

REVISION to SP 21-01 – COBBLESTONE – V2 Submittal review cycle

START DATE: <b>SEPTEMBER 09-06-23</b>	DUE DATE: <u>09-15-23</u>	TRC/STAFF Comments issued on: <u>10/08/2023</u>
---------------------------------------	---------------------------	---

Review Group / Staff	Comments	Cleared Comments
Planning & Zoning – Planning Staff	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>**</b>Given the state of the actual physical development occurring on the site, it is unclear to Staff what is still possible to be changed, and what is actually BUILT. Can applicant explain exactly what is NOT yet built?</li> <li>2. <u>Cover Sheet – Sheet index</u> has 24 entries – there are 28 sheets in this plan set – REVISE Cover Sheet Sheet index to note/reference each and every sheet in the plan set.</li> <li>3. <u>Event and Overall Parking</u> – Please explain the full intent to provide Overall and Special Event parking spaces relative to the original plan with two (2) off-site parking areas (Main Street Park and parking lot across Young Street). Staff notes from the V1 Revision to the this V2 Revisions, the calculated REQUIRED parking after the 15% reduction dropped from 461 to 457 - clarify this especially relative to the current state of Construction occurring on the site.</li> <li>4. <u>GREENWAY near Building 7 and SCM</u> – Provide an update on the status / intent to rebuild this pursuant to the relocation in order to allow for the SCM construction, etc. Building 7 appears completed on the exterior, hence appears “site” improvements around it may be nearing completion and thus time to finish Greenway.</li> <li>5. <b>REPEAT</b> - Provide a Written Response to ALL the comments. Do not just write “comment addressed” – explain first where/on what sheet(s), and then how, by making what change or revision, the comment is being addressed. The “explanation” document with this Submittal is NOT sufficient to facilitate a swift Staff Review; Staff is left reviewing each and every detail on every sheet because Applicant has given very little clarity as to what might have been changed.</li> <li>6. <b>REPEAT</b> – (this was NOT performed on the Resubmittal) -- <u>Revisions On Plan Set</u> - Cloud/bubble both the original intended Revisions/Changes to this approved Plan Set, PLUS all the changes/revisions to address these comments. The lack of a clear and concise expression of what it is that was being Revised in the original (Revision plan set) made the Staff Review immensely more difficult than it had to be.</li> <li>7. <b>REPEAT</b> – <u>Sht C1.1 Overall Site Data - Amount of Non-Residential space/square footage</u> – it is unclear how many dwelling units are in Buildings 2,3, and 6. From the Overall Site Data table. Please revise to make this explicitly clear, matching the text in the building footprints in the drawing.</li> <li>8. <b>REPEAT</b> – <u>There was NO response to this -- Clock Tower</u> – <i>On Sheet C1.1, in both the original/approved Plan set and the Revision plan set it is unclear where this intended clock tower was to go – explain where it “was” and ensure that it is no longer referenced in this Revised Plan set.</i></li> </ol>	

REVISION to SP 21-01 – COBBLESTONE – V2 Submittal review cycle

	<p>9. <b>REPEAT</b> - “Proposed Lease line” – Sheet C1.1., both the original/approved Plan set, the 1<sup>st</sup> Revision, and now this 2<sup>nd</sup> Revision, plan set shows a “proposed lease line” in the area of the Veterans memorial – is this still in play/required? Please explain, revise plans as necessary, thank you.</p> <p>10. <b>REPEAT</b> Lighting Plan (V2 Revision, Sht 19/28) – This shows the ORIGINALLY approved layout and thus not reflective of the project layout and therefore the Lights/poles in those areas. Have DUKE revise Lighting Plan based on proposed layout and re-submit. Area around Building 8 clearly is not what this sheet shows; Building 4 is a completely different shape/orientation from original community center, and unclear if Lighting should be changed to accommodate ?.</p>	
Engineering (CJS/B&M) - Brian Laux / Jacque Thompson	See 2 PDF's – a Memo dated 9-13-23 and a set of mark-ups.	
Wake County Watershed Management - Janet Boyer	<p>V2 - Wake County permits SEC-055248-2021/SWF-055250-2021 have not been modified. Permits must be revised. Upload to Wake County permit portal for review.</p> <p>REV V1 - Modify Wake County permits SEC-055248-2021/SWF-055250-2021 as necessary to reflect changes.</p>	TBD
COR Public Utilities Tim Beasley	<p>REV V2 – no record of comments submitted.</p> <p>REV V1 - Please provide a callout for the location of the BFPs for buildings 2, 3 and 4 for both domestic and fire lines and demonstrate that they are within 50' of piping from the WM.</p>	TBD
Wake County Fire / EMS - Brittany Hocutt	<p>REV V2 - no record of comments submitted.</p> <p>REV V1 -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide a truck turning diagram to ensure fire truck can access the parking area(s) primarily where Building 8 original was sited.</li> <li>2. No issues with FDC/Hydrant.</li> </ol>	TBD

