



Strong Rock Engineering Group, PLLC
PO Box 99552
Raleigh, NC 27624
984.200.1932 (p)
Company License # P-2166

Comment Responses

HOLDING COMMENT: The Town's LDO was last updated on April 4, 2023 to include new dimensional standards for the RM Zoning District - Cluster option, including lot size and setbacks. The current plan set, submitted on August 2, 2023 does not comply with these standards. Understanding that the associated rezoning application was approved on January 17, 2023 would necessitate a vesting of a site-specific development plan in order to ensure the regulations in place at the time of the original application for this project are secured for the duration and development of this project. Without vesting, the applicant would need to address any standards that were not secured as a portion of the conditional zoning and have changed since the initial submittal. The applicant shall review the Vested Right standards of LDO Section 2.3 and Appendix A/3.4, and address this with Town Staff and the Town Attorney..

(Need to coordinate with Town Staff to address this comment.)

Cover Sheet

repeat comment

1. Site Information table: The address is 5109 Mitchell Mill Road, not 5019.
 - a. **A typo It will be changed.**
2. Correct the PIN information as the same number is listed twice.
 - a. **It is all one Parcel that straddles Jonesville Road. It will be corrected.**
3. Sheet Index does not match the sheets in the plan – revise/clarify.
 - a. **Sheets and the associated index have been revised.**
4. Include a reference box to MA22-06 and list the Conditions of Approval.
 - a. **The Conditions of Approval are extensive and will be listed on a separate sheet after the Cover.**
5. Regarding the Site Data Table:
 - a. To the Site Data table, also revise/add the Dimensional Standards for/by each Zoning District, and then by the Use being Developed (Single-family Detached, Single Family Attached).
 - i. Building Height
 - ii. Building Setbacks (per District and per Use)
 - iii. Maximum Building Size (NC District)
 - iv. Building Size Proposed
 - v. Minimum Lot Width
 - vi. Minimum Lot Length (NC District only)
 - vii. Lot Length Proposed (NC District only)
 - viii. Density within each Zoning District, for each Use
 - ix. Minimum building square footage as specified in MA22-06
 - x. Parking Provided (Per Use)

Zoning Dimensional Table

	NC-CZ		RM-CZ
LDO Section	3.4.3		3.1.2
	Townhomes [TH] (Attached)	SFH (Detached Cluster)	SFH Detached (Cluster Option)
i. Building Height	35 feet	35 feet	35 feet
ii. Building Setbacks			
Front	15 feet	20 feet	20 feet
Side	10 feet	10 feet	10 feet
Rear	10 feet	20 feet	20 feet
Corner	N/A	12 feet	12 feet
iii. Max Building Size	25,000 sf	25,000 sf	N/A
iv. Building Size Proposed	1,200 SF Minimum	2,000 SF Minimum	N/A
v. Lot Width (minimum)	20 feet	50 feet	50 feet
vi. Lot Length (minimum)	100 feet	100 feet	100 feet
vii. Lot Length (Proposed)	100 feet	100 feet	100 feet
viii. Density Allowed/Proposed	8 U/A(Allowed)	186 Units/46.31 AC 4.01 U/A (Proposed)	5 U/A (Allowed) 2.29 U/A (Proposed)
ix. Building SF Zoning Condition MA22-06 (Minimum)	1200 SF	2000 SF	2000 SF
x. Parking Provided (2.25 per TH Unit)	246 Spaces	N/A	N/A
xi. NC District Residential AC		46.31 AC MA-22-06	
xii. NC District Commercial AC	8.27AC MA-22-06		
xiii. RM-CZ District			84.033 AC

Open Space Table

Civil Notes

6. Include updated FRIS notes within the general notes section.

FRIS notes have been added to the cover sheet as well as general notes sheet.

Existing Conditions and Demolition

7. Include use and zoning district of adjacent properties.

All Surrounding Zoning is r-30 Wake County

8. Label riparian streams and the width of any required buffers.

Wake County GIS notes Harris Creek is also known as Peeples Creek, A tributary that flows from the south east is an unnamed creek

is there a reason for no Buffers on Harris Creek and the rest of the tributary streams from letter.

