

SDP-23-07 / 302 S Main St – The Learning Center
2nd Submittal
Planning/Zoning Comments

Project Background:

The following is the 2nd review of the Site Development Plan for the Learning Center, originally submitted by Kimley Horn on September 29, 2023, and last revised January 2024. The proposed site is a one-story, 10,000 square foot day care center located at 302 S. Main Street. The plan has been reviewed against the requirements of the Town of Rolesville Land Development Ordinance (LDO).

General Planning Comments

- A. LDO Section 3.2.1.C. -- In order to utilize the GC District [Building] setback reductions outlined in this Section the Plan needs to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of this section. Sheet C2.3 has been provided to show compliance but the dimensions provided do not appear accurate. In some instances dimensions are provided at the property line and for others they are provided at the [building] setback lines. Drive aisles are excluded from the frontage measurements as well.

It does not appear that the applicant is in compliance with the minimum building and community gathering spaces along Main Street (3.2.1.C1) or on Old Rogers Road. It also does not appear that the maximum vehicular surface area along Main Street (3.2.1.C.2) is in compliance.

- B. A number of BUFFER reductions have been utilized on this version of the site development plan. It is not the intent of the ordinance nor of the interpretation by staff to reduce BUFFER widths at the rear of the site. The ordinance language of 3.2.1.C is very clear that [Building] SETBACKS may be reduced. The staff interpretation intended to reduce/eliminate the street buffer along Main Street as the required street buffer width was wider than the front setback in this location only and therefore if the setback along Main Street could be reduced, the buffer along Main Street, therefore, could also be reduced.
- C. There was a conversation between the Applicant and the Town to request that the playground be counted towards open space. Understanding that the space is fenced and not accessible to the public for obvious reasons, this space can be counted toward the required 5% open space requirement of Section 6.2.1.D.3. However, it clearly does not meet the intent of Section 3.2.1.C.5, **“A privately maintained community gathering space or green space, at least one-thousand two hundred (1,200) square feet, that is publicly accessible.”**

Sheet-Specific Review Comments:

Cover Sheet

1. The Site Data Table shall be updated to:
 - a. Indicate the PROPOSED setbacks.
 - b. Add Corner setbacks.
 - c. Provide the types and width of the Buffers required and proposed.
2. **Revised Comment.** The applicant has indicated the setbacks and planned reductions in the response memo but the cover sheet should be revised to reflect compliance with the requirements and any reduction proposed in a note. Please list the required setbacks and required buffers as well as the proposed widths with the allowed reductions. This note should reference LDO Section 3.2.1.C, and demonstrate which of the requirements are being met with the design.

NOTE: Staff understands the Build-to Exhibit has been included and that is helpful in demonstrating how the requirements are being met but notes should be included on the Cover Sheet.

Existing/Demolition Plan

3. **Repeat Comment:** Per the Legend provided, please label removed trees with an "X". There are no "X"s shown. The applicant noted that hatches and labels will now be used to mark demolition areas. **Please update the legend to remove the "X" as this symbol does not appear relevant.**
4. **Repeat Comment:** Due to the proximity of existing vegetation on the adjacent property, tree protection fencing should be installed at the drip line for the existing trees. **Tree protection is not shown on sheet C1.0 and a detail is not provided within the plan set.**
5. Street buffers and the required widths should be labeled corrected on the plans.

