

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

June 11, 2024 – 5:30 P.M.

Hybrid Meeting

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

Beginning: 4:30 PM

Location: NDS Conference Room

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

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Missy Creasy, Jeff Werner, Matt Alfele, James Freas, Remy Trail

Chair Mitchell called the meeting to order and provided background on the EIFs question from the VERVE application. He noted that Mr. Werner and Commissioner Schwarz worked through language to clarify a condition for how to address the complete EIFs system. Chair Mitchell noted he would be okay with the condition as put together. There was general agreement. Commissioner Schwarz noted an update needed to the May 14, 2024 minutes.

In reference to the 2005 JPA site plan application, Mr. Alfele provided information on the TMD for the new code and noted the requirements under the old code. The Special Use Permit for this project required a parking plan which was reviewed and approved by the Traffic Engineer. It was noted that the language for the condition was the best we had at the time. Commissioner Schwarz asked if bike parking should be included in the parking plan. It was noted that the old code was less specific, but a recommendation will be made to include a note that will provide directional signage to the bike parking.

Mr. Werner provided updated language for the conditions for the VERVE application. There was a brief discussion about street tree requirements for this site. It was noted that the current site plan version included the requirement and final approval of the site plan would return to the Commission. Commissioner Stolzenberg asked for clarification as to the areas of the site that will be brick. Mr. Werner reviewed the materials as shown on the plans. There was concern that materials could change, and significant changes would return to the Entrance Corridor Review Board for review. Clarification was also provided concerning the screening of mechanical equipment.

II. COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING – Meeting called to order by Chairman Mitchell at 5:30 PM

Beginning: 5:30 PM

Location: City Hall Chambers

A. COMMISSIONER’S REPORT

Commissioner Stolzenberg – There was a LUPEC meeting. We received a presentation from VDOT about the upcoming smart-scale projects. There were a couple Albemarle County projects that we covered. One of the projects will be a ‘dog-bone’ or ‘peanut’ roundabout at Hillsdale and Rio. There are 2 sets of roads intersecting close to each other. Rather than one roundabout, you have 2 roundabouts connected to each other. There are some complications because some of them are private roads. VDOT can’t move private accessways. Albemarle County will be submitting that application. With MPO Tech, we approved moving toward the 2050 Long-range Transportation Plan. That process is finally wrapped up. We got an update on the 64/5th Street project, which is a similar configuration as it was earlier. It was a diverging diamond with a shared use path going up the middle

and crosswalks at lights where pedestrians can get to that shared use path. The update is that it will now connect that shared use path all the way up to where the previous smart-scale project trails hub behind the Exxon down there. There are trails that connect to Wegmans and have a stubbed-out connection at Starbucks. This connects to that rather than having a tiny gap. The other project is the Barracks Road interchange and shared use path. That will be 2 applications. The MPO will be submitting the entire extent from Emmet Street to Georgetown. The County will be submitting the part that is in the County. The interchange part is 2 roundabouts on either side of the interchange so that there is enough room underneath the underpass to fit a shared use path continuing. All the left turns on the median will be closed from the interchange to Georgetown Avenue where there will be another roundabout. The big point of contention is that, in the current proposal, there will not be a midblock crosswalk for pedestrians to cross at any point in between. There are bus stops on both sides of Barracks Road there. The hope is that VDOT will figure out a way to integrate a crosswalk there. They are concerned that if you did it as a single stage crosswalk, it would have impacts on operations in that both sides would have to stop. I also had a meeting with Mr. Lavine on the same topics. I had a conversation about in lieu payments versus on-site affordable housing.

Commissioner Schwarz – In May, I had a meeting with Jeff Lavine concerning a potential development on the Downtown Mall. He did not want to specify what parcel he was looking at but wanted to go over some of his concerns/hangups he was having with the zoning code. One of the things was he wanted to float the idea of not limiting buildings by story height but by foot height. With the BAR, we had a preliminary discussion on the UVA affordable housing project at the corner of Wertland and 10th Street. It was a preliminary look at it. There wasn't any discussion regarding materials. It is looking like it is going to be a 6-story building. A lot of the discussion had to do with how the building interacts with the streets.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – I have been watching the Virginia Housing Commission. They have started meeting to discuss new zoning regulations statewide that would affect us. They are considering 2 items that are relevant to us: faith in housing, which is an idea to allow more affordable housing on religious properties, and an accessory dwelling unit ordinance. I think both would be largely in compliance with what we have done here.

