



# Town of Vienna

## Meeting Minutes Board of Architectural Review

127 Center Street South  
Vienna, Virginia 22180  
p: 703.255.6341  
TTY 7111

Thursday, February 21, 2019

8:00 PM

COUNCIL CHAMBERS-VIENNA TOWN  
HALL

### 1. Roll Call

The Board of Architectural Review met in regular session in the Vienna Town Hall, 127 Center Street, South Vienna, Virginia, with Paul Layer presiding as Chair. The following members were present: Roy Baldwin, Laine Hyde, Michael Cheskla, and Patty Hanley. Staff members Kelly O'Brien, Principle Planner, Andrea West, Planner, and Sharmaine Abaied, Board Clerk were present.

Mr. Layer opened the meeting stating there were signup sheets for the two agenda items that the public wished to speak on.

#### ROLL CALL:

Ms. Abaied called roll with Roy Baldwin, Laine Hyde, Paul Layer, Michael Cheskla, and Patty Hanley being present.

### 2. Approval of Minutes

#### MEETING MINUTES:

Mr. Cheskla made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from January 2019

Ms. Hyde seconded the motion.

Motion: Cheskla

Second: Hyde

Approved: 5-0

### 3. Regular Business

#### 235 Maple Ave E - Keiko Charcoal Chicken - Sign

Request for approval of a new wall sign for Keiko Charcoal Chicken located at 235 Maple Ave E, (Docket No. 04-19-BAR), in the C-2 General Commercial zoning district; filed by Ruth Van Landingham, Service Neon Signs Inc., sign agent.

Ms. Ruth Van Landingham was present to represent the application.

Mr. Baldwin asked what would happen to the existing sign, Ms. Van Landingham stated it was already taken down and the landlord had already repainted the façade. Mr. Baldwin asked if the owner chose the colors. Ms. Van Landingham stated that they were, but also the landlord would not allow the logo due to the fact that it is not a nationally recognized logo. Mr. Baldwin stated his concern about the yellow used in the sign.

Ms. Van Landingham spoke on the changes in signs at the shopping center. When new tenants come in the cabinet sign comes down and channel letter sign goes up. The

landlord is only allowing four colors at the shopping center and signs of the same color cannot be next to each other.

Ms. Hyde asked if the landlord had considered applying for a master sign plan. Ms. Van Landingham stated the landlord will keep track of the signage. Ms. Hyde stated that Ms. Van Landingham could talk with the landlord in regards to the benefits of a master sign plan. There was continued discussion regarding the benefits of a master sign plan.

Ms. Hanley asked if there were black return for all the letters, Ms. Van Landingham stated yes. Ms. Hanley then asked what kelvins and lumens the sign would be illuminated at specifically the upper sign. Ms. Van Landingham stated they were white LED's. Ms. Hanley asked staff if they had the kelvin and lumen levels. Ms. West stated the keiko portion of the sign would be 100 lumens and the charcoal chicken would be 80 lumens, but the kelvins had not been stated on the application. Ms. Hanley inquired about recommending a maximum kelvin level rather than just white. Ms. Van Landingham stated that if there is a specific level that they could make the sign that level. Mr. Layer stated that in terms of kelvin it should be 3000k or below and the lumen level is more significant. He then asked staff the lumen level. Ms. West stated a portion of the sign would be 100 and another portion would be 80. Mr. Layer asked how it compared to others and Ms. West stated it was about similar to others. There was continued discussion regarding the kelvin and lumen levels.

Mr. Layer discussed signs in centers and that the board likes to avoid too many colors as it could become cacophonous. Mr. Layer then asked what the four colors would be that the landlord is allowing at the center. Ms. Van Landingham stated it would be blue, red, golden, and green. Mr. Layer stated the approval for this sign could set a precedent and asked Ms. Van Landingham to take the information back to the landlord that the board will want to see signs that are compatible with neighbors and itself in regards to the number of colors. Ms. Van Landingham stated she would do that as well as advise the landlord to send in a letter stating the number of colors and colors he would allow.