9. Provide ROW width and Book and Page Number for Jonesville Road
NC SR2226 ROW varies.

10. Label the tree line and tree protection fencing areas.

Added to tree protection areas in Buffers

Sheet C-5.0 - Overall Site Plan

11. Please clarify what the green line is referring to in the legend.

10ft wide green line is the proposed Greenway

add to be part of the legend if not labeling

12. Please label the zoning line using Pink or Orange, something not typical in the review/mark up process.

Pink will be the NC-CZ Zone area West of Jonesville Road, Orange will be NC-CZ Zone east of Jonesville Road.

Sheet C-5.1 - Partial Site Plan I

13. Add the noted symbol to the legend provided on the previous page.

Legends updated to reflect plans

14. Label ramps as required by LDO Section 9.2.1.B.10

Drawings will show City of Raleigh Engineering Standard HC Ramps

All ramps within ROW to use the most up to date NCDOT curb ramp details. (848.05)

Alternative Curb Ramps designs in private areas, parking and when hardship within ROW (grading concerns) (NCDOT alternative details type 1-8) may be used.

15. Label sidewalk width internal to the site.

All internal sidewalks are 5ft typical. And will be labeled.

16. Label Street names.

After this submittal street names will be submitted to Wake County 911

repeat: noted till addressed.

17. Label the ROW Width.

As noted.

18. Lot 167 and Lots 138 through 145 do not meet the minimum 50-foot lot width required in Table 3.1.2.

Cluster lots minimum can be measured at front setback line at minimum of 50ft.

19. There are areas labeled as Open Space that are located to the rear of the individual lots or between the rear of a lot and ROW. This looks like an error as these should be buffer areas.

See Open Space Data Table Comment response 5.

- a. Correct the symbol and label the buffer width AND buffer type. For instance, along Jonesville Road there should be a Streetscape Buffer.

Perimeter Buffer surrounding Cluster: Type 2 Landscape Buffer 15 feet with fence.

3 Canopy Trees per 100' outside of Fence

1 understory tree per 100' outside of Fence

50 shrubs per 100' outside of Fence

6' fence inside of Property Line

Street Buffer Yard Along both Mitchell Mill and Jonesville Road 30 feet wide

One Canopy Tree per 40 LF

Local Street One canopy tree per 60LF

20. For all Open Space areas, please clarify the size (in sq. ft. and acreage) and type of open space (passive, active, park, etc).

Refer to Open Space Data Table Item no 5.

21. Regarding the Community Garden:

- a. Will there be sidewalks within this area? Please label sidewalks.
- b. Will the pollinator garden be located here as well?

There will be soft trails and one of pollinator garden located here

The Gardens will be included in a future Amenity Plan submittal as part of the Final Plat

Label this area/Lot for
"future plan submittal"

Sheet C-5.2 - Partial Site Plan II

22. Correctly label buffer and open space areas include their width/sizes.

Will be labeled and cross referenced to Open Space Data Table, see no 5

- a. Stormwater facilities can go towards PASSIVE OPEN SPACE requirements so long as they meet the limitations of LDO Sec 6.2.1.G.7

Will be noted on the Open Space Data Table

23. Include Greenway in Legend.

Legend updated

Repeat: missing in Legend

- a. Label the public easement width as required by LDO 6.2.1.J.2
Width as noted is 30 ft as from Planning director approval

24. Label sidewalk widths and ramps.

Duly noted, see comment 15,

25. Lots 78-82 and Lot 88 do not meet the 50-foot-wide minimum lot width requirement.

See Comment 18.