Commissioner d'Oronzio – The CDBG-HOME as presented last meeting here has been approved by City Council as submitted. The TJPDC met last Thursday. We had a session about how HOME is allocated and works. Councilor Payne has been elevated to Vice-Chair. We had an interesting conversation about hydrogen buses. Sean Tubbs did a 'deep dive' on that Champaign, Illinois trip. The HAC met on the 15th. They finished off the land bank ordinance. Two of us were designated to clean it up and finish it per the notes. It is now in staff's hands. I had a meeting with Mr. Lavine about the same thing as Commissioner Schwarz.

Commissioner Roettger – I went to the last Tree Commission meeting. I am amazed at their devotion to saving and adding trees in the community. What was interesting was that they picked out all the new pieces of code that may have changed from the old code regarding tree planting. There was more discussion on what other cities have done and what we could do to better keep trees on private land since public land is easier to regulate such as heritage trees. There was no movement or update on the trees Downtown.

B. UNIVERSITY REPORT

Commissioner Joy – I am going to update everyone on a few items that came out of last week's Board of Visitors Buildings & Grounds Committee. I will start with the Tessa & Richard Ader Center for the Arts. The B&G Committee approved the concept site design guidelines for this exciting performing arts center. The site that was approved is the easternmost parcel of the Emmet/Ivy Corridor. It has frontage along Emmet Street and sits caddy corner from the new School of Data Science. With this addition to the Emmet/Ivy Corridor, the 3 thematic goals that were laid out by President Ryan's Task Force of creating a nexus of discovery, democracy,

and the arts will be achieved through the ensemble of the School of Data Science, the Karsh School of Democracy, and the Ader Center for the Arts. The University is currently authorized by the state to complete the planning phases of the project. We are awaiting further state funding for the project to proceed into the construction related phases. The next project is the North Grounds Parking Garage. The B&G Committee reviewed the current design for the garage. We are anticipating going back for final design and approval at their September 2024 session. This will be a design-build project. We are projecting a late 2026 completion date. The design calls for 1000 parking spaces that will help address commuter and event related parking needs. With second year housing, an RFQ was published. We have received 7 letters of interest from different development teams. A review is underway of the qualifications of those teams in hopes of creating a short list that will be engaged for a request for proposal process. That will happen later this summer. I will report more as this project develops. With The Fontaine Parking Garage and Manning Institute to Biotechnology, there was some disruptive construction underway. That process is still progressing. It is on schedule. The University and UVA Health have been working together to communicate any construction related impacts to the community. They have been providing appropriate accommodations to visitors when needed. We are projecting that by the end of July, this invasive blasting phase will be complete. Some of the related parking restrictions will be fully lifted. On June 6th, there was a ribbon cutting for the Molly and Robert Hardy Football Operations Center. This is a 90,000 square foot state of the art training facility for our 115 to 125 student athletes who play on the football team. In the fall of 2025, the University will have a ribbon cutting for the Harrison Olympic Sports Center that will become the home for the Olympic sports teams that were displaced in the demolition of University Hall.

C. CHAIR'S REPORT

Chairman Mitchell – I had a meeting with Jeff Lavine as well. The topics were similar to the other commissioners. We talked about affordable housing, the bonus, or the payment in lieu. I only had one meeting. Most of my committees are not active lately. I don't think the BZA has met in at least 3 months. Parks and Recreation is always active. We met with the Adaptive Recreation Department a couple weeks ago. Their focus is on the elderly and people with challenges and disabilities. Many people that use that are people who live in Albemarle County. Albemarle County does not have any function like that. It is very busy. I sent you guys a PowerPoint that takes you through all the offerings of this group. With the Master Plan, the community engagement is done. We are now working with the stakeholders and focus groups. We are developing what will be our outline for the public hearing with Council. That should happen in the next couple of months. The dogs in the park conversation continues. I sent a PowerPoint that outlines the current ordinance/code as it relates to dogs in the park. The PowerPoint lists a few things that we can do to address some of the issues with dog waste. We are continuing to think about the need for dedicated dog parks and a revision to the dogs in the park ordinance. There will maybe be something coming before Mr. Sanders' office and Council soon. The pools are open. Staffing remains a challenge. We are working through it. With Oakwood Cemetery, water in that area remains an issue. We have had several conversations with the community about that. We have consultants on board. The consultant is an archaeologist and civil engineer. Their objective is to help us figure out how to deal with the water but also respect the remains that are in Cemetery.

