon – There is going to be a DABID system. Window cleaning is more often than any of this. There would be roof anchors on the top. That is how these buildings are serviced. There is a roof anchor. There is a structure that is hung off the side of the building from that for window washing.

Commissioner Joy – It is a portable system so it will collapse. It won't be visible.

Mr. Reardon – That would be the same way any maintenance issues with the envelope of the building would be dealt with if they came up or if there was a resurfacing of the exterior materials. It likely would be done that way as well.

Commissioner Joy – This is my third month of being a non-voting member of the Commission. I represent a significant neighbor to this project. I am aware of your other neighbors, the residential neighbors in this area. Looking for guiding principles on this process, I know there is the 2011 guidelines, which have been brought up for the entrance corridor. "The intent of these guidelines and the review processes is to ensure quality of development compatible with the city's historic, architectural, and cultural resources." Given that this is a 'stone's throw' from a unique site, The Lawn, which is a UNESCO World Heritage Site. They define that as

“the world heritage is the designation for places on Earth that are outstanding universal value to humanity. As such, have been inscribed on World Heritage List to be protected for future generations to appreciate and enjoy.” Looking at Chapter 1 of the checklist that went through that and was reviewed by the city, there was the last item in the chapter. Respect and enhance Charlottesville’s character. The response from the development team was that the building design is of a contemporary nature and does not attempt to be an imitator of a traditional architectural style. It is a unique design that is not lifted from external vernacular sources. The idea is that it is not lifted from external vernacular sources. My understanding is an architecture concerned with domestic and functional rather than public or monumental buildings. I scrolled through the body of work that is The VERVE. I think of this adjacency to a UNESCO World Heritage Site and the 2011 entrance corridor design guidelines with the intent of trying to acknowledge Charlottesville as a unique place, a place that we, as residents, are proud of, a place that has housing issues, which are significant. I have a hard time connecting the dots of meeting the intent of the design guidelines and have seen the context of The VERVE buildings across the country. I am at a loss to figure out how this building represents the intent that this community set forth in previous years, which may or may not change in the future and acknowledge the significance of the adjacency to The Lawn and UVA, which is the only higher education UNESCO World Heritage Site on this continent. It is more of a question for the commissioners and as a community. We have a new zoning ordinance. I know we need housing. Density is good. You have a good site plan. The amenities at the street level are great. With the scale, you have 1200 people. I understand the economics are challenging with the building materials and in this market. I wonder about the concept of stewardship. We, as this Commission, are reviewing projects that more likely will impact future generations than the current lived experience. As an architect at UVA, I am no stranger to reviews and oversight and attempts to try to address the complexity of construction and cost. It is not an easy task. This is a great site with its proximity. This affords a great opportunity. Subtext’s commitment to the idea of bigger projects that are more proximate are preferable over doing smaller, scattered sprawling periphery projects. With it comes this challenge.

Mr. Reardon – This is challenging work. There are a lot of buildings. There is a lot of square footage that is built. I try to do it well. These are fabric buildings. We try to do them well. We don’t have the budget to execute good brick details all the way through a project. It does not exist in most cases. We try to do it where possible and find the opportunities to do it. Doing the work well is hitting the sweet spot of what you can do, what is in budget, and making sure, at the foremost, that all the things related to the exterior and right-of-way are being done as well as possible.

Mr. Werner – The ERB Guidelines are on my list of things that need to be updated. Your question is a good one. It is why I included the images of buildings around Charlottesville. We are going from seeing monumental scale buildings occasionally. We are going to see them more regularly. What is it that we are trying to emulate? I don’t know how to answer the question architecturally. Ultimately, it comes down to that subjective of liking this or not. I don’t know how to answer that question. Where I am stuck is that this is the 6th time with the elevations. I went back and looked at the prior submittals that went to the Planning Commission and City Council. It hasn’t changed significantly except for that opening as you come down Emmet Street. We looked at this. I must assume some level of acceptance from the parties that have been reviewing it. When I start to look at it, I am not sure what my canvas is. That is some of the difficulty of an entrance corridor project versus something we review with the BAR. The one thing that is still lingering out there is the idea of these reveal lines. They do present a transition of colors and whether that transition in there was due to shadow or shade. Does the width of that matter? I am not sure how to answer that. If there is something you would prefer to see stylistically architecturally, I would like for you to express it. That is the biggest detail tonight. I want to make sure we get that right.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – There are 8 conditions recommended in the packet from staff. Do you have concerns on those issues?

