

(13)

## SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY DESIGN COMMISSION CONCEPT PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS

- Subject:** Performance BMW/Hedrick Automotive Group - Concept Plan Review
- Meeting Date:** November 19, 2003
- Recommendation:** That the comments of the Commission be forwarded to the applicant and the Town Council.
- Vote:** Unanimous to forward comments by members present: George Cianciolo (Chair), Chris Culbreth, Laura King Moore, Scott Nilsen, Scott Radway, John Runkle, Amy Ryan, Polly Van de Velde

### DESIGN and LAND USE

1. One Commission member observed that the history of the site and the business on the site was that over time the automotive sales and service activity on this site had been successful and that with each opportunity to expand, the business had improved the building and site appearance of new activity and had improved the character of the prior buildings.

The Commissioner also noted that the proposed concept plan seemed to continue that process by better organizing the internal use of the site, reducing the amount of auto parking and car display area facing 15-501 and by providing an additional new building opportunity to provide an upgrade in architectural character along the entryway corridor.

In addition, the Commission member also expressed the opinion that the overall economic affect of maintaining and expanding this business in an appropriate business location was important and that losing this business and employer to the new auto-mall that will be built near the Southpointe shopping center would be very undesirable.

2. One Commission member, lamenting that the proposal does not preserve the existing green space around the bank building, noted that the planned design creates a sea of asphalt.
3. Some Commissioners expressed a concern with proposed scale of buildings and also stated that the proposal seems to include a lot of building.
4. In referring to the long building frontage along the Fordham Boulevard frontage, one Commission member supported rearrangement of the site. Another Commissioned noted that the new buildings layout reflected more of a suburban design (parking

between building and street) and that the applicant should consider a stronger urban layout with building closer to the street and parking on the side or in back.

5. One Commission member recognized a potential for internal vehicular conflicts near the centrally located car wash area.

#### EMPLOYEE PARKING LOT (Southwest corner Old Durham Rd/Cooper Street)

6. Two Commissioners recommended that the applicant construct a sidewalk along the east side of the employee parking lot (adjacent to Cooper Street).
7. A citizen complained about litter overflow from employee parking lot. The citizen also noted the inadequate existing buffers between the parking lot and adjacent residential development.
8. One Commission member suggested that the applicant provide for the collection and control of employee trash.

#### STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

9. A near-by property owner expressed a concern with the applicant's proposal to enlarge the employee parking lot (southwest corner Old Durham Rd/Cooper Street) onto an adjacent site (due east) that currently includes a residential structure. Specifically, the citizen described an existing problem with excessive stormwater runoff from the residential lot and that there is no control of stormwater when it leaves the property. The individual also voiced a concern about stormwater runoff washing automobile oils and gasoline from the existing employee parking lot.
10. One Commissioner wondered if the proposed expansion of the main site would incorporate state of the art stormwater management techniques such as rainwater collection systems and/or recycling of water at the car wash facility.
11. A concern was raised by a Commissioner with amount of cumulative post-construction impervious surface area (approximately 1.5 acres).

#### TRAFFIC

12. Several Commissioners expressed concern with pedestrian safety, including employees crossing the street at intersection of Old Durham/Cooper Street.
13. Another Commissioner, noting pending bike lane improvements along Old Durham Road, suggested that the applicant consider encouraging employees' use of alternate modes of transportation.

#### BUFFERS

14. One Commissioner suggested that as part of this Special Use Permit request, the applicant improve the existing minimum landscape buffers. In particular several Commission members suggested increased buffer plantings and trees along Old

15

Durham Road and improved buffers between the employee parking area and residential neighbors.

15. In response to the applicant's proposal to install a pierce brick wall, between the public street and the employee parking area, one Commissioner described this method of screening parked cars as inadequate.

#### ELEVATIONS

16. Noting that the proposed development presents the applicant with an opportunity to make a strong architectural statement, some recommendations and suggestions from the Commission included: deemphasizing building length; incorporate a variety of brick textures; and designing something more distinctive instead of blending into the existing architecture.

Prepared for: George Cianciolo, Chair

Prepared by: Gene Poveromo, Principal Planner