Ms. Hanley made a motion that the request for approval of a new wall sign for Keiko Charcoal Chicken located at 235 Maple Ave E, Docket No. 04-19-BAR, be approved with the stipulation that the kelvins be restricted to 3000k or below.

**Motion:** Hanley

**Second:** Hyde

**Approved:** 5-0

132 Branch Rd SE - Zenola Restaurant - Sign

**Request for approval of a new wall sign for Zenola Restaurant located at 132 Branch Rd SE, (Docket No. 08-19-BAR), in the C-2 General Commercial zoning district; filed by Jessica Sutherland, Talley Sign Company, sign agent.**

Ms. Noha Zeitoun and Samer Zeitoun were present to represent the application.

Ms. Hanley asked about the thickness of the letters. Ms. Zeitoun stated they were five inches in depth and they were aluminum. Ms. Hanley then inquired about the width. Ms. Zeitoun stated they were two feet illuminated channel letters. Ms. Hanley asked how wide the top of the Z would be and Mr. Zeitoun stated it would be about four to five inches. Ms. Hanley stated her concern about it being too thin.

Mr. Cheselka asked about the black trim cap. Ms. Zeitoun stated the tins the letters sit in are black making the outline black.

Mr. Baldwin asked about the colors as well as the sign only saying Zenola. Ms. Zeitoun stated they felt it looked cleaner just saying Zenola. There was discussion regarding the meaning of the name of the sign and the color.

Ms. Hyde made a motion that the request for approval of a new wall sign for Zenola Restaurant located at 132 Branch Rd SE, Docket No. 08-19-BAR, be approved as submitted.

**Motion:** Hyde

**Second:** Balwin

**Approved:** 5-0

121 Maple Ave W - Jolie Hair Studio 2 - Exterior Modification and Signs

Request for approval of an exterior modification (paint), new wall sign, window signage and a freestanding sign (tenant replacement) for Jolie Hair Studio 2, LLC located at 121 Maple Ave W, (Docket No. 07-19-BAR), in the C-1A Special Commercial zoning district; filed by Amy Phillippe, business owner.

Ms. Amy Phillippe was present to represent the application.

Ms. Hanley and Mr. Baldwin inquired about the window signs and Ms. Phillippe stated they were not part of the application. Ms. West stated they were included in the staff report and the sign calculations. Mr. Layer asked if Ms. Phillippe would like them considered and she stated yes.

Mr. Baldwin asked where the dark gray and light gray would be. Ms. Phillippe showed on the rendering where the colors would be. Mr. Baldwin asked about white lines on the rendering which were concluded to be errors in the rendering. Mr. Baldwin asked Ms. Phillippe to point out which greens were being used for the signs. Ms. West clarified the colors being used and stated that staff had not been provided samples for all the colors. Mr. Baldwin stated he felt the darker green went better with the gray. Mr. Baldwin asked about the green on the window. Ms. Phillippe stated it would be a light lime green. Mr. Baldwin asked for a sample, but the applicant did not have one. Mr. Layer stated there was a color on the freestanding sign and a sample was provided. He asked Ms. Phillippe if the hair on the vinyl sign to match the freestanding sign and Ms. Phillippe stated she could do that.

Mr. Cheselka encouraged the applicant to use a concrete stain or better quality paint rather than Behr paint as Behr will not last as long. Mr. Layer also stated Behr would not be the best quality paint. Ms. Phillippe stated the landlord would be choosing the paint. Mr. Layer asked if she could pass that recommendation along to the landlord.

Ms. Hanley asked if the entire building would be painted or just the front face. Ms. Phillippe stated it would be the entire building. Ms. Hanley asked about the arches above the three windows. Ms. West stated there is a slight recessed arch above the two windows and the center door as well as a metal/plexi-plastic awning that did not show in the rendering. They are in the concrete, not painted on, showing the change in depth of the façade. Ms. Hanley asked about the planters as she felt they freshened up the space and Ms. Phillippe stated they were gone. Ms. Phillippe asked if she would need approval in the future if she wanted to put something there. Ms. West stated staff would need to review for clearance purposes as well as if it would need to go before the Board.