Site Plan

6. **Repeat Comment:** 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.**
7. **Revised Comment:** Please revise the legend and the site design to reflect the three different fence types and their locations. Further, details of all proposed fencing shall be added to the plans.
8. **Repeat Comment:** Per LDO Section 6.2.1.G.5-6, public seating and receptacles shall be provided in open space areas. **The applicant noted that benches were labeled on the plan however, they are not shown on Sheet C2.0. Please label the location of the benches proposed within the open space.**
9. **Repeat Comment:** LDO Section 6.8.4.B.2, all non-residential development shall provide at least four (4) pedestrian amenities. **A note shall be added to the cover sheet indicating compliance with this ordinance section. It appears the applicant is proposing a patio, two benches, and a potted plant shown on the site plan. This area should be provided with decorative pavement or pavers or another feature to meet the requirements of this section. Further, the area should be removed from the right-of-way.**
10. Cut sheets of the proposed building lights have been added to the Site Plan sheet. However, there is no key or note that these lights are proposed for the building. There is a note referencing Architectural drawings. Please add the model number of the light to this note and add to the key/legend on the page. Also, it should be noted that although lights are shown on the architectural elevations, again, the specific light type or model is not identified.
11. The applicant is showing a screen wall (required by the Type 3 Buffer) on top of an existing sanitary sewer line. This line should be within a utility easement and no landscaping / hardscaping will be permitted within the easement.
12. Update sidewalk width label to reflect 6'.
13. The next submission should clean up line work and layers so plans are easier to read.

Grading Plan

14. **Repeat Comment:** If there is vegetation to be preserved, label the Tree Protection Fencing (TPF). **The applicant stated that TPF has been shown on the plan set but is not labeled nor keyed on the Grading Plan Sheet. Please label TPF and update the legend.**
15. There is a screen wall labeled on the Sheet C2.0 between the Watkins property and the proposed storm water pond. Please show the top and bottom of this wall on the Grading Plan Sheet. And as

mentioned previously, the applicant should verify this placement on top of an existing sanitary sewer line.

Lighting Plan

16. The lighting plan has been provided by Duke Energy for the parking lot lighting only. Isofootcandle measurements have not been added to the plans to reflect the proposed building mounted lights.
17. Please move all lighting details to the lighting plans and a separate plan sheet should include all proposed lighting and lighting fixtures.
18. The detail of the proposed pole(s) for the showbox lights have not been provided.

Landscape Plan

19. A number of BUFFER reductions have been utilized on this version of the site development plan. As mentioned previously, this was not the intention of the setback allowance. Further, the applicant has not demonstrated the setback allowance may even be taken. The applicant should address setback and buffer reduction with the Town staff.
20. 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 10'. The required number of plants needed for the buffer in addition to the area needed for the wall is insufficient. Further, the reduction is not permitted per Section 3.2.1.
21. **Revised Comment:** Per LDO Section 6.2.2.1.F.3, a 6-foot wall is required with a Type 3 buffer. **The applicant has revised the plans to show the required wall. However, the placement of the wall is in direct conflict with the existing sanitary sewer line. In addition, there is a proposed stormwater management facility adjacent to the buffer. Both the sanitary sewer and the SCM will require easements for access and maintenance (verification from COR/Town engineer). The applicant will need to address and relocate the proposed wall and/or buffer.**
22. There is a canopy tree located with the 2' proposed between the fence and the edge of the right-of-way. At least ten feet is required. Canopy trees in streetscapes are permitted by Section 6.2.2.D.3 to be grouped so we suggest that the street trees along Old Rogers Road be moved closer together so that there is not tree adjacent to the proposed fence, unless the fence is moved further from the property line.
23. In accordance with Section 6.5.E.9., For any fence or wall above four (4) feet in height, the property owner shall landscape the area between the street side of the wall or fence and the right-of-way line if within five (5) feet of the right-of-way line. As the proposed fence is within two feet of the right-of-way and exceed four (4) feet in height, landscaping shall be installed. Please revised the plans accordingly.

General Comments

24. The proposed art installation shall be included on the plans.
25. **Repeat Comment.** Per LDO Section 6.1.5.B.2, an awning should have a minimum 10-foot clearance from the surface below and a max height of 4 feet above the clearance. **The height revision was reflected on one of the elevations but not all. Please update for consistency and compliance with the ordinance requirement.**
26. The plans should be revised to eliminate overlapping layers, misplaced notes, etc.