Mr. Reardon – Of the 8 conditions, we don't have major concerns over any of them. The last 2 are pertaining to EIFS. It sounds like there needs to be some level of specificity with those. I would withhold complete agreement on all 8 conditions. The last condition says that clarification is needed. The condition above that the EIFS product will be a STO product as specified. It notes a durable synthetic material, which is mechanically fastened over appropriate drainage. We already got into that. We do not have a problem with that one. If there are modifications to any of these, we would want to re-comment on that. No major concerns with those other conditions.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – Condition 8 is part of the site plan process.

Mr. Werner – That was a placeholder. The second one up is identical condition from 2005 JPA. If you wanted to insert something, I put that in there as pneumonic device.

ECRB Discussion and Motion

Commissioner Schwarz – When this first came to us, you won us over with some beautiful renderings. I remember the discussion the last time we saw you. It was about a metal panel building in masonry, which has become all EIFS. The renderings still say metal panel building with masonry. They show some very clear protruded joint details that look like metal extrusions. You have mentioned that with the faux brick that you are going to try to keep the details at the lower levels but get rid of them at the upper levels. We don't know what this joint detail is going to be. Because this is a 12-story building and because materials are important, going back to our guidelines, "choose materials that offer texture and avoid monotonous surfaces." You are trying to get rid of the monotonous surface. I get that. You are doing that with a lot of color. "Use a variation of materials, textures, patterns, colors, and details," with details being the key word "to break down the mass and scale the building." "Use massing reduction techniques of articulated base, water table, string courses, cornices, material changes, patterns, and fenestrations to reduce the apparent height of a large building." There is a whole page on details in our guidelines. Architectural details are important tools to create human scale and architectural character. Techniques include highlighting foundations, lentils, sills, and cornices with contrasting materials and breaking up the mass of the building with bands at floor levels, projections at entries, use articulated elements such as cornices, bell courses, water tables, beta visions, variations in wall plan and roof features to create designs of interest. As much as I don't like our guidelines for the ERB, there is a lot about details. You need to show us what details you want to use. I like your renderings. When you tell me that these are just a guideline, we are going to simplify them, and they are not going to be this, I don't have enough anymore to go on to approve this. You are moving in a good direction as far as the building is concerned. I would like you to figure out what you want to do with the skin of the building and tell us so that we can approve it or not. Your renderings show a lot of richness. When you tell me that you are going to take the details off the masonry, that does worry me because this is going to be the biggest and tallest building in Charlottesville. We have messed up a couple times with big buildings. The Standard on West Main looked fine on paper. The construction of it was terrible. The way it was finished was terrible. You are telling us that you are going to figure out as you go this 100 percent EIFS building. I am worried about the many ways it could go wrong. Looking on STO's website, I was feeling Ok about this brick. That sample scares me. You are going to have to convince me that is going to do all the detailing that you say it will. I am not sure if you have another project that you have done that you have used this material that has all the ins and outs with the brick. EIFS can't touch the ground. What are you going to do when the brick comes near the ground? How are you going to disguise the fact that it is floating right there? I would like to see some details to understand it. I would suggest that you ask for a deferral unless everybody else wants to approve it. You need to find a way to screen that utility box. With the rooftop lights, no lights greater than 1600 lumens where the light source is visible from beyond the property line. Any building mounted light should be shielded and directed to only light the surface of the building and not shine out from the building. This is something we ran into with some of the buildings on West Main Street. You are showing shielded lights on your façade, which is great. With some of the buildings on West Main, we