Mr. Baldwin made a motion that request for approval of an exterior modification (paint),

**new wall sign, window signage and a freestanding sign (tenant replacement) for Jolie Hair Studio 2, LLC located at 121 Maple Ave W, Docket No. 07-19-BAR, be approved with the proviso that the green on the window sign be the same as the freestanding sign, the entire building be painted gray with no white lines, and the recommendation for paint be passed along to the landlord.**

**Motion:** Baldwin

**Second:** Hanley

**Approved:** 5-0

#### 362 Maple Ave E - Starbucks - Exterior Modification (Revision)

**Request for approval of an exterior modification (revision) for Starbucks located at 362 Maple Ave E, (Docket No. 16-18-BAR), in the C-1A Special Commercial zoning district; filed by Scott Sanfilippo of Curry Architects, agent for Starbucks.**

**Ms. Claudia Humphries was present to represent the application.**

**Mr. Layer** asked if the portion raised would be “D” on sheet seven and more of “B” would show. **Ms. Humphries** stated that was correct on that side of the building, on the rear of the building, and the same, corresponding portion, on the parking lot side of the building.

**Ms. Hanley** asked about the revised patio picture in the application and wanted to make sure the bollards were there for safety. **Ms. Humphries** stated that the revised patio in the application increases the safety factor of the patio. They are purposing, in the application, a new landscaping space as a buffer between the patio, and parking area as screening of the elevated patio space and to have the proper sloping and drainage away from the patio.

**Mr. Baldwin** asked that the **Ms. Humphries** point out the where the building is on the diagram. **Ms. Humphries** pointed out the building and entrance. **Mr. Baldwin** also inquired about the bollards.

**Ms. Humphries** stated the manufacturer for the wood cladding that was proposed notified Curry Architects that they do not have enough material for the installation so they provided a sample of an alternate. There will not be as drastic a read in the graining and the stain would be much lighter. **Ms. Hanley** asked if the rest would be the same. **Ms. Humphries** stated the metal, and masonry stain would stay the same.

**Mr. Baldwin** asked if there would still be a contrast. **Ms. Humphries** stated there would be and the masonry stain would be a little darker which would show the contrast.

**Mr. Layer** asked if the variation would be more consistent and **Ms. Humphries** stated yes and that was why the manufacturer had given the two samples.

**Mr. Cheselka** made a motion that the request for approval of an exterior modification (revision) for Starbucks located at 362 Maple Ave E, Docket No. 16-18-BAR, be approved as submitted.

**Motion:** Cheselka

**Second:** Hyde

**Approved:** 5-0

#### 465 Maple Ave W - Wawa Convenience Store - Exterior Modification and Signs

**Request for approval of an exterior modification for Wawa Convenience Store located at**

465 Maple Ave W, (Docket No. 09-19-BAR), in the C-1 Local Commercial zoning district; filed by Robert D. Brant, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh P.C., agent for Wawa.

Mr. Bob Brandt was present with Liz Lawrence, and Nick Georges to represent the application. Mr. Brandt stated the only item that was new from the work sessions was the landscape design plan and detailed lighting. Mr. Brandt also pointed out the directional signage that was added on page 20 showing a few options and specified the preferred sign choice. Screening along the rear property side was mentioned. The design team at Bohler had identified some additional screening, two rows of staggered evergreen shrubs between three and four feet in height, that could be available for the rear property line that was outside the scope of the landscape plan.