26. Specify which housing type and zoning district the detail applies to if there are any differences between districts.

Detail removed and SFH Cluster detail and Townhome typical details shown on Site Data/Zoning Conditions

27. The street's name is "Gro Peg LANE".

Duly noted and revised,

Sheet C-5.3 - Partial Site Plan III

28. Label buffer width.

Perimeter Buffer Type 2 15 feet

Street Yard Buffer 30ft

29. Label sidewalks.

See comment 15

30. Label Open Space types and sizes in sq. ft. and acreage.

Duly Noted, See Open Space Data Chart Comment 5

31. Label SCM sizes.

Duly Noted see SIA Report

32. The following lots are not 50-feet-wide:

- a. Lots 67 and 68
- b. Lots 79 thru 81
- c. Lot 88
- d. Lots 117 thru 119
- e. Lots 122 thru 128

See Comment 18

33. The area noted on the plan sheet was labeled as having a Community Garden on it on MA22-06 Concept Plan. Is that still the intention here?

Yes, it will be shown in greater detail at Final Plat submittal

34. Label retaining walls.

Walls removed as for revised grading plan, Details by others.

Sheet C-5.4 - Partial Site Plan IV

35. Label the following:

- a. Street Names
- b. ROW Width of Jonesville Road
- c. SCM sizes

Duly Noted, Street Names submitted see comments 16,17, 31and SIA Report

36. Lots 4 and 5 do not meet the 50-foot-wide minimum lot width.

See Comment 18

37. Label retaining walls

Duly Noted See comment 34.

Sheet C-5.5 - Partial Site Plan V

38. Label retaining walls

Duly Noted See Comment 34..

39. Label stream buffer width.

UDO Section4.2.9 Section 1 buffer 100 ft and section 2 Buffer 50 ft

40. Label Street Name.

Duly Noted see comment 16

41. Label street names.

Duly Noted see comment 16

42. Label SCM and open space sizes.

See Open Space Data Table Comment 5 and Comment 31.

43. Label ramps.

Duly Noted see comment 14

44. Per Table 3.4.3, the MINIMUM lot length for Townhomes the NC Zoning District is 100 feet. Please revise individual lots to meet this requirement.

Townhome layout has been revised substantially from the previous submittal.

45. Provide easement width of the SCM easement.

Duly Noted, see comment 31

46. For all Open Space areas, please clarify the size (in sq. ft. and acreage) and type of open space (passive, active, park, etc).

See Open Space Data Table Comment 5

47. Text Amendment TA23-05 is not relevant to this project and has not been approved. For the adjacent parcel, please just note the property owner, PIN or Parcel ID, use, and existing zoning district.

Townhomes have been redesigned to meet TA-23-05 conditions as original plans were approved without parking requirements.

Adjacent owner are all Wake County R-30 zone, and owner information will be updated as per GIS information.

48. Please clarify what is in the called-out box on the plan set.

Box items revised

Sheet C-5.6 - Partial Site Plan VI

49. Label clubhouse parking.

Club House Area will be separate site plan submittal after Plat Approved.

50. Label street name.

Duly noted see comment 16

51. Lots 4, 5, 67, and 68 are not 50-feet wide.

Duly Noted see comment 18.

52. There are retaining walls shown here on the Grading Plan sheet C7.6. Please label.

See comment 34

53. What is this area adjacent to "Street C"?

Site plan revised and area relabeled See Open Space Data Table Comment 5

Sheet C-5.7 - Partial Site Plan VII

54. Additional information must be provided about the commercial portion of the project as Table 3.4.3 is very specific about the required gross area devoted to both commercial and residential uses.

See Site Data Table Item Number 5

55. Label Open Space types and size.

Refer to Open Space Data Table comment 5.

56. Label SCM size and width of all shown SCM easements.

Duly noted. See comment response 31.

57. Lots 47 thru 49 are not 50-feet wide.
Duly Noted, See Note 18.

58. Please clarify what is intended in the highlighted parking area. On the MA 22-06 Rezoning Concept Plan it is labeled as a Park. Please clarify what the intention is for this parking lot as it is too far to service either the residential or the commercial aspects of the site.
As staff recommended Site Plan was revised to meet Town Code.

