



FINAL ARB ACTION MEMO / MINUTES

Date: May 4, 2026

Time: 1:00 PM

Meeting Room: Lane Auditorium

Members:

Chris Henningsen, Chair: Present
Frank Hancock, Vice-Chair: Present
Frank Stoner: Present
Taro Matsuno: Present
Dade Van Der Werf: Absent

Staff:

Margaret Maliszewski
Khris Taggart

CALL TO ORDER: Mr. Henningsen called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. and established a quorum.

DISCLOSURES: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

CONSENT AGENDA: None.

REGULAR REVIEW ITEMS:

a. ARB-2026-00002 City Church Final Site Plan

Location: 1010 Rio Road E

Proposal: To construct a new 10,000 sf building to house a gym, offices, and kitchen with associated site improvements.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representative: John Daly, Mather & Daly Architects; Chris Becker, City Church

Ms. Maliszewski summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members asked which view accurately represented the intended landscaping (the one on the left) and architectural design (the one on the right). John Daly of Mather & Daly Architects and Chris Becker of City

Church addressed the ARB, briefly reviewing and confirming the team’s ability to address the recommendations. Mr. Stoner asked about the materials (brick base and EIFS above) and available space for planting near the building (4’). Mr. Matsuno confirmed that the applicant was open to coordination on the planting issues. Mr. Hancock asked which color was intended for the EIFS at the first story (the tan one on the right). No members of the public wanted to speak to the application. In discussion, the ARB thanked the applicant for the updates, noted that the position of the building will help minimize the impact of its size, and said that the darker color EIFS is more contextual and will help the building recede.

Motion: Mr. Stoner moved to approve ARB-2026-00002 City Church Final Site Plan, with the conditions listed in the staff report, as follows:

1. Revise the architectural elevation drawings to identify all proposed materials and colors.
2. Add a note to the architectural elevation drawings stating that the roof color of the addition will be coordinated with the roof of the existing church.
3. Provide sheet A-101b with legible details.
4. Coordinate the site and architectural drawings regarding the length of the church canopy.
5. Add the standard mechanical equipment note to the architectural plans: “Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated.”
6. Revise the Luminaire Schedule to indicate proposed light fixture and pole colors. Dark brown, dark bronze, or black are recommended.
7. Add the standard lighting note to the site plan: “Each outdoor luminaire equipped with a lamp that emits 3,000 or more initial lumens shall be a full cutoff luminaire and shall be arranged or shielded to reflect light away from adjoining residential districts and away from adjacent roads. The spillover of lighting from luminaires onto public roads and property in residential or rural areas zoning districts shall not exceed one half footcandle.”
8. Shift new trees proposed in locations that are close to utility lines to avoid conflicts as the trees mature, without reducing quantities, including trees near the existing underground telephone line and the proposed storm pipe.
9. Add a tree and tree island in the parking row adjacent to the addition.
10. Update the site plan to show the foundation planting that is shown on the architectural renderings.
11. Revise *Myrica Cerifera* in the plant list to *Morella Cerifera*.

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0. (Van Der Werf absent)

b. SDP-2026-00033 and ARB-2026-00003 Sheetz Rio Road

Location: 1648 Rio Road E

Proposal: To construct a new Sheetz Gas Station and Convenient Store with associated site improvements.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representative: Valerie Long, Williams Mullen

Mr. Taggart summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members had no questions for staff. Valerie Long with Williams Mullen represented the applicant and explained the proposal, addressing another site layout that was considered. ARB members asked the applicant why the current layout was chosen over the original layout (technical and design issues), what the grade difference is (2' from street to finished floor), and confirmed that the proposed building is about 10' closer to the street than the Red Lobster building. No members of the public wanted to comment on the application.

In discussion, Mr. Matsuno said that bringing the building closer and making the rear façade less attractive is unfortunate and the original layout meets the competing interests better. He ranked the priorities as: 1) active façade to the street, 2) relegate parking, and 3) impact of canopies. Mr. Hancock said that the current proposal is the better option because the building has more impact when heading west and the entrance and tower are in the right place; if the entrance and tower could turn the corridor that could improve the north elevation; the fuel canopy is in the right spot; this layout provides opportunity for lots of landscaping; the building will still read that it is close to the corridor; the faux windows aren't great in concept but are more successful than the reflective windows; the key is to make them not look like a billboard; less is more; there is already a loud color palette by design; those don't have to be as loud. Mr. Stoner recognized the challenge with the site. He said the 30' setback was to activate the street. The elevation isn't going to activate the street; the faux windows don't really help; it is clear that it isn't the front of the building; landscaping isn't doing much; the original layout works better; we've come to accept canopies on the corridor. He said he understood the complexities of the waiver but encouraged the applicant to consider it. Mr. Henningsen agreed it is a tough site from an EC perspective; there is no rear to the site but there is a rear to the building; Mr. Hancock had a good point that this orientation gives opportunity for landscape screening; also agree that coming from Rt. 29 side you aren't going to see much of that; having the back face the EC defeats the purpose of the 30' maximum setback; the waiver is something to look at; if it isn't possible, do more to make the back side not look like a back side; how flexible can the interior layout be; maybe have an entrance that faces Rio.

