



March 1, 2024

Michael Elabarger
Senior Planner, Town of Rolesville
P.O. Box 250, 502 Southtown Circle
Rolesville, NC 27571

RE: *Response to Comments for TLE Rolesville*

Attached, please find the Applicant's written responses to comments from the Town of Rolesville, issued on February 6, 2023 for the above referenced project.

The responses are transmitted to you with the following information:

- One (1) Electronic Copy of the Plan set
- One (1) Stormwater Report
- One (1) Revised Fee-in-Lieu Calculation for Old Rogers Road
- One (1) Septic Field Correspondence

Please do not hesitate to contact me at (919) 653-2927 or chris.bostic@kimley-horn.com should you or your staff have any questions concerning our responses.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Chris Bostic", written over a horizontal line.

Chris Bostic, PE
Kimley-Horn and Associates

PLANNING/ZONING: PLANNING STAFF & WITHERSRAVENEL

General 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.

Response: Per meeting with the Town on 2/19/24, the site layout and dimensions on Sheet C2.3 have been revised. Dimensions along Old Rogers Rd have been removed, and S Main St dimensions have been adjusted to begin with the property line. Per LDO Sec. 11.7, active use areas may also be used to achieve frontage requirements; as such, the proposed building frontage is now measured from the building corner to the edge of the active use area. Per discussion with the Town, portions of the frontage may be considered building or vehicular surface area frontage, but not both; as such, the vehicular surface area, including the drive aisles, has been reduced to be within compliance for the GC District building setback reductions.

- 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.

Response: A variance request application will be submitted under separate cover.

- 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."

Response: The project is not proposing a "privately maintained community gathering space" as described in Section 3.2.1.C.5. For the setback reduction, the project is only

required to provide two of the items in Sections 3.2.1.C.4-6. To meet this requirement, the project is proposing the enhanced landscaping described in 3.2.1.C.4 and the art installation from 3.2.1.C.6. The enhanced landscaping calculations are shown on Sheet L1.0 and the art installation will be provided on the playground fence and will be visible from the public right-of-way.

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.

Response: Provided setbacks, corner setback, and types/width of required and proposed buffers added to the Site Date table.

2. 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.

Response: Required and provided setbacks and buffers, reductions, and LDO reference notes added to the Site Data table as requested.

3. Please provide submittal & revision dates.

Response: Submittal and revision dates added to Cover Sheet.

4. There is only one 10' buffer on the site. Please update with the required street buffers and perimeter buffers.

Response: Street and perimeter buffers added to Site Data table.

5. Add corner setback

Response: Corner setback added to Site Data table.

6. The amount of open space listed here does not match the amount shown on the site plan. Please revise.

Response: Open spaced on Site Data table updated to match site plan.

7. Please clarify what setbacks are required, what setbacks are being reduced, and by which ordinance section number this reduction is permitted, including the specific design criteria that is being met. While some of this is provided on Sheet C.2.3 there should be a note on the cover sheet.

Response: Required and provided setbacks and buffers, reductions, and LDO reference notes added to the Site Data table as requested.

Existing/Demolition Plan

8. 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.

Response: "X" symbol removed from Demolition Legend.

9. 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.

Response: Tree protection added to sheet C1.0. Tree protection fence detail previously provided on sheet C5.3.

10. Street buffers and the required widths should be labeled corrected on the plans.

Response: Street buffer widths updated.

11. REMOVE IF THIS IS NOT BEING USED

Response: "X" symbol removed.

12. This should be labeled as a Street buffer. Please also provide a reference to a note on Landscape plan and/or cover sheet which details the reduction allowance proposed with this application.

Response: Buffer label corrected. Notes regarding buffer widths, reductions, and code references in the Site Data table on the Cover sheet.

13. This should be labeled as a 10' Local Street Buffer.

Response: Buffer label corrected.

14. Tree protection fencing shall be installed in this area to prevent disturbance of the critical zone of existing vegetation on adjacent property.

Response: Tree protection fence shown.