Sheet C-5.8 - Partial Site Plan VIII

59. Clarify Open Space Boundaries, Type, and size.
Refer to Open Space Data Table comment 5.

60. Label all retaining walls on this sheet.
Duly noted see comment 34.

61. Label the Streetscape Buffer.
Streetscape and Perimeter buffers will be labeled.

62. The following Lots are not 50-feet wide.

- a. Lots 17 thru 23
 - b. Lots 26 and 27
 - c. Lots 35, 39, 42 and 53
- See Comment 18**

Sheets C-7.0 – C-7.8 - Grading Plan

63. Label existing vegeion to be preserved.

64. Label TPF.

65. Label critical root zones.
All saved and protected vegetation will be labeled appropriately.

Sheet C-8.0 - Preservation and Landscaping plan (this sheet is BLANK)

66. A Preservation and Landscaping Plan was not provided with this submittal. When resubmitting, please note that the following should be provided:

- a. The plan needs to show all information listed in LDO Section 6.2.4.5.C. A written version of the Tree Survey was provided, however the information noted on that report needs to be shown within the plan set on the Preservation Plan.

Tree Report prepared and will be submitted

- b. A landscape plan should also be provided with the project. Please consult LDO Section 6.2 regarding the requirements of the landscape plan for the scope of this project.

Parking Lot Planting

All Spaces within 60 of a Canopy Tree

Terminal Islands minimum 8 feet by 18 feet

One tree every 150 sf of island, minimum 1 tree or 2 Understory Trees

Shrubs or Ground Cover at 100% of Island within 2 years of growth

Perimeter shrubs continuous row 3ft OC, 4ft tall max height with maintenance.

c. Additional comments will be provided once materials have been provided.

67. The RM-CZ area of the site was approved by the Board as a “*Cluster Development*”. Please note the following requirements from LDO Section 3.1.B:

- a. Cluster Developments shall designate at least forty (40) percent of the site for contiguous open space.
See Open Space Data Table Comment 5
- b. Open space areas within the perimeter of the subdivision can be used for the buffering requirements.
See Open Space Data Table Comment 5
- c. The required open space **must be** conserved as a conservation easement. (Hopper Development)
Conservation Easement information at Final Plat submittal
- d. Required open space, recorded as a conservation easement, shall be indicated on **all** development approval.
Duly noted see more information at Final Plat submittal
- e. A Type 2 buffer shall be provided for Cluster Developments.
 - i. The Type 2 buffer may be counted towards **no more than 50%** of the required open space percentage for a Cluster Development.
 - ii. These buffers may also allow pedestrian paths within the buffers.
 - iii. These buffers shall be platted as separate Lots to be owned and maintained by the Homeowner’s Association or similar entity.
Type 2 Buffers will be shown and are listed in Open Space Data Table

Part Two BOLTON & MENK Engineering Comments

- *Sheet C-1.0:*

Update the submittal name and number to the correct one: PSP-23-03.

This has been updated.

1. Add contact information for Owner/Applicant/Consultants/Property Owner and the FIRM Map Panel number for this site.

This has been updated.

2. Confirm parcel information. According to iMAPS, there is only one pin for this property, not two, and the acreage varies from what is currently shown in the Site Information.

This has been updated.

3. Correct the location address (5109 not 5019).

This has been updated.

4. Break down setbacks for each zoning and make sure they match LDO Article 3.1.2. (RM, SF, and TH)

This has been updated.

5. Confirm the proposed lots. What is currently shown does not match MA 22-06.

This submittal has been revised subject to TA-23-05

6. The sheet index needs to be updated to reflect the sheets included. Currently the sheet numbering shows 63 sheets, not 35. Please check and revise sheet numbering and the sheet index accordingly. **This has been updated.**

a. Please provide the following sheets with future submittals:

- Signed sealed survey/TOPO **Survey has been completed by Timmons Group and is included with this submittal and has been used as basis for this Preliminary Site Plan Submittal**

