


SDP-23-07 – 302 S Main / Learning Center Day Care – 3rd Submittal review cycle

START DATE: <b>MARCH 2024</b>	DUE DATE: <b>_04-08-24_</b>	TRC/STAFF Comments issued on: <b>_04/07/2024_</b>
-------------------------------	-----------------------------	---

Review Group / Staff	Comments	Cleared Comments
Planning & Zoning – Planning Staff & WithersRavenel	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>PAY the V3 (Resubmittal) INVOICE emailed to Applicant on 03-03-2024.</b></li> <li>2. <i>Continue to Provide a Written response to all the comments; mark-ups to mark-ups is OK.</i></li> <li>3. <i>Continue to Add revision dates to all documents (original + each resubmittal).</i></li> <li>4. <b>REPEAT</b> -- Based on other TRC reviewer comments, a plat to create certain Easements is necessary – TBD as whether that plat is required to be recorded and referenced on this SDP plan set, or if it can occur later on during or after development (coinciding with As-built plan submittal).</li> <li>5. In order to utilize LDO 3.2.1. setback reductions of the General Commercial zoning district, the applicant needs to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of this section. Sheet C2.3 has been provided to show compliance We offer the following:                         <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. A meeting was held with the Town and the applicant on 2024-02-19. The applicant agreed to move the building closer to Main Street to take advantage of the building setback reduction and provide a larger active use area to the side of the building so as to increase the frontage dedicated to a building or an active use area.</li> <li>b. The applicant has moved the building closer to the road (Main Street) and is Proposing a 7' Building setback adjacent Main Street. The reduction is subject to the applicant providing the following:                                 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. 3.2.1.C.1. Buildings and community gathering spaces define no less than two-thirds of street frontage; <i>While the plans have been revised to show a greater frontage occupied by community gathering space, it does not appear the required frontage is provided. There is approximately 37' between the building frontage and the community gathering space. Suggest installation of a knee wall which is typically seen as an alternative to providing building frontage in areas with reduced setbacks.</i></li> <li>ii. 3.2.1.C.2. Vehicular surface areas are limited to no more than one-third of property frontage; <i>It appears the plans are in compliance with this requirement.</i></li> <li>iii. 3.2.1.C.3. A minimum ten-foot wide sidewalk or multi-use trail is provided along Main Street. <i>The plans comply with this requirement.</i></li> <li>iv. 3.2.1.C.4. Enhanced landscaping, visible from the public right-of-way, that exceeds LDO standards by at least twenty-five (25) percent. <i>The applicant should correct the landscape calculations, although it appears sufficient buffer trees have been provided. Please refer to landscaping comments.</i></li> <li>v. 3.2.1.C.6. Art installations visible from the public right-of-way. <i>The applicant should revise the plans to indicate the location of the proposed art installation and provide details in the plan set.</i></li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> <li>6. A Type 3, 25' buffer is required along the rear property line adjacent to the RL property to the west of the site. It appears this buffer has been reduced to 7'. The required number of plants needed for the buffer in addition to the area needed for the wall/fence is insufficient.</li> </ol>	

SDP-23-07 – 302 S Main / Learning Center Day Care – 3rd Submittal review cycle

	<p><i>The applicant has requested a variance from the rear buffer requirements. The plans should be revised to reflect case number VAR24-01. Please include status and materials pertaining to the variance application.</i></p> <p>7. Provide a cross-access easement for the shared driveways with the drive-in located to the southwest of the subject property. Recording information shall be provided on the plans.</p> <p>8. <u>Site Plan</u> - <b>Repeat Comment:</b> LDO Section 5.1.3.F, areas dedicated for drop off and pick up must be included for any site plan or permit request for a day care. The applicant has indicated that vehicles must be parked and children escorted into the building. Therefore, those spaces dedicated for pick up and drop off (as opposed to visitor or employee parking) should be clearly marked with signage and proposed signage shall be included on the plans. <i>Applicant has noted that this item is pending approval from client. Provide update.</i></p> <p>9. <u>Site Plan</u> - <b>Revised Comment:</b> Revise the legend and the site design to reflect the three different fence types and their locations. Further, add all details of all proposed fencing. <i>Aluminum rail fence and white vinyl fence details provided. Please revise the details or rename legend to indicate all 3 fence types and their associated details. The proposed art installation details shall also be provided.</i></p> <p>10. <u>Landscape Plan</u> – LDO 6.2.2.2.D.2 - The Landscape requirements for Streetyard buffers are incorrectly calculate. Revise to reflect the calculations as shown on the plans.</p> <p>11. <u>Landscape Plan</u> – Revise plans to show the proposed ground covers on the site, including mulched areas, sodded or grassed area, including the playground materials and landscape beds. For purposes of determining the longevity and placement of canopy trees, the area and intended ground cover between the property line and the edge of pavement on Old Rogers Road should be identified.</p> <p>12. See PDF of mark-up Comments on the SDP plan set (19 entries/comments)</p>	
Engineering (CJS/B&M) - Brian Laux / Jacque Thompson	See three (3) PDF's – 1.) Memo with 27 comments; 2.) Mark-up comments on Plan set; 3.) Mark-ups on the Stormwater report.	
COR Public Utilities - Tim Beasley	Demonstrate that 6' will be adequate for maintenance within the SSE? Label as 6' private sanitary sewer easement. Dedicate easement (Recorded by plat or separate instrument) prior to SDP approval.	
Wake County Watershed Management - Janet Boyer	No comments received – previous comment was: Wake County permitting SEC/SWF permits required.	
NCDOT – Jacob Nicholson	<b>REPEAT V2 Comment</b> --- Full NCDOT review will occur during encroachment/driveway permit review. That review and approval will relate to if/how/when the DOT approves of this Site Development Plan.	
Parks & Recreation - Eddie Henderson	No further comments; defer to Planning staff.	
Wake County Fire / EMS - Brittany Hocutt	<i>No additional comments at this time.</i>	