15. Please clarify what vegetation is being demolished here.

Response: Label updated to state "Demolish existing shrubs and trees."

16. Tree protection fencing shall be installed in this area to prevent disturbance of the critical zone of existing vegetation on adjacent property.

Response: Tree protection fence shown.

Site Plan

17. 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.

Response: Pending approval from client.

18. 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.

Response: Legend and site features updated to reflect each fence type. Fence details added, see Sheet C8.1.

19. 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.

Response: Location of benches and trash receptacle labeled on Sheet C2.0.

20. 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.

Response: The area has been removed from the right-of-way and decorative pavement has been added, see Sheet C2.0.

21. 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.

Response: Site plan sheet references building lighting detail on same sheet. Actual model is boxed on detail.

22. 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.

Response: 6' utility easement shown. Per discussion with the Town, a fence may be proposed to serve the intent of the screen wall. The fence has been moved off the sewer line and outside the proposed easement.

23. Update sidewalk width label to reflect 6'.

Response: Sidewalk width label updated.

24. The next submission should clean up line work and layers so plans are easier to read.

Response: Linework and layers adjusted for clarify.

25. Correct the layering of CAD files and charts here as things are ineligible due to overlap.

Response: Linework and layers adjusted for clarify.

26. Please label this feature.

Response: Septic tank labeled, see Sheet C2.0.

27. Update label to indicate street buffer

Response: Labels updated to indicate street buffer.

28. Label benches

Response: Benches labeled, see Sheet C2.0.

29. The proposed patio should be removed from the right-of-way

Response: Proposed patio removed from the right-of-way.

30. THIS SHOULD BE ADDED AS A NOTE ON THE PLAN SHEET RATHER THAN A CALL OUT

Response: Fee-in-lieu call out removed and replaced with note on Sheet C2.0.

31. Please provide a detail.

Response: Fence details added, see Sheet C8.1.

32. This arrow is pointing the property line. Please show where the outswing gates will be located.

Response: Fence leader updated and outswing gates labeled.

33. Please label wall height and provide a detail. Address the installation on top of a sanitary sewer line. Further, the sanitary sewer should be covered by a utility easement. Please revise plans to show extent of utility easement as well as any access or drainage easement for the adjacent SCM

Response: Per discussion with the Town, a fence may be proposed to serve the intent of the screen wall. The height of the fence has been labeled and both the sewer easement and SCM access easement now shown. Fence shifted off sewer line and outside of all easements.

Truck Routing Exhibit

34. Drafting errors, please remove

Response: Linework and layers adjusted for clarify.

Build-To Exhibit

35. On this sheet the fence is shown on the right-of-way line.

Response: Fence shifted away from right-of-way.

Grading Plan

36. 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.

Response: Tree protection fence shown and labeled.

37. 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.

Response: Per discussion with the Town, a fence may be proposed to serve the intent of the screen wall. The fence has been shifted off of the sewer line and outside the sewer easement.

38. There is a screen wall labeled here on the Sheet C2.0. Please show the top and bottom of this wall here on the Grading Plan Sheet. The placement of this wall seems to be in direct conflict with the existing sanitary sewer line.

Response: Per discussion with the Town, a fence may be proposed to serve the intent of the screen wall. The fence has been shifted off the sewer line and outside the sewer easement.

Lighting Plan

39. 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.

Response: Building lighting will have minimal impact on photometrics.

40. Please move all lighting details to the lighting plans and a separate plan sheet should include all proposed lighting and lighting fixtures.

Response: Details shown on plan sheets C2.0 and LT1.0.

41. The detail of the proposed pole(s) for the showbox lights have not been provided.

Response: Light detail provided on Sheet LT1.0.

Landscape Plan

- 42. 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.

Response: The plans have been revised to clarify the buffer reductions for the Main St buffer, where the buffer reduction is permitted due to the setback reduction per staff interpretation, and the rear perimeter buffer. See the cover sheet for required and provided setback and buffer widths and notes. Calculations for setback and buffer reductions are also shown on Sheet C2.3. As discussed with the Town, we understand that the rear buffer reduction as shown does not meet the requirements of the LDO. We intend to request a variance with the Board of Adjustment to address this conflict, and if approved, will continue with the current site layout.

