Review Group / Staff		Comments	Cleared Comments	
Planning & Zoning – Planning Staff & WithersRavenel / Karen Mallo & Liza Monroe				
1.	Please pay the INVO	DICE for Application fee, originally emailed on 1/31/23.		
2.	Provide a written re	esponse to ALL the Comments.		
3.	Add appropriate rev	vision Dates to all submittal materials.		
4.		s (OVERALL) – Please examine other Rezoning/Map Amendment applications in review or recently approved and revise/provide Conditions accordingly.		
5.	Little River Watersh Section 4.2. Given the	ittle River Watershed – See PDF exhibit of IMAPS information; see the Wake County Watershed comments. Please review LDO section 4.2. Given this please provide a clear explanation as to how the Applicant intends to move forward with the project given this status; what are the impediments to development of the shown project.		
6.	ITE/ TIA Provide a Staff estimates that	In ITE Trip Generation letter to determine if a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) is required per LDO Section 8.C. the project exceeds the 500 ADT standard; the AM/PM Peak periods would require specific knowledge of uses (ie day-care or a coffee shop would have high AM peak hour counts for example, whereas many other		
7.	•	F of 15 Mark-up comments on the Concept Plan.		
8.	Future Land Use / P map identifies this t its Master Plan iden Original PUD is a pro and Jones Dairy Roa this "mixed use trac of the Averette Farr Farms, Preserve at J fulfill the original vis	rast Entitlement approvals — See PDF called "Zoning History". The 2017 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use tract as "Medium Density Residential". SUP 18-06 for the adjacent Preserve at Jones Dairy Central project, atifies/references this tract as "Commercial Property (previously approved under Original PUD)". That oject known as Averette Farms which encompassed several hundred acres of land between Wait Avenue ad, west of Averette Road, including the subject property. MA 07-07/SUP 07-05, SUP Provision 6.E. speaks to ct' being the referenced #1 and being 19 acres (which would include 701 & 709 Averette Road). The majority ms land has been developed exclusively as single-family residential subdivisions (Elizabeth Springs, Perry Jones Dairy Central and North (both under construction) — there has been no non-residential component to sion for the east side of this corridor. Please address how the proposed land plan — providing		
9.	LDO Section 3.4.3.C	_ – Revise Concept plan to provide calculations demonstrating that a maximum 75% of gross acreage (which		
	is 12.585 acres of 16	6.78 acres) is dedicated to residential uses. A general/bubble diagram may express this best.		
10	LDO 3.4.3. / Propose	ed Residential Density – See previous Comment; Concept Plan indicates a proposed Residential density of		
	Revise the residenti	per acre; that is simple math of 45 single-family dwelling units over the gross site acreage of 16.78 acres; all density by determining and then subtracting the proposed non-residential area; the density will obviously 3.4.3., Table 3.4.3., the NC District allows a Density of 8 units/acre, which exceeds the maximum 5 units/acre		

- intended for Medium Density Residential land use category in the Comprehensive Plan. Staff must review the proposed Density against the above to gauge compliance/appropriateness.
- 11. <u>LDO Section 3.4.3.D.1.</u> Revise Concept Plan to provide calculations demonstrating that a minimum 15% of gross area is for non-residential uses. A general/bubble diagram may express this best.
- 12. <u>LDO Section 3.4.3.D.2.</u> Revise Concept Plan to provide calculations demonstrating where and the amounts (acreage, percentage of gross acreage) that Buffers, Open Spaces, and Stormwater facilities will entail, and that they are not within the 15% gross area of non-residential uses.
- 13. <u>LDO 3.4.3.D.4.</u> and 5. Proposed Non-Residential Building portion Create a Condition that details the delivery of non-residential development commensurate with these standards; review other Rezoning applications Conditions for example. Further discussion is necessary about the layout/design/future LDO compliance with the shown non-residential once other Comments are addressed. Concept Plan may be too specific for Rezoning consideration.
- 14. <u>LDO 6.2.4.5. Tree Preservation</u> Application justification statement states "The development will not result in adverse impacts on ...vegetation..." Concept Plan shows the vast majority of the existing tree stand to be developed with lots, streets, or the stormwater management facility, plus possible (Averette Rd.) right-of-way dedication which is not indicated. Please address this apparent conflict. Tree Preservation compliance is demonstrated at Major Preliminary Subdivision Plat.
- 15. <u>LDO Section 6.4.5.C.</u> Revise Concept Plan to update the parking calculations as one loading space is required per 30,000 square feet of gross floor area (GFA).
- 16. <u>LDO Section 6.2.1.G.4</u> Revise Concept Plan to address how the open space areas located behind the homes meet the accessibility requirement.
- 17. Lot 38 Revise Concept Plan to Label lot lines for Lot 38.
- 18. <u>LDO 6.2.3.A.1.</u> Mixed Use Perimeter Compatibility Revise Concept Plan to demonstrate the minimum transitional use area [minimum of 20 feet] between non-mixed-use districts and mixed-use zoning districts; the first 10 feet is shown correctly on the plan, but the remaining 10 feet (Transition Area B) should be shown where the site is directly adjacent to a single-family residence (see red Mark-up on the plan set). If any of the proposed buildings have increased heights, the width may be increased (Transitional Area C) over the base 20'.