Mr. Matsuno asked that, based on the extent of changes recommended and the many interested parties, if there is a mechanism to help provide more guidance to the applicant. Staff suggested a work session and noted that the Airport Road Sheetz benefited from that process. ARB members agreed, if the applicant is open to it. Mr. Hancock noted that he was OK with forwarding the recommendations, but he reiterated that the site layout and dumpster location as shown are appropriate.

Motion: Mr. Stoner moved to forward the recommendations outlined in the staff report for the Initial Site Plan to the Agent for the Site Review Committee, as follows:

- Regarding requirements to satisfy the design guidelines as per § 18-30.6.4c(2), (3) and (5) and recommended conditions of initial plan approval:
The ARB does not recommend approval of the Initial Plan at this time. Prior to Initial Plan approval the following items shall be resolved to the satisfaction of the ARB:
 1. Revise the overall site layout to ensure that the development presents an appropriate front to the Rio Road EC.

2. Revise the site plan to locate the dumpster in a less visible location from the EC.
- Regarding recommendations on the plan as it relates to the guidelines: None.
 - Regarding conditions to be satisfied prior to issuance of a grading permit: None.
 - Regarding the final site plan submittal:
A Certificate of Appropriateness is required prior to final site plan approval. The following items and all items on the ARB Final Site Plan Checklist must be addressed:
 1. Revise the overall site layout to ensure that the development presents an appropriate front to the Rio Road EC.
 2. Revise any back-of-building elevations visible from the EC to provide design elements that present an appropriate front to the Rio Road EC.
 3. Provide specifications on the proposed window glass. Provide samples, if tinted window glass is proposed.
 4. Revise the site plan to locate the dumpster in a less visible location from the EC.
 5. Relocate the electrical box and gas meter/riser to a location with less visibility from the EC.
 6. Revise the building design to use parapet walls to screen the proposed roof-mounted mechanical equipment. Revise the height of the towers to provide a coordinated appearance.
 7. Add the standard mechanical equipment note to the site and architectural plans: “Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated.”
 8. Provide a lighting plan with the next submittal that shows:
 - a. Lighting levels not exceeding 30 fc under the canopy and 20 fc elsewhere.
 - b. Spillover not exceeding .5 fc.
 - c. Full cut of fixtures.
 - d. Freestanding pole heights not exceeding 20’ including the base.
 - e. Wall and freestanding fixtures finishes that are either dark brown, dark bronze, or black.
 9. Provide the standard lighting note with the lighting plan: “Each outdoor luminaire equipped with a lamp that emits 3,000 or more initial lumens shall be a full cutoff luminaire and shall be arranged or shielded to reflect light away from adjoining residential districts and away from adjacent roads. The spillover of lighting from luminaires onto public roads and property in residential or rural areas zoning districts shall not exceed one-half footcandle.”
 10. If decorative lighting is proposed, revise the plan to show that it meets the Guidelines requirements.
 11. Revise the landscape plan to provide interior tree islands with large trees at the southeast and southwest corners of the building.
 12. Revise the landscape plan to increase the minimum planting height for all shrubs to 24 inches.
 13. Revise the canopy design so that the lowest edge measured from the grade to the bottom of the truss does not exceed 14’6”.
 14. Provide a lighting plan with the next submittal. The maximum footcandle value should not exceed 30 fc beneath the canopy and 20 fc anywhere else on site.
 15. Sign applications are required for all proposed signs.

16. Eliminate cabinet-style signs or limit them to secondary signs. All cabinet-type signs must have opaque backgrounds.
17. Revise the monument sign to better integrate the Sheetz cabinet sign and base.
18. Revise the site plan to include a note acknowledging that the sign location is shown only for information and will not be approved with the site plan.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0. (Van Der Werf absent)

WORK SESSION: None.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. Minutes Approval:

Motion: Mr. Henningsen moved for approval of the minutes from the April 20, 2026, ARB meeting.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0. (Van Der Werf absent)

b. Other items from staff or ARB members: None.

c. Next ARB Meeting: Monday, May 11, 2026, 1:00 PM – Lane Auditorium

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:05 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Monday, May 11, 2026, at 1:00 p.m.