



Design Review Board Meeting
May 20, 2022
Department of Community Development
ALPHARETTA CITY HALL | 2 PARK PLAZA
8:30 AM

This summary is provided as a convenience and service to the public, media and staff. It is not the intent to record proceedings verbatim. Any reproduction of this summary must include this notice. Public comments are noted as heard by Design Review Board, but not quoted or paraphrased. This document includes limited presentation by Design Review Board and invited speakers in summary form. The public is advised that the tapes recorded at said meeting are a matter of public record and are available upon request.

I. MEETING ANNOUNCEMENTS

Today's Design Review Board meeting will commence at 8:30 a.m. and a break is scheduled at 12:00 p.m. The meeting will resume at 12:30 p.m.

II. WORKSHOP

- Chairman Kramer called the meeting to order at 8:41 a.m.
- Bret Schroeder, Code Enforcement Manager, provided a brief overview of each case on the agenda for May 20, 2022.
- Chairman Kramer adjourned the workshop at 9:00 and called for a short recess.

III. CALL TO ORDER

- Chairman Kramer called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m.

IV. ROLL CALL

- Design Review Board Members present:
 - Richard Kramer, Chair
 - Pat Corkill
 - Richard Owens
 - Teresa Rhodes
 - Holly Palmer
 - Katie Rocco
 - Kim Matherly, Alternate
- Design Review Board Members absent:
 - Frank Schwing
 - Tom Lecain, Alternate
- Staff
 - Bret Schroeder, Code Enforcement Officer

- Alexandra Callum, Planning + Zoning Coordinator

V. PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

VI. ITEMS FROM STAFF

VII. ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS

A. Approval of the Design Review Board Meeting Minutes from April 22, 2022.

- ❖ Board Member Owens offered a motion to approve the meeting minutes of April 22, 2022.
 - Board Member Rhodes seconded the motion.
 - The motion was approved unanimously (7-0).

VIII. PUBLIC HEARING

A. DRB220025 / Viva Chicken / 11760 Haynes Bridge Road

- The applicant came forward to present this item.
 - Viva Chicken is a Peruvian chicken joint.
 - The signs will have halo lighting.
 - The square footage is up to code.
 - We are asking for two signs.
 - The applicant did not provide a color sample.
 - The returns are black.
 - The patio will eventually have some kind of enclosure.
- The Design Review Board discussed the following:
 - Why was the mural taken off? It's not for this board's review.
 - I think the orange looks great. It will pull the attention.
 - I like how it adds a little dimension on the monument sign.
 - I'm not opposed to the color, but the sign itself needs some interest.
 - Is this the standard brand image you developed? Yes.
 - What if you put a faux shadow behind the letters to bring life to it?

Public Comment:

- There were no public comments for this item.
 - ❖ Board Member Rocco offered a motion to approve the two building signs and monument sign as presented.
 - Board Member Corkill seconded the motion.
 - The motion was approved 6-1, with Chairman Kramer opposed.

B. DRB220021 / Bed Bath & Beyond / 6050 North Point Parkway

- The applicant came forward to present this item.
 - We are proposing a change of colors and change of some materials.
 - The material behind letters currently is a tile.
 - We are proposing to remove the tile and continue the existing EFIS.
 - We will also freshen up the letters.
 - All of it will be the same color.
 - We provided some samples of other stores with the similar concept.
 - The last tenant bricked the storefronts.
 - The water table is not being painted.
- The Design Review Board discussed the following:
 - The paint color changes are just what we can see in the pictures, right? Yes. The texture will be different.
 - I like the blue color change, but it seems like a little too much in the front.
 - The examples you showed are simpler than this one.
 - None of the other tenants have wrapped their front in a bright color like this.
 - The brick will look odd if it's not updated as well.
 - If we're changing the front, what do you do with the cornice that continues their part of the building?
 - Are you okay with it ending where it's proposed? Yes.
 - The gray color should be brought down to the brick.
 - I'd like to minimize the amount of blue we're seeing.

Public Comment:

- There were no public comments for this item.
 - ❖ Board Member Owens offered a motion to approve the application of the colors as presented, but:
 1. The blue will be taken off the cornice and off the upper portion of the columns and keep it as a rectangle between the columns and below the cornice.
 - Board Member Corkill seconded the motion.
 - During the motion, the following was discussed by the Board:
 - Are you saying a larger portion goes to blue? Correct, the full rectangle.
 - Are those separate panels? Yes.
 - Is this something the applicant would agree with? I understand your points and would have to go back to the client to discuss.
 - What happens to the paint scheme as it goes around that blue?
 - I would presume within the motion that the colors that are proposed would be

expanded to replace the blue in the cornice.

- Maybe the motion should be withdrawn , and the presenter takes that back to the applicant to discuss.
- We found a store where the blue is only behind the letters.
- The lower area that spans between the colors- that could also be one of your other colors. It needs that kind of visual support.
- We're okay with the colors, we would just like to see a different format.
- The elevation makes the words seem centered. Would you reposition the words if you wanted all the blue?

❖ Board Member Owens offered a motion to withdraw the previous motion.

- Board Member Corkill seconded the motion.

