

**SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY DESIGN COMMISSION  
CONCEPT PLAN PROPOSAL COMMENTS**

**Subject:** Softball Complex-University of North Carolina  
Concept Plan Proposal

**Meeting Date:** February 25, 2004

**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), Dale Coker, Chris Culbreth, Thatcher Freund, Scott Nilsen, Scott Radway, John Runkle, Amy Ryan, Polly Van de Velde

General Comments

1. A majority of the Commissioners expressed support for the proposal to add two buildings. Several members stated that the plans look good and the proposal is a nice improvement to the existing softball field complex.
2. A Commission member recommended that the applicant include a gathering area or courtyard for spectators to congregate and meet during the games.
3. A Commissioner pointed out the existing erosion problem on the upper banks of the practice field.
4. One Commission member requested that the applicant consider making the use of the softball field complex open to various community groups.

Parking and Impervious Surface Area

5. Several Commission members voiced opposing opinions on the applicant's proposal to asphalt the existing gravel parking.

Some Commissioners asked if the applicant would consider maintaining the gravel parking lot instead of paving the existing gravel lot and increasing the impervious surface area. In lieu of asphalt pavement, one Commissioner suggested that the applicant investigate the use of porous pavement.

Another Commissioner stated that a gravel parking lot is just as impervious as an asphalt lot. The Commissioner also stated that gravel parking lots usually require higher maintenance than paved lots. Questioning whether porous pavement would work with the clay soils encountered in this area, the Commissioner recommended that, absent a measurable performance standard indicating that gravel lots or porous pavement improve stormwater management or water quality, the applicant should be permitted to pave the parking area.

Access and Circulation

6. One Commission member asked the applicant if the proposed parking area can adequately satisfy parking demands during events that generate larger crowds and expressed concern with the indirect vehicular access to the site, through the General Administration Office Building parking lot. In light of these issues, the Commissioner suggested that the applicant provide better pedestrian access to the facility including access from the nearby St. Thomas More Church.

Architecture

7. In addition to receiving positive feedback from several Commissioners on the proposed elevations, other Commission members provided the applicant with suggestions and recommendations on modifications to the proposed architecture.

Prepared for: George Cianciolo, Chair

Prepared by: Gene Poveromo, Principal Planner