D. DEPARTMENT OF NDS

Missy Creasy, NDS Deputy Director – The BZA is working towards a July meeting. We are continuing to have pre-application meetings with several people throughout the community. We are slowly getting some submissions based on the new code. A lot of work is going towards shoring up items that are under the old code. We are making a lot of progress through that. Our computer system that is newer to us than the building techs. Our building techs have been on the new system for about a year. We have some good data from that. They have been able to make some adjustments to the system to create efficiencies. On the plan review, site plan side of things, we are still in the early learning phases of the computer system. We are working quite a bit with internal staff and the public to try and sort through those things as we go. Everyone is on board with trying

to make our situation work the best that it can. We are not scheduled for a work session for this month. You have another date off. I don't know what July looks like. It might be 1 to 2 items at the most. We are not having large numbers of items at this moment.

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

No Public Comments

F. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Minutes – May 14, 2024 – Regular Meeting
2. Minutes – October 11, 2022 – Regular Meeting
3. Site Plan – 2005 Jefferson Park Avenue

Motion to Approve – Commissioner Schwarz – Second from Commissioner d’Oronzio – Motion passes 6-0.

III. PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARINGS

Beginning: 6:00 PM

Continuing: Until all public hearings are complete

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

No Public Hearings Scheduled.

IV. Commission’s Action Items

Continuing: until all public hearings and action items are completed.

Chairman Mitchell gaveled out of the Planning Commission and convened the ECRB.

1. Entrance Corridor Review – The VERVE (JPA, 100 Stadium Road, Emmet Street, Montebello Circle)

i. Staff Report

Jeff Werner, Preservation Planner – This is a continuation of a discussion you had on April 9th. You were considering the CoA request for The VERVE. It is 100 Stadium Road. At the end of that discussion on April 9th, the applicant requested a deferral. There were some questions that you had. You requested some clarifications on the finishes on the exterior walls of the building. In the interim, they have addressed those clarifications. We circulated the drawings last week that were appended to the initial application that is dated from March. The most significant change in that is that there was initially an EIFS material, a simulated brick material that was going to be used. It is now being presented as a masonry brick. I addressed that in the comments. On the drawings, BRK1 will now be a true masonry brick. There is a condition on that. The other questions primarily revolved around the EIFS, which is the simulated stucco. EIFS is a generic word for the exterior insulation and finish coat that you see on buildings. The applicant has prepared some samples and has some information. They addressed the reveal detail. There were questions about where it would be located. With the masonry predominantly at that lower level, there is no EIFS at the ground level. It is either masonry, some metal panels, or some storefronts. The concern about the ground connection or ground contact has been taken care of. The questions related to the EIFS product is a system. Many thanks to Commissioner Schwarz and Chairman Mitchell in working with me in crafting a condition that we believe addresses that question about what material is being used and how it will be applied. The applicant has offered some suggested changes to that; nothing

substantive. This is in a good spot, and they have responded to what you all had asked for. I am comfortable, given the conditions that have been recommended. I am comfortable with approving a CoA on this project.

ii. Applicant Presentation

Neil Reardon, Applicant – We wanted to come back and clarify these 2 things. Those are the switch to a clay masonry product. If you remember, this is the charcoal areas. The charcoal areas of simulated brick are now clay masonry. We were able to make that change. The project got further along, and the budget got more defined. It was the preference of our design team and the developer to do that superior material. At the time when we submitted before, we were not there yet. In some further study, we are very happy to come back to you with this product change. In terms of the aesthetic and the overall achievement of the details in that area, nothing has really changed.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – There is no more EIFS at the ground level.