- 43. 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.

Response: We intend to request a variance with the Board of Adjustment to address the rear perimeter buffer reduction. If approved, the project will continue with the site layout as shown.

- 44. 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.

Response: Per discussion with the Town, a fence may be proposed to serve the intent of the screen wall. The fence has been shifted off the sewer line and outside the sewer easement. The fence has also been placed outside of the SCM access easement.

- 45. 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.

Response: The fence was shifted further from the property line. Trees are no longer in conflict with other site elements.

- 46. 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.

Response: The fence has been shifted to be more than 5' from the right-of-way.

- 47. Please relocate this tree as it's proximity to the required water / fire hydrant may be problematic over time

Response: Tree relocated out of utility conflict areas.

- 48. There is not reduction permitted or required, the street buffer is only 10'

Response: Noted.

- 49. There is no width reduction permitted for perimeter buffers. Setbacks are permitted by ordinance only when the criteria are met. Street buffer along Main Street was permitted by interpretation from the Planning Director.

Response: We intend to request a variance with the Board of Adjustment to address the rear perimeter buffer reduction. If approved, the project will continue with the site layout as shown.

- 50. Please move tree so that not located within 2' between the fence and the right-of-way. trees are allowed to be clustered so we suggest moving this tree elsewhere along the street buffer

Response: The fence was shifted further from the property line. Trees are no longer in conflict with other site elements.

- 51. There is no allowance for perimeter buffer requirements with Section 3.2.1

Response: We intend to request a variance with the Board of Adjustment to address the rear perimeter buffer reduction. If approved, the project will continue with the site layout as shown.

Architectural Drawings

- 52. Awning height not updated.

Response: Awning dimension updated.

General Comments

- 53. The proposed art installation shall be included on the plans.

Response: A mural is noted to be installed on the playground fence, see Sheet C2.0.

- 54. 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.

Response: Updated as requested.

- 55. The plans should be revised to eliminate overlapping layers, misplaced notes, etc.

Response: Plans have been revised for clarity.

ENGINEERING: BRIAN LAUX/JACQUELINE THOMPSON

Sheet C0.0 Cover Sheet

1. GENERAL WE ARE NOT ABLE TO COMPLETE ENGINEERING REVIEW WITH OUT:

PLEASE PROVIDE STORM CALCS.
PLEASE PROVIDE EROSION CONTROL CALCS.
PLEASE PROVIDE CULVERT CALCS. (25-YEAR)
PLEASE PROVIDE DRAINAGE AREA MAP(S) PRE/POST
PROVIDE ALL CALCULATIONS AND MAPS NEEDED.

Response: Calculations have been provided as requested.

Sheet C1.0 Existing Conditions

2. Repeat: EX WATERLINE SIZE?.

Response: Existing waterline sizes labeled.

3. Repeat: EX WATERLINE SIZE?

Response: Existing waterline sizes labeled.

4. Repeat: A few trees standalone on site per Google maps images and field verification (demo)?

Response: Note revised to state "Demolish existing shrubs and trees."

5. Repeat: There is no tree line here? Tree line continues south behind the existing storm pond

Response: This portion of the treeline bordering the plan south property boundary denotes shrubs existing associated the adjacent parcel.

6. IMAPS shows that there is currently a septic tank permitted on site. Provide documentation that septic tank and leach field have been remediated/abandoned or let us know how you are planning to manage the on-site septic system. Please add location to the existing condition sheet.

Response: Per discussion with Wake County Environmental Services/Division of Water Quality, there is no septic tank on-site and it has been removed from the GIS for the property. See correspondence "2024-02-23 – TLE Septic Comment" included with resubmittal.

7. The existing walk to be demo'd? Will need to verify if the Planner will allow widening as apposed to demoing and replacing the entire walk.

Response: Plan revised to reflect demolition of entire existing sidewalk.

8. COR believes that the 2" force main has an existing easement. Verify and provide a design that does not conflict with this easement.