had to go through and get the developer to reduce the brightness of those lights because they were creating some serious glare issues to people on the streets. Any appreciable loss of canopy trees from the depictions presented in this application, regardless of cause, should require review by the ERB. I am saying that because things happen during the site plan process. Make sure you have that figured out before you promise us that this building is going to be ringed with street trees. Tonight, I am not prepared to approve this without some more detail on what you want to do with the building skin and to beg you to find something else other than the fake brick or do something to convince me that it is going to do what you think it is going to do.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I don't disagree with Commissioner Schwarz on the fact that these renderings appear to be something different from the cladding that we have been presented tonight. My view of a CoA is that what matters to me and ultimately to most of the ERB guidelines is how that building interfaces with the public realm. While the cladding is not nothing, it is a small piece of that. They have done a good job of building a streetscape here. I think they have done a good job of design in the public realm. While these aren't the cladding decisions I would have made, the guidelines tell me about my preferences for how buildings should be clad and appear are wrong. That building in Nashville looked pretty good. The guidelines would call that a cheap imitation of the Jeffersonian architectural style and say that it is neither appropriate nor desirable. Reading that in the guidelines, the guidelines are asking for buildings that are modern and different. Do I want buildings that are modern and different? Not really. Do I think it complies with the guidelines? I would have to vote to approve a CoA.

Commissioner d'Oronzio – I would 'mirror' a couple of Commissioner Stolzenberg's view on that. I would put it in a more sweeping way. Acknowledging the grittiness level of some of Commissioner Schwarz's concerns there and my own dubious relationship with EIFS that has come from a dreadful experience, I would be inclined to grant the CoA provided we had that solid consensus.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – I taught design at UVA. I don't feel qualified to talk about this. I like the rendering. It makes sense. There is a lot of good in it. I hear Commissioner Schwarz's concerns. I trust them. I don't know the best way procedurally to address those concerns. I am interested in thoughts from staff on that. To Commissioner Joy's concern about how to find a reasonable balance, which is the right question to be asking, I am leaning somewhat on the Comprehensive Plan. On page 24, goal 7-Entrance Corridors, 'ensure that the quality of development in Charlottesville's designated entrance corridor overlay districts is compatible with the city's requirements and standards and with the adjacent neighborhoods' historic, architectural, and cultural resources, while allowing for reuse of structures and evolution of uses in these areas.' To me, it is about finding the right balance. It is going to be hard. Broadly, I support the vision here. I see its merit. I am concerned about the details. I am interested in how we can resolve those details.

Commissioner Roettger – I am not sure on the procedures and options that we have available to us. On the architectural side, there are the mockups. Those are things we are doing where you get to see the materials. That is so far down the road that it doesn't come to the Planning Commission. I do like that the public realm has been worked out well. It is in a valley. It is hard to make those ground levels feel important enough. Because of the topography, it feels like it is squashed. That corner is nice. My question is about the material. We need housing for students. It is hard to push the massing and density in there. I drove over there. JPA has 2 ends to it. One end does have stores and more commercial space. The other end is a dead end into UVA, which becomes very historic and protected property. All the activity in the market seems like a very nice balance. The students who live there are usually flowing the other way. It hopefully gives them retail. It would benefit those coming to the UVA side. I support it. I don't know what we can do about the evolution of what happens with the material. We need to have these more approximate student housing to help us with our affordability issues.

Commissioner Joy – The PUD has been approved. My concern is the general massing, density, and the nature of the development. I feel that we are closer to this development discourse than average. I would have a hard

time imparting after seeing the presentation and why this is best for this prominent site in Charlottesville and for the students of UVA. I would have a hard time explaining other than it is expensive to build here. I think there is an opportunity for ingenuity and stewardship. That is what I was touching on. It is hard for me to catch the thread of what would make the VERVE at this site the best rendition of what it could be, even with the limitations. With the limitations come design opportunity. You get more to the core of what would make a place great. I concur with everybody here. It is hard to look at that board. I understand the challenge you are in. It is a design issue. I would be hard to advocate in future years.

Chairman Mitchell – The PUD has been approved. Something is going to get built here. I agree with everything that Commissioner Schwarz said. There needs to be more detail, more specificity. If I had to vote today, I would vote not to approve the CoA.

Chairman Mitchell conducted a straw poll on approving or denying the CoA. The straw poll was 3-3.

