

**ANX-23-01 – WOODLIEF ASSEMBLAGE – 1st Submittal review cycle**

START DATE: <b>MARCH 03-03-23</b>	DUE DATE: <u>  04-03-23  </u>	TRC/STAFF Comments issued on: <u>  04/10/2023  </u>
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------	---

	Comments
Planning & Zoning – Planning Staff	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Please pay the INVOICE for application fee that was issued/emailed 03-02-2023 to the WithersRavenel contact listed in the Property Owner Consent Form.</b></li> <li>2. <u>Regarding the Annexation Petition</u> – there are 6 separate Petitions submitted; each one represents a different PIN numbered property; there are two for PIN 1768409261 – there is no Petition for PIN 1767590335 (per Wake Co owned by Betty Joyce Woodlief and being 18.49 acres, and lot 5 from BM2011/pg84. Please clarify, explain, or resolve this apparent omission.</li> <li>3. <u>Deeds</u> – the first required item on the Annexation petition is the (in this case, all of them) Deed of record for the subject property. There were no Deeds submitted.</li> <li>4. <u>Regarding Exhibit D and “Annexation Exhibit”</u> – the second requirement of the Annexation Petition is an annexation boundary plat/map for recordation...prepared by a professional land surveyor showing the boundaries of the area...”. This document looks like it was generated from IMAPS; it is not signed and sealed by a professional land surveyor; there is no demonstration that Exhibit D matches</li> <li>5. <u>Exhibit D</u> – the third requirement of the Annexation petition is a complete copy of the written metes and bounds description based on the annexation boundary plat/map. As previously noted, the submitted map looks to be created via IMAPS. Exhibit D has no credentials of the professional land surveyor who created (it). Please submit metes and bounds that result from a drawn boundary plat/map created, signed, sealed by a professional land surveyor.</li> <li>6. <u>Regarding the Exhibit D, Legal Description that was submitted</u> – this has metes and bounds descriptions for the 6 “tracts” of land that appear to be proposed for Annexation.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The southern 5 “tracts” all appear to be the same properties (intact, no obvious deviations) as those platted lots per BM2011/pg84 – Lots 6, 5, 4, 3, 2 working south to north. Being these are already platted lots, could they simply be described (as those lots via BM2011/pg84) rather than metes and bounds? Please explain or share thoughts/reasons. Staff believes the call for metes and bounds is because land being annexed is often not platted at all and ‘raw land’ for which only a metes and bounds description might exist (via deeds).</li> <li>ii. PIN 1768511519, a 38.29 acre tract, looks to be (all of Lot 1 from BM2011/pg84) plus some/part/all of a PIN 1768524216 which is seen adjacent (north) of this Lot 1 in BM2011/pg84 – IMAPs links this tract to BM2011/pg84 even though it does not exist/was not created via that BM. The Deed for this PIN (Bk014286/pg1880-01884) describes it as 17.700 acres being Lot 1 from BM2011/pg84. Please explain how this 38.29 acre tract came to be, as neither the Deed nor Book of Maps describes it.</li> </ol> </li> <li>7. <u>Limits of Annexation vs. Limits of Development in Concept Plan</u> – as noted, the entirety of the described Tracts does not reflect the Concept Plan’s exclusions of the ~5 and ~10 acre tracts – confirm the intent is to annex those. If to be annexed, the Rezoning will need to include these 2 tracts – they must be rezoned to LDO Districts. Staff and applicant can discuss this further.</li> </ol>