Response: Proposed 6' sewer easement now shown.

Sheet C2.0 Site Plan:

9. Repeat: Provide site distance triangles at Old Rogers Road intersection.

Response: 10' x 70' Sight distance triangles shown and labeled.

10. Please add bollards to the details or remove them if they are no longer needed.

Response: Bollard detail shown, see Sheet C8.1.

11. Show and Label access easement recorded in DB 15441 PG 01221.

Response: The recorded access easement is a blanket easement for the Learning Center Rolesville parcel and adjacent parcels identified as PIN #1759807165 (Sonic Drive-Thru) and PIN #1759806076 (Vacant). No boundary for this easement is recorded so it cannot be shown on the plan.

12. Viewport is now overlapping with Site Legend and Parking Calculations table. Revise to fix overlapping. Also fix scale.

Response: Plan revised for clarity.

13. ADA ramp required for Old Rogers Road crossing.

Response: ADA ramp added.

14. Talk with COR on existing easement (10ft min.) for Sonic sewer service.

Response: 6' sanitary sewer easement shown and labeled.

Truck Turn Exhibit 1-2

15. Remove Handicap ramps from parking table.

Response: Plan revised for clarity.

16. Remove Handicap ramps from parking table.

Response: Plan revised for clarity.

Build-To Exhibit

17. Town planner to decide if they will allow the proposed widening shown in design.

Response: Plan revised to demolish existing sidewalk and propose new 10' sidewalk.

18. Verify setback reductions that will be allowed with the Town planner. TYP.

Response: Noted.

Sheet C3.0 Grading Plan

19. The existing ditch along Old Rogers Road has drainage concerns after reviewing existing contours. This will need to be revised with the construction of your project (Ditch to be regraded per response. Show contours labels and additional grading details needed to verify positive drainage.)

Response: Contour and slope labels added within proposed roadside ditch.

20. The proposed culvert at entrance appears to only have one foot of cover on the pipe at the back of curb. Given this pipe will need to be 18" Minimum per NCDOT requirements and will not work with proposed grade. Please invert associated with it.

Response: Culvert size, inverts, and cover are limited by downstream 15" pipe. Inverts provided.

21. Repeat The culvert downstream of your pond and any other downstream culverts may need to be up sized due to increased flows. Please provide needed calculations in these areas. (Leaving comment until storm report is received to verify)

Response: Culvert calculations added to the Stormwater report.

22. Repeat: Please grade in the proposed pond and show it tying into existing grade.

Response: Proposed pond grading shown, see Sheet C3.0.

23. Repeat Please clarify if this proposed storm is going through or under the proposed retaining wall.

Response: Proposed storm is no longer going through or under the proposed retaining wall.

24. Repeat The area I have highlighted appears to be draining off your site. Please revise your drainage to capture and treat this drainage area.

Response: A trench drain has been added at the cross access with Sonic to capture this drainage area.

25. Repeat Please grade ADA space to design standards and provide spot grades for compliance review.

Response: Spot elevations shown for ADA spaces.

26. Repeat Please provide and label an access and maintenance easement connecting to the ROW for the proposed SCM

Response: Access and maintenance easement shown and labeled.

27. Please submit a storm calculations package to review for complete review comments to be completed.
(Was not provided with previous review submittal)

Response: Storm calculations package included with resubmittal.

28. Will splash pad drainage be tying into RD? Verify and show drainage collection.

Response: The splash pad drainage tie-in to the proposed roof drainage has been added.

29. No grading revisions appear to have been made.

Response: Grading has been revised.

30. Storm connecting into NCDOT drainage system will need to be reviewed by NCDOT and Hydraulic Division for flow rate being added into their existing system.NCDOT to provide the requirements for encroachment and permitting on storm connection

Response: Noted.

Sheet C4.0 Utility Plan:

31. Repeat Verify and add waterline size for all water lines surrounding the site.

Response: Existing waterline sizes labeled.

32. Repeat Please identify the section of road/curb that will need to be cut and repaired to install connection to water line.