Mr. Reardon – This is an important point of clarification. The charcoal color is the field that reaches the ground. The 3-color champagne colors never touch the ground plane or meet grade. That was intentional, along with the massing. That champagne zone of the 3 different versions of that color do not meet the ground. That is correct.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – In the areas where it is not brick at the ground level, none of that is EIFS. That is all metal panels.

Mr. Reardon – That is correct. There are a few areas of detail where metal panel would come down and touch the ground. It is where the brick is interrupted.

Next Slides – A1, A2, and A3

The first page here takes care of the brick component that I just mentioned.

Next Slide – A4

The question was framed 2 months ago. What does this reveal? We had, in some renderings, shown on outboard reveal as a starting point in the early renderings. We were not sure how we were going to achieve that. The preference here the last time we visited you was to articulate that detail. Perhaps an inboard reveal might be the best thing. We agreed. It is the best thing. What we are proposing here is 1-inch wide and a 1-inch-deep reveal that is inboard. That is that charcoal color you see that is the background color and material on a lot of this building. It would time out with the interruptions between the windows of that charcoal material and compliment the 3-color pattern that has been revealed. The jointing pattern has not been altered. The articulation of how exactly we are achieving that joint reveal is what we are here to summarize for you.

Next Slide – A5

On page A5, there is a zoomed-up view of that. You can see again the three panels of champagne colors. Each of those would return around the corner on that 1-inch depth. The back side of that 1-inch will be the charcoal color. We are showing this view so you can see the charcoal color on the field of its own, which happens where the building massing is modified if you remember those areas. That field itself would also have a 1-inch reveal in those zones as well. This is material such that you must have a joint every so often for control.

Next Slide – A6

This is showing that larger field, the jointing pattern, and the typical instance of this.

Next Slide – A7

Here this is pointing out that there is a vertical and horizontal 1-inch-wide and 1-inch-deep reveal. The one spot where we alter from that is at the windowsills. That reason is that needs to weep out and needs to be controlled at that base, so we are not able to do the inside inboard reveal at that location.

Next Slide – A8

A8 includes another zoomed in view here. More importantly, there is a diagrammatic reveal detail there that you could see. This would really be a plan view or a sectional view of a vertical or horizontal joint. You can see either color one, color two, or color three of each panel there and how it returns and where that color three, the charcoal happens at the inboard set location. I wanted to summarize all that.

Commissioner Joy – While we are talking about EIFS, I had a clarification with color three. You said color three is charcoal. There are 3 colors.

Mr. Reardon – There are 4 colors. There are the 3 champagne tones and the 4th color being the charcoal. Color 3 in this detail would be the charcoal. We are showing 2 panels of champagne coming together.

Commissioner Joy – With this stow color, it looks like there is a variety of textures. Can you speak about how fine the texture is? Are you going to have a pronounced texture on the panel?

Mr. Reardon – It is a textured panel. It is not completely smooth. It does have a metallic sheen to it. We are hoping to achieve that. We are having some mockups done. We hope to define the exact sheen. It is pebbleized. It is not a smooth finish like a panel would be, which we don't want it to be because we have the metal panel as an accent on the building itself. We want that to be a slightly separate sheen. It is a somewhat pebbleized metallic finish.

Commissioner Joy – If you were thinking of it as a spectrum, would you go towards the finest amount of pebbling that you could achieve with the product?

Mr. Reardon – In terms of those materials that are applied in the field like that, it would be in the medium area of pebblication or scale, so it is not rough. It is not very tiny.

Commissioner Joy – Regarding the brick, I want to thank you for going back and reassessing those areas. Last time we saw your presentation, I had concern. I went down the STOW 'rabbit hole,' and looked at the brick. Pivoting away from that is going to be a great asset to the overall look of this facility and make it a better neighbor. Thank you for doing that and for restricting the EIFS to areas above the grade. The ground level is another strong shift. The team has been remarkable. Since you went to City Council, you have shown an ability to adapt to feedback and criticism. I wanted to thank you for going back, taking feedback, and implementing it into the project.