Ms. Hanley asked if there would be illumination on the directional sign, Ms. Lawrence stated yes. Ms. Hanley then asked if the sign would be parallel with Nutley Street. Ms. Lawrence stated it would be perpendicular to Nutley Street. Ms. Hanley then asked if it would be faced on both sides of the sign and Ms. Lawrence said that was correct. Ms. Hanley asked for the lumen and kelvin levels of the directional sign. Ms. Lawrence said all of the lighting was 3000 to 3500 kelvins and that she would need to get the lumen output on that specific sign as she didn't have it with her, but could provide it. Ms. Lawrence asked for the maximum allowable, Ms. Hanley stated her preference was 3000 as the directional sign was not her primary sign and 80-100 for the max lumen output. There was continued discussion regarding the directional sign. Ms. Hanley inquired about the lighting plan and dots that appeared to represent can lights that are every two feet around the building. Ms. Lawrence stated it was a grid matrix that was put together and the can lights are not that close in nature. Mr. Layer asked for the legend or index that indicated the dots were lights. Ms. Lawrence stated it was a grid matrix so they were providing the amount of cans that would provide that and if there was need for a more detailed layout it could be provided. Mr. Layer asked for clarification on the spacing of the actual lights. Mr. Layer mentioned that the lowest light level recommended, by lighting engineers, for the activity is what is preferred. Ms. Hanley stated 20 is shown at primary entrances and the plan shows it lighting the entire perimeter of the building which is concerning. Ms. Lawrence stated they could provide clarification as well as offer the ability to dim lights. Ms. Hanley then asked about the illumination at the electric car charging stations. Ms. Lawrence stated there was a lighted ring around the cord and depending on the unit the T will also be illuminated. Tesla puts together their package and they can provide what is put together for that specific location as additional information. Mr. Layer asked if the fixtures around the perimeter were pointing down and shielded appropriately, Ms. Lawrence stated that was correct. Ms. Hanley asked if the existing pole would be used, Ms. Lawrence stated only one would be used and the lighting plan showed the proposed locations of the new poles. Ms. Hanley asked how tall they were and Ms. Lawrence stated ten feet. Mr. Layer stated that in the motion it should be noted that the section on the lights be carved out until clarification is received. There was continued discussion regarding the lighting plan and levels.

Ms. Hanley inquired about the trash enclosure and the materials used. Ms. Lawrence stated it would mimic the building with the bottom having the brick veneer, painting the brickwork above, and have an EFIS band similar to the signage panel. The doors would match the bollards. Ms. Hanley asked if the proportion of the banding was accurate in the rendering and Ms. Lawrence stated yes. Ms. Hanley asked if they could provide the Board with the species for the additional plantings that would be between the building and the residences, Mr. Brandt stated yes. Mr. Georges stated they would propose a couple types of evergreen shrubs along the back, in two rows about three to four feet in height, adjacent to the parking lot area. Behind the dumpster enclosure, there would be a leather leaf viburnum, which would be taller to help screen the wall, and with the dark tone, it should

blend in with the walls. Ms. Hanley asked if the pest control people would have access to the alley to maintain traps. Mr. Brandt stated it is public access so they would be able to do so. Ms. Hanley asked if the doors opened to 123 and Ms. Lawrence stated yes.

Mr. Cheskla asked why there was linear lighting around the entirety of the tower and if it was necessary. Mr. Brandt stated the purpose was to emphasize the tower feature of the building. Ms. Lawrence stated the intention was to accentuate that architectural piece and as it faces away from the road, it would be a way to draw attention to the site. Mr. Layer stated if it is an enhancement then has some continuity in terms of design, but when it rings around it just becomes a border. During the work session it was stated that if it was just along the front washing down the front of Wawa that would clear as an architectural enhancement versus a border. There was continued discussion regarding what would be appropriate as an architectural enhancement for the tower feature.

Ms. Hyde asked that they walk them around the building with the proposed landscaping plan. Mr. Georges explained the landscape plan to the Board including the types of plantings, the heights of the plantings, and the species.

Mr. Baldwin inquired about the space on page nine, and asked if it was space between the curbs, and if it would be kept. Mr. Brandt stated yes because it was inter-parcel access. Mr. Baldwin commented on the need of the lighted directional sign. Mr. Baldwin stated he would vote against it because he felt the building's design was not right for Vienna.