- Site Details

- Typical Street Sections

b. Confirm what utility improvements will be required along Jonesville Road and Mitchell Mill Road. Will these be separate plans or included in future submittals? **This will be confirmed during detailed CD design.**

- *Sheet C-3.0:*

7. Please add curve information for existing adjoiners or master boundary. **These callouts/references were on the previous submittal. Please reach out to Josh Lambert for clarification on this item.**

8. Please add symbol(s) for survey monuments/irons to your legend. **This is provided on the Timmons Survey (attached to this submittal)**

9. Label all ROW widths. a. This comment applies to all sheets. **This has been updated.**

10. Add bearing and distance for line segment in the SE corner. **This has been updated.**

- *Sheet C-4.0:*

11. Construction entrances appear to affect more than the trees marked as demo. Check all trees that need to be removed are included in this plan. **This plan is schematic; The Erosion Control Plans and Sequence will dictate tree removal.**

12. Please include wetland impacts in the demolition plan. a. Labeling the wetland impacts also applies to all other sheets. **Wetland Impacts will be applied for during CD design phase.**

- *Sheet C-5.0:*

13. Per the LDO, Section 9.2.1.B.5.c, the minimum distance between intersections that cannot be aligned is 200 feet. Please review and revise. **Can we meet offline to discuss? Street M is a location that needs to be evaluated but serves a small number of lots;**

14. Following NCDOT's minimum design criteria, minimum centerline radii are as follows:

a. Local Roads: 230'

b. Collector Roads: 310'

c. Please review and revise accordingly.

15. When revising the street layouts due to the comments above, please take note that the minimum intersection angle is 60 degrees per LDO Section 9.2.1.B.5.C.

Understood; Streets K and L will be evaluated.

16. Please review hatching for the flood zones; they are very similar in the legend and hard to differentiate. **This has been updated.**

17. Show setback table or reference cover. (LDO Article 3.1.2) **This has been updated.**

18. Show ADA ramps at intersections. **This has been updated.**

19. Show buffers for the commercial lot. **This has been updated.**

20. Please confirm the intent for the curb and gutter. The legend calls out standard curb everywhere. Will curb type be adjusted for the townhome area? Will there be any mountable curb? **Mountable curb is preferred for the townhome area if town allows. This will be addressed during CD design.**

- *Sheet C-5.1:*

21. Label and dimension all buffers. a. This comment applies to all sheets. **This has been updated.**

22. Confirm the access easement between Lot 146 to the Community Garden. People will have to walk into Lot 146 to access Community Garden? a. The house on Lot 146 does not appear to be constructible and/or meet the minimum depth requirements of the LDO. Clarify intent and/or revise accordingly. **This has been updated. There will be a boardwalk for a short portion of greenway across the small wetlands area.**

23. Town of Rolesville uses the terminology “side path”. a. Side paths should continue to pedestrian ramps and crosswalks. **This has been updated.**

24. The SCM access easement has a wall in the middle of it, and the easement is inside an existing sewer easement on site. Please review and revise accordingly. **This has been updated.**

25. The retaining wall geogrid will be on private lots along this pond. Please review and revise accordingly. **This has been updated.**

a. Will there be a wall easement?

b. This comment applies to all retaining walls on various sheets.

- *Sheet C-5.2:*

26. Label the zone that the typical driveway placement is for. a. Include any details to show driveway placement for corner or side entry lots. **Driveway placement is determined by builder product which is being determined.**

27. The buffer will stop on each side of easements. Please revise the linework accordingly. **This has been updated.**

28. The greenway easement is on private lots; Please confirm intent. **This has been updated.**

29. Extend ROW to the property line. All roadways should be constructed to the property line for future connections. a. This comment applies to all dead-end roads on various sheets. **This has been updated.**

- *Sheet C-5.3:*

30. Please clarify the linework shown at the top of page. They appear to be easement lines, but there are duplicates and they are crossing private lots. **This has been updated.**

31. The private drainage easement is connected to an SCM maintenance easement. Confirm why this is being made private. **Wouldn't HOA maintain SCM in perpetuity?**