Commissioner Roettger – I would echo those comments. I was pleased to see the brick. It is nice to see the reveal worked out. In the renderings, I like the metallic look of how the lights are hitting it. Hopefully that can be achieved. I appreciate that change. I imagine walking by, having a real brick surface next to all the people walking on JPA, will be great.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – For the windowsill extension segments, are those 1-inch wide like the reveals?

Mr. Reardon – Yes. We wanted to make the dimension consistent on those horizontal windowsill details that were a little bit outboard intentionally. From a distance, it shouldn't be perceived differently. We had considered the idea of just doing them under the windows. That leads to a lot of inconsistency on that horizontal joint. We thought bringing it all the way across is the way to go. It is just above the floor line. It is consistent

horizontally. It will look slightly different within a distance of the façade. If you are a block away, the jointing pattern will feel consistent.

Commissioner Schwarz – Regarding the sills, where we see windows stacked with a charcoal piece in between, we are not going to see a stripe through the adjacent champagne panels.

Mr. Reardon – Yes. There is not a horizontal joint at that point because the charcoal panel that is between the zones in that instance. It is changing from the charcoal field to the champagne field. In those instances, that sill detail is only at the sill of the window, which would be the top of the charcoal zones that you see in the middle.

Commissioner Schwarz – The rendering is what we are going to see as far as the joint pattern.

Mr. Reardon – That is correct. That jointing pattern has largely been unchanged the entire time since we unveiled this new design.

Commissioner Schwarz – With the concrete that has a wood look to it, what was the plan for that?

Mr. Reardon – I think you are speaking to the terrace that would be at the walkup of the retail function of the building, which is to the left of the main entrance of the building if approaching from the northwest. With that zone, we have a cascading terrace. In some renderings, we had shown some wood-look product in that area. We think that is best applied in strategic locations, probably on vertical surfaces rather than horizontal surfaces. In some renderings, we had shown it on a horizontal surface at places. If we were to do that, it would be a durable material. It is privately maintained. Because that is a semi-public space, we would probably limit the areas of that to particular zones on the terrace where we were encouraging seating out in front of it. Those would be limited to those horizontal uses of it. Vertical, for that matter, would be limited to those areas that we are intentionally planning for seating. Otherwise, the surface would be concrete.

Commissioner Schwarz – At our last meeting, you said that the detailing we are seeing at the windows might be abbreviated on the upper levels. Is that going to be the case? Is it going to be, as the rendering show with all the inset brick pattering at every level?

Mr. Reardon – You are asking about the soldier coursing that is consistent on the renderings as we go up the building.

Commissioner Schwarz – There is some soldier coursing. At the window heads, there is the brick insets.

Mr. Reardon – We are planning for that currently at those locations. We will submit refined elevations through the site plan review process when that wraps up. Those upper areas could be clarified. It is a question about the exact extent of the corbeling or the locations of its existence?

Commissioner Schwarz – It is the locations. Are we going to see the same level of detail that we are seeing in these renderings?

Mr. Reardon – A3, as submitted, would be the typical soldier course and corbeling detail for a typical floor level. It is slightly different there at odd and even floors. These 2-story volumes are our module. There is corbeling that exists at both and corbeling that exists at the odd floor where there is not a soldier course but corbeling. Our intent here is to use that detail as we rise in those charcoal sections of the building.

Commissioner Joy – With the color for the charcoal, is the intent to have a close color match with the brick masonry?

Mr. Reardon – They are complimentary of one another. Our brick color is a charcoal. It would have a different texture than that charcoal panel. It is similar. In different lights, it would appear different. The other component to the masonry is the mortar color. Our intent, with the charcoal brick masonry, would be that the mortar color would be like that and not a standard gray but a darker color. From a distance, the fields of both of those would appear somewhat similar. That is intentional to highlight the massing moves that we are making with the other tricolor champagne idea.

Commissioner Joy – Is the grey EIFS envisioned to have the metallic finish like the champagne colors? Will it have a matte finish?