The Following are more applicable to a future Preliminary Subdivision Plat (PSP) submittal and/or Site Development Plan reviews, but must be mentioned as they may influence how the project is portrayed and proposed on the Concept Plan, and whether or not the Concept is actually buildable. These comments do not reflect a full and complete review; regulations unmentioned are applicable at the appropriate development application stage:

- 19. <u>LDO Section 9.2.2.B. / Block Length</u> Per LDO (incl. definition of "Block" LDO Section 11 see attached Block Length Exhibit PDF) provide measurements to demonstrate that all Blocks do not exceed 1,200 linear feet.
- 20. <u>Table 3.4.3. FRONTAGE Requirements</u> --- Demonstrate compliance with the Frontage requirements, as well as building and site design requirements. Concept Plan has no overt expression of compliance with this set of requirements.

- 21. <u>LDO Table 6.2.1.2. Open Space/Mixed-Use Districts</u> -- Specify open space type and square footage of each; Note: Per LDO Section 6.2.1.G.12, A minimum of fifty (50) percent of all required Open Space shall be dedicated and designed to allow for active recreation features.
- 22. Revise Concept Plan to indicate Loading spaces, dumpster areas, and associated screening in the non-residential portion of the site.
- 23. <u>Proposed 10' Multi-Use Trail</u> Clarify if this is meeting the Town Greenway requirement or is a 'private' pedestrian facility. Revise to indicate the multi-use trail construction material. Label everything accordingly and revise the Legend to provide a different symbol for that material.
- 24. <u>LDO Section 6.8.4.B.4.</u> -- Sidewalk throughout the site is shown as 6' (typ) but the ROW detail shows sidewalk as 5'. Please clarify / revise that which is incorrect.
- 25. <u>LDO Section 6.4.4.A.4.</u> -- Where parking spaces are located such that the parked vehicle will overhang a sidewalk, a minimum clear width shall be provided equal to the minimum sidewalk width required. Alternatively, wheel stops can be utilized as noted in LDO Section 6.4.4.A.6.
- 26. <u>Table 3.4.3. Front Setback</u> Although the (single-family residential) minimum front setback is 15', it should be noted that 15' is not a sufficient length to park a car and does <u>not</u> meet the minimum parking space requirements. Therefore, for driveway parking to count toward parking requirements, the driveway length must be 19'.
- 27. <u>LDO Section 6.2.2.2.D.6.</u> -- Where there is a Vehicular Use Area [VUA] between the right-of-way of the Thoroughfare [Averette Rd] and a permanent building, the streetscaping shall provide a semi-opaque screen or barrier between the ROW and the VUA. The screen or barrier may consist of existing vegetation, plants, earthen berms, decorative entry fences (not privacy), walls or any combination thereof which meets the requirements in this section.
- 28. <u>LDO Section 6.2.4.2.A.12.</u> According to Aerial images this area has substantial trees existing. A tree/vegetative survey is required and the appropriate time to submit is the Major Preliminary Subdivision Plat application.
- 29. <u>LDO Section 6.2.4.2.B.3.</u> Tree surveys are utilized to determine the number trees that will be required to be replaced on site.
- 30. <u>LDO Section 6.2.4.2.B.1.</u> At least ten (10) percent of all existing trees in good health (as determined by a professional arborist) shall be preserved within developments that are two (2) acres or greater in size, excluding non-native invasive plants as listed by the US Forest Service or the NC Forest Service
- 31. Although not required with mixed use buffer requirements, it is recommended to provide a screen and a larger separation between the commercial building parking lot and Lot 1 as they are differing uses. Currently, there is roughly 9 feet and it appears this may be the only public access point to the open space behind the SF lots.

	The Application has been reviewed by Staff, and presented to the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board (PARAB), whom collectively provide these comments:	
Parks & Recreation - Eddie Henderson	 Revise Concept Plan to demonstrate compliance with 2022 Rolesville Greenway Plan (Page 5) and 2022 Rolesville Bike Plan (Page 5) for Sidepaths and Bicycle Lanes respectively along the site's frontage on Averette Road. Revise Concept Plan to demonstrate compliance with 2022 Rolesville Greenway Plan (Page 5) for Sidepath along the site's frontage on Jones Diary Road. Both plans can be found here: https://www.rolesvillenc.gov/planning/adopted-policy-plans. 	
Engineering (CJS/B&M) -	See two (2) PDF's – 1.) Memo dated 02-27-23 and 2.) Mark-ups on Concept Plan.	
Brian Laux / Jacque Thompson		
Wake County Watershed Management - Janet Boyer	Per IMAPS, this parcel appears to be in the Little River Watershed and is required to meet the Watershed Overlay requirements in LDO Section 4.2.	
Wake County Fire / EMS -	See PDF of Wake County Fire Report dated 02-09-2023.	
Brittany Hocutt		
NCDOT – Trevor Darnell	 A TIA may be required for this site. Further detail regarding the anticipated commercial land uses is needed to make this determination. A northbound left-turn lane at the proposed site access will likely be required. It is preferred that the proposed site access is located as far as possible from the Averette Road / Jones Dairy Road intersection. However, the current proposed location appears to be acceptable under existing conditions. 	
COR Public Utilities Tim Beasley	No Comments provided; will be included in next submittal review.	