Mr. Layer stated his appreciation for taking all their comments for the work sessions into consideration.

#### Audience Comments:

**Aldis & Ingrid Lusis, 446 Windover Ave NW:** Mr. Lusis stated they have lived there for twenty-five years and appreciated their neighbor, Coldwell Banker. He continued that he was perplexed as to why there was no provision for a barrier per town code 18-172 specifying that certain residential and commercial areas there is a required six-foot brick fence, not needing maintenance, will not come down, but will provide a barrier. Ms. Lusis asked if there was a waiver for that wall as well as the concern for lighting and its impact on their back yard. Mr. Layer stated the Board is concerned in regards to lighting as well and the Board works to limit light spilling offsite. Ms. West stated when the site was developed in 1974 a determination was made that a wall was not required due to the alley right of way and the current site plan is not altered enough to cause a requirement to upgrade to the wall. Ms. Lusis asked if there was a way to petition the wall. Mr. Layer stated the landscaping would be intensified. Mr. Brandt stated it would be up to three or four feet. Mr. Layer asked the applicant if they would be amenable to additional screening. Mr. Brandt stated they could work on it. Ms. Lusis asked if that property received a special exception as other commercial buildings and restaurants do have the barrier wall. Ms. West stated it was not a special exception, but a determination made in 1974. Mr. Layer asked to get through all the questions as no determination had been made yet and that the Board are all residents who care about the neighbors.

**Chris Hogan, 226 Glen Ave SW:** Mr. Hogan thanked the Board for the wall they were getting behind 380 Maple Ave W and stated the wall was helpful. He also stated he understands the concern for the look of the wall, but he felt it was critical concerning the sound. The Wawa will be busy with many cars and people and felt shrubbery does not stop noise. He continued stating he hoped Wawa would be a good neighbor by proffering the wall so the neighbors are not bothered and that it matches all the other properties on the street.

**Shelley Ebert, 402 Roland St SW:** Ms. Ebert stated she was there to offer support of the neighbors regarding the wall. Ms. Ebert stated she hoped to come to the meeting earlier to speak with staff, but was unable to do so. She stated the slat fence, with a space between each slat, and was three inches shorter than was she was sitting. She stated she benefits from a wall on the south side. She also commented on the vehicle lights going into Wawa and the streetlights dimming at 10:00 could that mean they would be open 24 hours. Ms. Ebert stated staff did explain the determination made in 1974, but wasn't sure how she could help the neighbors as she felt bad for them. She also stated that although it's not the Boards fault they may be upset with them. Ms. Ebert closed stating the only solution would be that Wawa give the residents the wall.

**John Pott, 134 Wade Hampton Dr. SW:** Mr. Pott stated his sympathies with the neighbors' concerns regarding noise. Mr. Pott stated the building was going from quiet office operation to a noisy shopping/fast food operation. Mr. Pott then stated Wawa takes pride in being a good neighbor and serving the neighborhood. Good neighbors work with good boundaries and for this situation, a good boundary is a wall. Mr. Pott stated he supported the neighbors in their request for a wall.

**Liz Difrancisco, 434 Knoll St NW:** Ms. Difrancisco stated she would like light proffering, some sort of wall. She stated her back yard backs to the Green Hedges School and the streetlight in the back of their parking lot shines and illuminates their back yard whenever it is dark out. The new light going in will shine directly into the Lusis property. The Green Hedges light it is about 300 feet from her backdoor, but the new Wawa light is around 75 feet from the Lusis's backdoor leaving their rooms illuminated all night. The noise from the dumpsters at night will be heard as well as the cars and teenagers coming through at two in the morning. Sound or light remediation that can be offered to help the family will be wonderful. Mr. Layer asked if the light at Green Hedges had a shield, Ms. Difrancisco stated it did not. Mr. Layer stated the Wawa lights are shielded and directional. He continued that the residents who live there should speak with staff so they can see the lights, as they are not open lights. Mr. Layer stated lights would be shielded, and directed down.