Response: Curb and road to be sawcut and replaced shown on Sheet C1.0.

Sheet C5.0 Erosion Control Plan Phase 1:

33. Repeat Sediment is not being managed with a Temporary Basin in phase 1. Suggest adding diversion ditch and basin to phase one for erosion control.

Response: Separate drainage areas are less than 1 acre so no basin is proposed.

34. Repeat There is a low point at the cross-access point labeled. How will any erosion getting to this point be managed and not allowed to flow off site.

Response: Separate drainage areas are less than 1 acre so no basin is proposed.

35. Repeat Remove Gravel Drive label as there is no Gravel Drive shown on this site.

Response: There is an existing gravel drive on the site per current survey, see Sheet C1.0. This drive will be present during the installation of Phase 1 erosion control measures, prior to site clearing.

36. Revise sequence to match plans. All clearing is shown in Phase 2 and will need to be done then when the basin is installed. No erosion control basin is shown on this phase. Please revise the construction sequence to match plans.

Response: Sequence revised to match plans.

Sheet C5.1 Erosion Control Plan Phase 2:

37. Repeat Please provide Sediment inlet protection on all neighboring structures and pipes that sediment could reach from site work.

Response: Inlet protection added to neighboring structures.

38. Repeat Please provide the supporting Calculations to support pond being used as temporary sediment basin.

Response: Separate drainage areas are less than 1 acre so no basin is proposed.

Sheet C8.0 Site Details:

39. Please provide a detail for the bollards being proposed on site or remove from plans if they are no longer needed with the addition of Wheel Stops

Response: Bollard detail shown, see Sheet C8.1.

Sheet C8.1 Site Details:

40. Repeat Verify that the town allows painted striping.

Response: Per 6.4.4.A.10, the Town's only requirement regarding off-street parking area spaces is they shall be marked. Painted striping is proposed to meet this requirement.

Sheet C10.0-11.1 Sanitary Sewer & Water Details:

41. Repeat USE THE CITY OF RALEIGH STANDARD DETAILS WHEN AVAILIBLE FOR
- SANTIARY SEWER
- WATERLINE.

Response: Water and sewer details updated with City of Raleigh details as applicable.

Sheet L1.0 Landscape Plan:

42. Please verify proposed trees will not be in proposed ditch line. Please verify and update the existing vegetation/tree lines shown and update them as needed.

Response: Proposed trees not shown in ditch line.

FIL Markups:

1. Please provide areas for these as the numbers I am getting from the PDF are considerably higher.

Response: Areas provided on revised FIL page.

2. storm CI
storm, RCP piping to ditch outlet down stream (west, 20ft plus fall)
grading to limits of improvements.

Response: Additional line items added to FIL page.

COR PUBLIC UTILITIES: TIM BEASLEY

1. A private sewer easement must be recorded to provide Sonic access to this FM for future maintenance prior to CD approval.

Response: 6' proposed sewer easement shown.

2. This is an existing non conforming service. This development should minimize any negative impacts to this service.

Response: The development is not proposing any improvements within the easement for the non-conforming sewer service.

WAKE COUNTY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT: JANET BOYER

Wake county permitting SEC/SWF permits required.

Response: Noted.

PARKS & RECREATION: EDDIE HENDERSON

1. Please revise landscape plan/plantings to show more of a diversity of native shrubs, which currently has just one. The original landscape plan had multiple native shrubs. Per Rolesville LDO 6.3.4.7c: "All developments shall provide a diverse plant palette..." See attachment and these links:

<https://ncwildflower.org/recommended-native-species/>

<https://content.ces.ncsu.edu/extension-gardener-handbook/12-native-plants>

Response: (LANDSCAPE TO RESPOND) .

NCDOT: JACOB NICHOLSON

1. Full NCDOT review will occur during encroachment/driveway permit review. The

review and approval will relate to if/how/when the DOT approves of this Site Development Plan.

Response: Noted.

WAKE COUNTY FIRE / EMS: BRITTANY HOCUTT

No additional comments at this time.