Mr. Reardon – It is intended to fade into the background to the extent we can control. The metallic we would do. We would like to do less of a sheen on the charcoal.

iii. ERB Discussion and Motion

Commissioner Joy – The improvements they present today are welcome additions and move the project into a better place from its aesthetic overall look. I commend the team for taking the time to go back and reassess the palate to address the commission’s concerns that we made last time.

Commissioner Roettger – I agree. I appreciate the changes. I have always thought the massing is well done. It is a hard thing to make such a big building look smaller. I thank Commissioner Schwarz and Mr. Werner, who worked on getting more exact wording to make us feel comfortable.

Commissioner Schwarz – The brick changed everything. It is much better.

Chairman Mitchell – If I was the authority on architecture in Charlottesville, every inch of the entrance corridor would use noble materials. EIFS is an ignoble material. I worry what this building is going to look like in 25 to 30 years. It is going to age. EIFS is going to age quicker than the brick. This is significantly better than what we saw a couple months ago. I commend you on the revisions. EIFS does concern me. This is much better.

Motion – Commissioner Schwarz – **Having considered the standards set forth within the City’s Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed design for 100 Stadium Road [The Verve] is consistent with the Guidelines and compatible with this Entrance Corridor, and that the ERB approves the Certificate of Appropriateness application as submitted, with the following conditions of approval:**

1.[Exterior lighting] Lamping for exterior lighting be dimmable, have a Color Temperature not exceeding 3,000K, and have a Color Rendering Index not less than 80, preferably not less than 90. Also, to prevent bright light and glare emanating from the garage openings, lamping for the garage lighting [immediately inside the opening] will comply with the above. Additionally, the owner will address any reasonable public complaints about brightness or glare from exterior lights by either dimming the lamp or replacing the lamps/fixtures. (Note: Compliance with the lamping requirements will be determined during review of the site plan and review of the building permit application.)

2.[Screening] Any ground-level mechanical equipment and/or utility boxes will be appropriately screened. That screening will be subject to approval by design staff and must be memorialized as an amendment to the site plan.

3.[Screening] Rooftop mechanical equipment will either be screened or set/located back from the wall plane so as to not be visible from adjoining properties.

4.[Screening] Meters and panel boxes for utility, communications, and cable connections will be located preferably within the garage; if not, then in non-prominent locations on the side elevations only and

appropriately screened. That screening will be subject to approval by design staff and must be memorialized as an amendment to the site plan.

5.[Signs] Signage represented in the submittal is for context only and not subject to this CoA, unless addressed specifically by the ERB. Regardless, all regulated signage will require an approved sign permit.

6.[Plantings] Variation to the specified plant species is allowed, should changes be requested by City staff during the site plan review process.

7. [EIFS] The exterior insulation and finish system (EIFS) must be a drainable, exterior wall covering consisting of sheathing, air and moisture barrier, insulation board, reinforcing fabric, base coat, finish coat, adhesive and mechanical fasteners as applicable. While not all of the components of the wall system will be provided and/or installed by the same parties under the supervision of the general contractor, the system components must be compatible with each other and with the substrate as recommended or approved by, and the products of, a single manufacturer regularly engaged in furnishing Exterior Insulation and Finish Systems. The system shall be installed according to the manufacturer's installation instructions and standards of good practice and only in applications as recommended by the manufacturer. Any areas of EIFS adjacent to pedestrian traffic or are otherwise prone to damage due to their location shall be reinforced or a Class PM system and/or a high-impact resistant system.

8. [Clear glass] Glass at commercial/retail storefronts, primarily at Building C, shall be clear, having a VLT not less than 70%. Glass in residential doors and windows to have a VLT not less than 60%. [Note: 60% is a recommended minimum.]

9. Per the elevations on sheets 33 through 37 of the initial submittal dated March 25, 2024, and per sheets A1 through A3 of the addendum dated June 11, 2024, exterior walls labeled "BRK-01" will be constructed with true, masonry bricks and mortar; not EIFS or other simulated masonry. Second by Commissioner d'Oronzio. Motion passes 6-0.

Chairman Mitchell adjourned the ECRB and reconvened the Planning Commission.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 PM.