32. Review and revise the SCM access easement; it is currently crossing private lots. **This has been updated.**

33. Confirm lots meet the minimum width requirements in the LDO and are therefore buildable. Review and revise. a. This comment applies to all lots and therefore multiple sheets. **Lot width is measured at the front Setback.**

34. Please label any road improvements on Gro-Peg Road, including buffers. **There's potential for curb and gutter along the frontage, this is being determined.**

- *Sheet C-5.4:*

35. SCM embankment cannot be in CORPUD easement. Please Revise. **Final grading is being adjusted throughout CD design.**

36. Please confirm and label side setbacks. a. This comment applies to all sheets. **This has been updated.**

37. Please confirm which side these lots are getting access from. **This has been updated.**

- *Sheet C-5.5:*

38. The plan set mentions Town Home Development Design is subject to TA-23-05 but this Text Amendment has not been published yet. Either confirm with Town when publishing will occur or consider adding notes to clarify the intent for this project. a. If this is a note just for reviewers, it should be removed from final plans. **TA-23-05 has been approved.**

39. LDO states a minimum of 30' between Townhomes and this is not met throughout the site. Review and revise. **This submittal has been revised subject to TA-23-05**

40. Please confirm what the walk extending off the end of Mews 'H' will connect to. **This submittal has been revised subject to TA-23-05**

41. Please confirm what the 18' and 9' dimensions shown on Mews 'E' are defining; also, the 9' dimension on the end of Mews 'H'. **This submittal has been revised subject to TA-23-05**

42. There is excess pavement included throughout the Townhomes area that appear to have no purpose of benefit to the site. Please explain or remove these areas. **This submittal has been revised subject to TA-23-05**

43. Parking at the end of Mews 'U' does not allow for backing out of the spot onto the travel way. Please review and revise. **This submittal has been revised subject to TA-23-05**

44. Please label whether the Mews will be private or public. **This submittal has been revised subject to TA-23-05**

45. The radius at the intersection of Mews 'X' and Mews 'W' does not meet the requirement for fire access. **This submittal has been revised subject to TA-23-05**

- *Sheet C-5.6:*

46. The hammerhead areas will not be sufficient for firetruck turnaround. Please confirm the intent and provide dimensions. **This submittal has been revised subject to TA-23-05**

47. Please add a label for the future commercial section. **This has been updated.**

- *Sheet C-5.7:*

48. Based on the number of crosswalks shown, it is highly recommended to review and revise to reduce the amount of mid-block crossings. All mid-block crossings will require signage in addition to striping. **This has been updated.**

49. Impervious pavement is currently shown in the stream buffer. Review and revise. **This has been updated.**

- *Sheet C-5.8:*

50. Impervious materials are not allowed inside stream buffers. What will be the plan for material or crossings for the MUP in this area. **This has been updated.**

51. Walls are shown inside access easements, and this will prohibit access to the pond. Please revise the plan set. **This has been updated.**

- *Sheet C-6.0: Existing Water is being field located and will be updated in future submittal.*

52. Confirm the following waterline sizes:

- 12" for Road I & J Corridors
- Waterline for Jonesville Rd.
- Mitchell Mill Rd.

- *Sheet C-6.1:*

53. Please revise to show a waterline connection to Jonesville Rd. The current design has two blow offs and no connection to water. Please include the size of the waterline and the proposed material. **Existing Water is being field located and will be updated in future submittal.**

54. Please correct the typo for the northern blow off assembly note. a. This comment also applies to the blow off assembly notes on all other Utility Plan sheets. **This will be updated.**

Sheet C6.3:

55. The waterline will not be able to bend around this cul-de-sac as proposed. Consider ending it straight in to save on pipe and fittings as well. **This will be updated.**

56. FES and pipe will need to extend through and past the wall for constructability. **Wall has been reduced**

- *Sheet C-6.4:*

57. This SCM is inside of the existing sewer easement for CORPUD, and this will not be allowed. Please revise going forward. **This has been updated.**