❖ Board Member Owens offered a motion to defer the item.

- Board Member Corkill seconded the motion.
- The motion was approved unanimously (7-0).

Chairman Kramer adjourned the meeting for a short recess at 9:49 a.m.

Chairman Kramer called the meeting to order at 9:55 a.m.

C. DRB220023 / Texaco / 2190 Old Milton Parkway

- The applicants came forward to present this item.
 - We are changing the Valero to a Texaco.
 - We proposed a beige canopy.
 - Aluminum Composite Material (ACM) – around the canopy and building facial.
 - All ACM comes in gloss and is a painted finish from the factory.
 - The darker grey will be the coating at the bottom of the building.
 - The brick around the monument sign will be a darker grey.
 - The building color is medium gray.
 - I don't think the car wash will go back to a car wash, but we will make it blend in with the building.
 - The gas dispensers will get replaced with new ones.
 - The dispensers will be non-illuminated.
 - We are adding additional bushes, and we conducted a tree study.
 - The monument sign will be flood illuminated.
 - The sign is on the property line.
 - It is currently set on concrete, but we are proposing a brick face.

- The Design Review Board discussed the following:
 - Is there a reason you're not going black and red? We were told by the City we couldn't do that.
 - What have we done for Shell? It's white but has minimal red.
 - Texaco wants black and red together if approved, not one or the other.
 - RaceTrac and QT both have red, and they're very close to this location.
 - I'm not opposed to black and red; it just needs to be tasteful.
 - What if the Texaco words were red? Texaco wouldn't allow that because they only have white letters.
 - The beige doesn't work.
 - What if the canopy was grey and had black with a red stripe? I'm looking for muted with accent.
 - I think the canopy needs to be all one color.
 - The stone can be brought all the way down if need be.
 - Put the canopy and the building together in one picture for the future so we can see it all at once
 - If the lighting is changing, I'd like to see what the spillover is onto the street. We can bring a sample.
 - The landscaping presented for the front is way underdone.
 - There should be a dense hedge row – maintainable height of about 3 feet.
 - The sign doesn't need to have the wood grain – it's more about the stacking of materials.
 - If you are changing the building to stone, I would like to see the sign have the same stone.

Public Comment:

- There were no public comments for this item.
 - ❖ Board Member Rocco offered a motion to defer the elevations and materials as presented today.
 - Board Member Owens seconded the motion.
 - The motion was approved unanimously (7-0).
 - ❖ Board Member Corkill offered a motion to defer the landscaping based on today's comments.
 - Board Member Palmer seconded the motion.
 - The motion was approved unanimously (7-0).

D. DRB220022 / Village Park Phase II / 11940 Alpharetta Highway

- The applicants came forward to present this item.
 - We are going to demolish the existing structure, which is the Alpharetta Business Center.
 - We're trying to make it to where the site is consistently working.
 - The elevations shown are of the east, west, and south portions of the site.
 - Taking all elements and materials from the phase 1 design. We want cohesiveness.
 - The parking deck from Highway 9 is not noticeable.

- We are tying in a pedestrian bridge that will span over the road.
- We are trying to frame up the architecture and give a nice street presence with the landscaping.
- We want to give a lot of canopy.
- Next door had sugar maples as their street trees, so we pulled that across.
- It's more heavily planted because the front is all turf, which crunches our plants.
- There is parking and a sidewalk on the east side with some trees.
- On the west side, there are some magnolias, wax myrtle, oaks.
- The Design Review Board discussed the following:
 - Will it be an open or closed deck? More than likely it will be a closed deck.
 - 45% of the building will be stone.
 - Are there any supply issues in getting the same materials? No.
 - Will there be a bakery on the south side? It's currently a space that is to be defined. We would come back for signage once it's determined.
 - The elevation is showing some awning on the top – is that still the plan? Yes. It would be a dark metal to match the windows.
 - Are you planting things that will survive the shade under the trees?
 - I would not want you to match something if you don't believe it's the right tree.
 - How big are the utility boxes? 6 x 6.
 - Everything behind the canopy, is it shade tolerant? We had to space the trees out, so I don't think we will have as much shade.
 - We can thin out the landscaping some if need be.
 - Why do you not want a lot of the landscaping? It just comes down to the survivability.
 - How much impact will DOT's work have on the south side? I don't think it will impact us much; we aren't planting until 2023.
 - Boxes are made of concrete, and they are open at the bottom.

Public Comment:

- There were no public comments for this item.
 - ❖ Board Member Palmer offered a motion to approve the elevations and materials as presented today.
 - Board Member Rocco seconded the motion.
 - The motion was approved unanimously (7-0).
 - ❖ Board Member Owens offered a motion to approve the landscaping as presented today, keeping in mind the discussions we've had.
 - Board Member Rhodes seconded the motion.
 - During the motion, the following was discussed by the Board:
 - Do we need direction on the boxes or on the tree street scape? No, but I'll send a note

to David Shostak, the City Arborist, that he needs to review that as well.

- The motion was approved unanimously (7-0).

IX. ADJOURNMENT

- Chairman Kramer adjourned the meeting at 11:43 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alexandra Callum

Alexandra Callum, Planning + Zoning Coordinator