

SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY DESIGN COMMISSION ACTION

Subject: Town Operation Facility – Courtesy Review

Meeting Date: June 18, 2003

Recommendation: The Community Design Commission conducted a courtesy review and agreed to forward the below comments to the Town Council.

General Site Design

1. In case the residential property situated between the public works area and the transit complex is acquired by the Town at a future date, the design should remain flexible and permit reconfiguration of uses.
2. A concern about locating the vehicle wash center and fueling station near the Resource Conservation District was expressed by a Commission member.
3. One Commission member asked about the proposed use of the disconnect portions of Town property situated west of the railroad tracks.
4. Use of permeable pavement, in vehicle parking areas and sidewalks, was commended.

Vistas and Views

1. Since the site is located adjacent to Interstate 40 and near a major entranceway into Town, members noted that it's important that the applicant be sensitive to the view shed into the site. Loss of the pastoral landscape along this portion of the Interstate would be unfortunate.
2. The appearance of the project from the immediate surrounding neighborhood along Mill House Road was also of considerable interest. Designing a "neighbor friendly" complex will be challenging.
3. Although massive parking areas (bus parking lot) and similar bulky storage areas may be unavoidable, screening and attempts to break up outside views of such areas should be pursued.

Rural Buffer

1. Members note that an impoundment lot and material storage area, although permitted in the Rural Buffer, are not desirable land uses.
2. The Rural Buffer is an area that should be protected. Members agreed that locating the animal control facility in the Rural Buffer is not an ideal use for this portion of the site. This facility could result in increased traffic and negatively impact the adjoining neighbors to the west.

3. A member stated that no improvements should be located within the Rural Buffer and although proposed use is permitted, locating the impoundment lot and storage area in the buffer is objectionable.

Landscape Buffers, and Open Space

1. One member stated that the buffer along Interstate 40 should be protected and maintained.
2. Another Commission member stated that the landscape buffers, adjacent to the residential property south of the public work/north of transit, should be increased from the proposed 20 feet to 50 feet. It was particularly noted that the bus traffic traveling back and forth, near the southern edge of this residential property, would likely be a greater nuisance than the nearby buildings.
3. A Commission member noted that extra effort should be undertaken to preserve the significant tree area identified as potential future bus parking lot.

Architecture

1. A member noted that due to the possibility that the project may be highly visible from I-40, the architectural quality of structures should be exceptional and avoid the typically metal-type buildings usually found with this type of facility.
2. Buildings should not be unaesthetic. Architectural style should attempt to break up building mass. Building material tonal pallet should be darker tones in order to recede into the background.

Day Care

1. Though several members agreed that the proposal to locate a day care on this site was a good idea, some expressed safety concern. Safety issues noted included locating a day care close to a land use that is somewhat industrial in nature and contains fuel storage areas. One member also voiced a safety concern stating that one needs to remain mindful of governmental facilities as potential targets of sabotage.

Access and Circulation

1. Recognizing the limitations imposed by trying to accommodate multiple Town operational functions on an irregularly shape property that is encumbered with environmental and man-made barriers, it was noted by a member that the proposed development does not lend itself to good access nor opportunity for effective internal circulation patterns.
2. A Commission member encouraged a second access drive to the area identified as future bus parking area should be investigated.

Prepared by: Terry Eason, Chair, Community Design Commission
Gene Poveromo, Staff

SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY DESIGN COMMISSION CONCEPT PLAN PROPOSAL COMMENTS

Subject: Town Operations Center - Concept Plan Proposal

Meeting Date: October 22, 2003

Recommendation: That the comments of the Commission be forwarded to the applicant and the Town Council.

The Commission also agreed that the Courtesy Review Comments, from the June 16, 2003 Community Design Commission meeting, should be referred to the Council for their consideration. Reconsideration of the courtesy comments was deemed important; especially in light of the fact that a number of responses from the applicant (contained in the Concept Plan materials) to these courtesy comments included the statement "so noted."

Vote: Unanimous to forward comments by members present: George Cianciolo, Chris Culbreth, Thatcher Freund, Laura King Moore, Scott Nilsen, Charlotte Newby (Chair), Scott Radway, John Runkle, Amy Ryan.

General Site Design

1. A Commission member described the proposed design as a very efficient use of space.
2. A concern about locating the vehicle wash center and fueling station near the Resource Conservation District, originally voiced during the June 16, 2003 Courtesy Review, was repeated. Noting that in response to this concern, the applicant's materials discuss "leak detection equipment," a Commissioner hoped that the Town would be sufficiently educated and staffed to monitor and detect leaks.

Rural Buffer

3. Repeating their concern voiced during the June 16, 2003 courtesy review, a member stated that no improvements should be located within the Rural Buffer, and although the proposed use is permitted, locating an impoundment lot and storage area in the buffer is objectionable.

Landscape Buffers, and Open Space

4. Several Commission members applauded recent revisions to the plan that included the addition of several trees save and open space areas. However, others expressed dismay with a proposal to eventually expansion into these areas with future phased construction.
5. Several Commission members again voiced concerns about the landscape buffers, adjacent to the residential property south of the public work/north of transit. As originally noted during the June 16, 2003 review, several members repeated the recommendation that the buffer should be increased from the proposed 20 feet. It was particularly noted that the

bus traffic traveling back and forth, near the southern edge of this residential property, would likely be a greater nuisance than the nearby buildings.

6. Complimenting the applicant's proposal to increase plant materials within the 20 foot buffer, one Commission members however expressed a concern and noted that the additional landscape material may not minimized the impact of bus traffic near residential property. The Commissioner again repeated the previous recommendation to increase the buffer width beyond the proposed 20 foot dimension. In addition to the wider buffer they also suggested that a realignment of the driveway could decrease the impact on the residence.

ACCESS AND CIRCULATION

7. It was recommended that the proposed location for bicycle racks be relocated from the parking lots to areas of the sites adjacent to planned building entrances.

ARCHITECTURE

8. With respect to noise, it was recommended that the applicant be mindful of noise generated by Interstate 40 and within the facility. It was suggested that noise impacts to employees and neighboring residence could be mitigated through the use of various acoustical building materials.
9. Restating a comment from June 16, 2003, a Commissioner expressed a safety concern that the land use is somewhat industrial in nature. It was specifically suggested that the applicant investigate the location and appearance of the fuel storage tank near Interstate-40. The Commissioner voiced a safety concern stating that one needs to remain mindful of governmental facilities as potential targets of sabotage, especially facilities located close to interstate highways.
10. Highlighting a comment presented to the applicant during the June meeting, a member noted that due to the possibility that the project will be highly visible from I-40, the architectural quality of structures should be exceptional and avoid the typically metal-type buildings usually found with this type of facility. Buildings should not be unaesthetic. Architectural style should attempt to break up building mass. Building material tonal pallet should be darker tones in order to recede into the background.

OTHER COMMENTS

11. One Commissioner Member hoped that the applicant strived to personally contact all of immediate homeowners surrounding the site.
12. Concern was also expressed with the future ability of this site to accommodate the expanding needs of the Town's citizens beyond the current 15 year plan.

Prepared by: Charlotte Newby, Chair, Community Design Commission
Gene Poveromo, Staff