Mr. Layer asked if anyone else wanted to speak. There was no more audience comment so he asked the applicant for clarification on the lights. Ms. Lawrence stated the lights were directional. The lights for the parking area are a small unit that projects light down to the ground to avoid light pollution. The signage would be illuminated with red plexi-glass in front to provide a muted light. The parking light area will also be a 3000-kelvin, similar to an incandescent light bulb, giving that warm feeling. Mr. Layer asked if the hood swiveled and Ms. Lawrence stated it should be able to swivel a little projecting the light down. Mr. Layer pointed out to the audience the light that they were speaking about.

Mr. Layer spoke on the barrier and that the Board does not have the authority to ask and applicant to install something not required by code. The Board can urge the applicant to do what they can to be a good neighbor. He continued suggesting that the applicant do what they could to work out something that would satisfy and address the concerns of the adjacent properties. They would then have residents who would welcome Wawa to the community. Mr. Brandt stated that when they learned of the concerns of the neighbors he contact Mr. Georges at Bohler to look at opportunities to screen that area and they came up with the landscape option. He had also asked Mr. Georges about a wall and putting up the wall would negatively affect the existing vegetation. It would be necessary to take down or effect the mature trees if they put a wall up at that location which is why they went with the landscape screening option. They will continue to look at additional options, as they do want to be a good neighbor. Mr. Baldwin discussed some options for the barrier and Mr.

Layer stated they could leave it up to the applicant as the application needs to be looked at in reference to what is the charge of the BAR. Mr. Layer continued stating that if they did decide to build a wall there would be root disturbance, which would have a deleterious effect on trees.

Mr. Hyde made a motion that the request for approval of an exterior modification for Wawa Convenience Store located at 465 Maple Ave W, Docket No. 09-19-BAR, be approved with the proviso that additional evergreens be placed along the rear property line, applicant give consideration to other methods up to, and including a barrier along the rear property line. The way finding sign be the wood version and logo, and the applicant provide to staff the spacing of the pole, under canopy, and pictures as well as the details of charging stations, their lights, and colors, including lumen and kelvin levels. The lighting around the tower architectural feature is limited to the front elevation of the door.

**Motion:** Hyde

**Second:** Cheskela

**Approved:** 4-1

**Nay:** Baldwin

100-112 Maple Ave E - Sunrise Assisted Living - Maple Avenue Commercial (MAC)

Ms. Hanley's concern for the removable panel. Ms. Hanley stated that she appreciated that the doors for the storage were recessed back and were out of the walkway. Ms. Hanley commented on the loading dock with the mountable curb entrance. She asked if it was for the whole thing or just one wheel, Mr. Rust stated that had been revised. Ms. Hanley continued discussion on the importance of the revision in association with public works. Mr. Hanley asked to take a look at the pocket park in reference to future meetings with Planning Commission and Town Council. She felt renderings of what the pocket park would feel like would be important to be able to grasp what it would look like walking through the park. She asked if the fence went all the way down and Mr. Fleming stated yes. He continued stating the current fence was old and deteriorated and needed to be replaced. Ms. Hanley stated they would want the pocket park to be an inviting space and not just a corridor that had landscaping trimming the edges. Mr. Rust stated they would want it to look good too, but they also have to keep the access for the easement. Ms. Hanley asked that with the landscape, fence, and wall line if there was a feature that could be brought in to break things up or add tiers. She continued with inquiring about public art or panels. Ms. O'Brien stated that anything in that area would need to be able to be moved out for any trucks that need to come in and the landscaping shown is the extent of what can be done. Ms. Hanley continued discussing possible public art panels in efforts to break up the long wall.

Mr. Layer asked what fencing material would be used. Mr. Fleming stated it was shown as a wood fence. Mr. Layer recommended that a composite material be used rather than wood. He continued mentioning board on board gray fences at various parks in town that when planted against make a good backdrop. Mr. Layer asked that they make the composite a consideration as the wood fences can deteriorate rapidly.