- *Sheet C-6.5:*

58. Please add "existing" to the dry pond label to differentiate the pond from proposed SCM's. **This has been updated.**

- *Sheet C-6.6:*

59. Drainage Easement is needed on the pipe outside of ROW. **This has been updated.**

60. Water and sewer connections, as well as hydrants, will need to be provided to the future commercial lot. a. This comment also applies to Sheet C-6.7. **We are working with ownership on layout and connection points.**

61. If the intent is that street and utilities are to be connected to and extended in the future, utilities need to be extended to the property line. **This has been updated.**

- *Sheet C-6.8:*

62. The waterline on street A will need to connect to the waterline in Mitchell Mill Rd. Update labels to match the new condition. **Existing water is being field located and the utility design will be updated.**

63. Please show the waterline along Mitchell Mill Rd. and include size and material label.
Existing water is being field located and utility design will be updated.

- *Sheet C-7.3:*
64. Review the retaining wall on the west side of the site. There is a length that is less than half a foot tall and may not be necessary. **This is a callout showing where the wall terminates to existing grade. Grading plan has been updated.**
- *Sheet C-7.7:*
65. Review SCM #3's size and design. The SCM does not seem to be big enough size to get a forebay and main pool into the SCM. **This has been updated.**
- *Sheet C-8.0 (35 of 35):*
66. Page 35 Preservation Plan is blank. Remove if not needed. **Sheet set has been modified.**
- *Sheet C-8.0 (35 of 63):*
67. Please review and correct page numbering. Prior to this page, the page numbering was XX of 35. This sheet now shows a duplicate 35 of 63 sheets, and the last sheet in the plan set is 62 of 63. **Sheet set has been modified.**
68. A sentence about installing diversion ditches is repeated in notes 1 & 2 of the Stage 1 Specific Sequence. Please review and revise. **This has been updated.**
69. Notes refer to the Town of Knightdale instead of the Town of Rolesville. Please correct. **This has been updated.**
- *Sheet C-8.1:*
70. Construction entrances appear to affect more than the trees marked as demo. Check all trees that need to be removed are included in this plan. **This plan is schematic; The Erosion Control Plans and Sequence will dictate tree removal.**
71. Review the site and add tree protection. **This plan is schematic; The Erosion Control Plans and Sequence will dictate tree removal.**
- *Sheet C-8.9:*
72. Confirm when the construction of the retaining walls will occur. Are they required in Phase 1 of soil and erosion control for construction of the SBs? **A detailed erosion design will be used to analyze the cost benefit of building permanent pond shape (and therefore walls). This will be addressed during CDs**

Construction Drawings:

Please consider the following for CDs; These comments are shown as green in the markups and are not required for approval of the preliminary plat:

All comments below are noted.

Sheet C-5.2:

A. Provide retaining wall details or label as designed by others for clarification.

Sheet C-6.0:

B. Storm Drainage package review will be required during CDs and should include 10-year storm, gutter spread, pre-post maps, impervious maps, and Inlet DA maps. For any culverts, we will also review the 25-year storm.

Sheet C-6.9:

C. With the CD set, street and utility profiles will be required. Please make sure to include the following labels:

- a. Minimum cover over pipe
- b. Minimum separation between crossing pipes
- c. Pipe sizes, lengths, and slope
- d. Manhole labels including rim and inverts
- e. Existing ground and proposed ground
- f. Vertical curve lengths shall be in increments of 50'
- g. K values and maximum street grades shall be defined by terrain classification per NCDOT Subdivision Roads Minimum Construction Standards

Sheet C-7.1:

D. In efforts to collect drainage onsite for stormwater management, consider adding rear yard swales.

- a. Roof drainage will also need collected and managed.
- i. This comment applies to several areas and several sheets.

Overall project:

Will this subdivision be phased? If yes, think through phasing for not only streets and lot development, but also utilities and drainage/stormwater management. A phasing plan should be included, and phase lines should be reflected on all sheets so site improvements and utilities can be confirmed for constructability.