Chairman Mitchell – If it is deferred, they would have the opportunity to address a lot of the detailed concerns that Commissioner Schwarz raised. We can vote to approve or deny. They can opt to come back to us next month.

Ms. Creasy – They can choose to defer. The ERB applications don't have the same time frames that others do. You could vote for the deferral. They could come back with the same material. It would probably make sense to have some conversation on that with the applicant.

Mr. Reardon – We hadn't planned for that scenario. We do have time through the site plan review process.

Dylan Lambur, Applicant – I would say we are open to deferring. I would assume that means next month. We would be happy to defer and come back with more details for you guys.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Would you prefer next month?

Mr. Werner – You requesting a deferral puts 'the ball in your court.' The challenge is that you would have to get some back to us. If the applicant requests a deferral, it becomes their decision when to bring it back.

Ms. Creasy – We would let them know the time frames of when we would need materials back. Once those materials are received by Mr. Werner, we work with them to get to an agenda that makes sense.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Can I understand what you guys are looking for out of a deferral? Are you looking for renderings with EIFS?

Commissioner Roettger – If we could select 1 or 2 renderings and look at the shadow line joints, how the metallic might look. I don't know if there is an opportunity to do some brick around the immediate entrance. If there is a way to take a rendering and show a corner, we can focus on taking some photos of those more in detail.

Commissioner Schwarz – I want to see a full-height view. If you are going to be reducing the details on the brick, I want to know what you are planning on reducing it down to and understanding what this is going to look like. It still looks like dark metal strips for all these reveals and understanding what that is going to look like if it is just EIFS as a depression or if it is a protrusion. Is that going to be painted a different color?

Mr. Reardon – I understand what you are looking for in a future version of this meeting with a deferral. I will summarize in 2 pieces: 1. anywhere where we have an older rendering and where that can be updated and what

we are proposing in detail is depicted. 2. Some additional information on how those things you brought up tonight and we spoke on how those are detailed out. You are not asking for specified materials currently but a level of detail with the areas of emphasis from. It is updated graphic illustrations on the things talked about and additional content on details.

Commissioner Schwarz – A section showing the brick. You don't have to show us what is behind the wall.

Mr. Reardon – A key here is the details around materiality depth for the major materials. You are not asking us to detail every canopy overhang but the major repeating instances of the major materials. We would highlight the areas of emphasis and not overwork the other areas as to reach a timeline for proper staff review. When it comes back to the schedule, whether this is deferred to next month's meeting or thereafter, it would have to work in the timeline that staff have outlined.

Commissioner Joy – It was a great point about having a record that could be referred to. With regards to the EIFS, the guidelines explicitly says that the entrance corridor does not recommend EIFS, and we are going to sit there and put a stamp on a building that is top to bottom EIFS at a highly sensitive site. Is there something in this packet that would be helpful to show something that EIFS from 2011 to 2024 is different? How would we save face with our neighbors?

Commissioner Schwarz – Staff had started this with his proposed condition, talking about having the drainage plane and being a STO product. We can probably elaborate that out possibly. Maybe you can elaborate on it however much you want to hold yourselves to certain detail standards with the drainage plane, the complete system. Somehow, we need to come up with some language to go with a condition that says why this EIFS is appropriate.

Mr. Reardon – Ideally, we would depict some details here, even a sectional detail that could allow you to provide that language that you were talking about. That would be at the meeting next month or the following month.

Applicant requests a deferral of CoA Application – Commissioner Stolzenberg – I move to accept the applicant's request to defer the Entrance Corridor Certificate of Appropriateness application for 100 Stadium Road [The Verve]. – Second by Commissioner Schwarz. Motion passes 6-0.

Commissioner Solla-Yates noted communication from the city forester on actions that the Planning Commission can do with canopy issues.

Chairman Mitchell gavelled the ECRB out of order and gavelled the Planning Commission back to order.

Commissioner Joy brought up the idea of an addendum to the ERB guidelines. There was further discussion amongst the Planning Commission on the ERB guidelines. Staff did bring up that there needs to be review and updates to the ERB Guidelines, ADC Guidelines, and the Historic Conservation District Guidelines. Staff also reminded the Commission that the city is still at the beginning of the new code.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:12 PM.