Ms. Hanley asked that they go back to page two in reference to the bus stops asking that it be more identifiable. Ms. O'Brien stated that staff has spoken with Fairfax County stating that bus stop was one of their timed bus stops. She continued stating she would be meeting with the transportation planner Monday (February 25) on site. Their preference is as the shelter is now with the wind break. They will also discuss the proposed moving of the bus stop 80 feet north, closer to Vienna Inn. Ms. Hanley asked if the landscaping could fill in

between the planters with the bus stop more to discourage jay walking and make people feel safer.

Mr. Layer asked what the reason was for all the planters on Center, but not on Maple Ave. Mr. Fleming asked they would like more greenspace on Maple as it is on Center and Mr. Layer stated yes, or something similar as it's a buffer between the street and the building.

Ms. Hanley inquired as to the future pedestrian parcel access. Mr. Fleming stated they would add a gate in the corner for future access, but currently they have no easements for access. Ms. Hanley asked if there was a design for the gate and Mr. Fleming stated not at that time. There was some discussion regarding the benefits of the access.

Mr. Cheskla and Mr. Baldwin had not comments. Ms. Hyde thanked the applicants for the several productive work sessions in which there were improvements every time. Mr. Layer spoke on the pocket park and the attention that needs to be paid to landscaping in that narrow strip. The side nearest to the building will be dark, but the side nearest to the fence will get sunlight. Mr. Layer asked if there had been consideration put towards a living wall matrix to survive the narrow band on the fence side or the building side making it a green corridor. Mr. Layer also wanted to bring attention to his earlier comment regarding the vegetation in the front (Maple Ave). There can be breaks in the vegetation so people can get through. He wanted to make sure there was space on Maple Ave in consideration to the beloved Halloween parade and other parades giving space for spectators. The planters could be pulled back from the edge. Mr. Layer asked if the town had given guidance as to the size of planters. Ms. O'Brien stated the arborist was working with them in regards to the plantings, but had not been specific on the size of the planters. The arborist had asked if some of the existing trees could be kept. Mr. Layer asked if they were the trees in the planters that exist and Ms. O'Brien said yes. Mr. Layer asked if the planter could be move to give a foot and half for spectators get in front of them to watch the parades. There was continued discussion regarding space given for parade spectators and vegetation. Mr. Layer complimented the applicants on the pedestrian scaled building. Mr. Layer asked what the material of the gate facing Center next to the park would be made from. Mr. Rust stated it would be made from steel. Mr. Fleming stated page seven has examples of the proposed gate. Mr. Layer thanked the applicants for their presentation.

#### Audience Comments:

Estelle Belisle, 200 Ceret Ct SW: Ms. Belisle thanked the applicants for reaching out to the community. She asked if the front setback was twenty feet and Ms. O'Brien stated yes. Ms. Belisle asked if the awning was six feet and Ms. O'Brien said yes. Ms. Belisle said that under the MAC the awning is not to encroach into the required setback by more than three feet and asked if a modification had been requested. Ms. O'Brien stated they were working with the applicant in reference to that. Ms. Belisle continued with issue regarding the three primary entrances into the three retail bays since the MAC code states that each entry shall be clearly defined. Ms. Belisle stated that with a continuing canopy there cannot be clearly defined entrances. Mr. Layer stated the elevation shows the Sunrise sign as one primary entry, then it goes to retail space for the other portion with retail entries, and the double doors would be the primary entry. Mr. Layer asked if that was what she was referencing. Ms. Belisle stated she thought there was a wrap-around canopy, but the new rendering does separating the entrances. Mr. Layer asked if she was seeing it as differentiated now and Ms. Belisle stated yes. Mr. Layer pointed out how the entrances were differentiated. Ms. Belisle asked what the second feature was for the primary entrance as she saw that the window walls of uninterrupted glass at 15x15 was one, but what was the second feature. She asked if it could be looked at as she thought it

was under the purview of the Board. Ms. Belisle stated she appreciated the green in the previous agenda item (Wawa). Ms. Belisle stated developers are being given the opportunity to do four stories and that with many projects there is little green. She stated that incentives could be given to increase the impervious space. Ms. Belisle felt like Vienna is losing the green space it's known for especially with the single family homes.

**John Pott, 134 Wade Hampton Dr SW:** Mr. Pott asked if lies behind the skin, was it all concrete or wood and concrete. Mr. Layer asked if they could pin that question and have the applicant answer after everyone had spoken.

**Shelley Ebert, 402 Roland St SW:** Ms. Ebert stated she was there to speak on the bus stop as she felt that design was in line with being pedestrian friendly and encouraging bus usage. She stated she felt buses would go past the stop as shrubbery would grow. She also felt it could be used as a bench instead of a bus stop. Ms. Ebert felt the existing bus stops conveyed the idea of the town similar to the trash cans and lamp posts. Ms. Ebert stated she feared that this MAC proposal is just the first in losing the identity of the town through the bus shelters. She continued her concern wondering if there was advanced that put into what constitutes as a bus shelter as well as aesthetic qualifications to what a bus shelter is and if that isn't there then things may be progressing too fast. Ms. Ebert inquired about staff speaking with Fairfax County so it may be a moot point and they may go back to the original shelter.

Mr. Layer asked the applicants to come back up to explain the structure of the building. Mr. Rust stated the whole building was concrete and it was post tension flat plate.

Mr. Layer stated he wanted to reiterate that the fence along the pocket park be a composite board on board instead of a wood fence. He also, strongly recommended a green matrix along the sides of the pocket park. Another recommendation was moving the planters back at least one to one and one half feet so a person could stand in front of the planter which could also be beneficial to people going to the bus. Mr. Layer asked that the vegetation be increased to the highest level that makes sense.

Mr. Baldwin asked staff, based on audience comment, if it was possible for Fairfax Connector to require it to be done a different way. Ms. O'Brien showed the existing conditions for the current shelter and stated that they do prefer that it be a wind break shelter, to shelter from wind and rain. She stated the ideal situation would be to use the existing bus shelter. Mr. Baldwin asked what the chances were that Fairfax requires a different shelter. Ms. O'Brien stated they wouldn't dictate what the Town's shelter look like, they just state their preference of shelter type, but that they are more concerned with location. Mr. Layer stated that in terms of maintenance it becomes not the issue of the town and he stated his preference for bus shelters.

Ms. Hanley commented on the existing condition plans with the utility poles all over the place with and without easements. She wanted to make sure things were thought of globally when it's done and for staff to be able to look at it.

Mr. Cheselka made a motion for the recommendation to Town Council regarding compliance with requirements of Article 13.1 of the Town Code for the proposed Sunrise Assisted Living mixed-use building, as part of Maple Avenue Commercial (MAC) Zone application, located at 100, 102 and 112 Maple Avenue, W, (Docket No. PF-59-18-MAC), be approved with the following recommendations: composite material is used for the fence that runs along the pocket park, consideration for a plant matrix on both sides as a foundation or backdrop to the plantings, increased vegetation on Maple Ave extending

planters right and left parallel to the road, step back the planters one foot six from the curb line.

Laine Hyde seconded the motion.

**Motion:** Cheselka

**Second:** Hyde

**Approved:** 5-0

#### **4. Meeting Adjournment**

**Mr. Cheselka made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Baldwin seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 10:34 PM.**

Respectfully submitted by,

**Sharmaine Abaied**  
**Board Clerk**

*THE TOWN OF VIENNA IS COMMITTED TO FULL COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT STANDARDS. TRANSLATION SERVICES, ASSISTANCE OR ACCOMMODATION REQUESTS FROM PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES ARE TO BE REQUESTED NOT LESS THAN 3 WORKING DAYS BEFORE THE DAY OF THE EVENT. PLEASE CALL (703) 255-6304, OR 711 VIRGINIA RELAY SERVICE FOR THE HEARING IMPAIRED.*