

## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Meredith Gruber, Town of Rolesville, Planning Director  
Michael Elabarger, Town of Rolesville, Senior Planner

**CC:** Kelly Arnold, Town of Rolesville, Manager

**From:** Liza Monroe  
Karen Morgan Mallo, AICP

**Date:** March 2, 2022

**Project:** Parker Ridge Rezoning  
MA 22-03

**Subject:** Rezoning Application Review Comments

---

We have completed a review of the rezoning application completed by Lennar Carolinas LLC, submitted on February 1, 2022. The project proposes the construction of 180 single-family detached dwellings and 130 townhouse dwellings, on approximately 88.36 acres, located on School Street and Redford Place Drive. The current zoning of the site is RL, R, and PUD. The proposed zoning is RM and RH.

When resubmitting, please cloud or highlight in another color any revisions to the plan set. Staff suggests doing so in red for an easier review. We offer the following comments:

### A. Application Documents Provided

1. There are four total parcels [ PIN's 1758988411, 1768091558, 1758884270, 1758983710 ] proposed as a part of this development yet on some application sheets, only three are mentioned. The Exhibit A in the application package lists all 4 of these parcels. If the intention is to recombine the parcels, existing property lines need to be shown on an existing conditions sheet as "to be removed".
2. Within the narrative on page 8, the applicant mentions open space and active open space being provided. Location of open space should be shown on the concept plan.
3. The applicant has provided conditions with their submittal but has not noted that this would be a conditional zoning on page one of the application ["Requested Zoning District RM and RH"]. The Concept Plan does express "RM-CZ" and "RH-CZ". Please correct these inconsistencies. If approved with the Proposed Conditions, the conditional zoning district shall be "RM-CZ" and "RH-CZ", and must be aware and adhere to the following:
  - a. LDO Section 3.3., with note to Section 3.3.B.2 which indicates, "*Conditions and site specific standards imposed in a conditional district shall be standards above and beyond the requirements of the LDO; conditions shall not lesser the standards ~~in~~ LDO.*"
  - b. LDO Section 1.14 of Appendix A. Conditions of Approval
  - c. LDO Section 2.3 of Appendix A, with note to Section 2.3.F.8., which indicates, "*If a conditional rezoning, the BOC may also consider if the conditional rezoning addresses the impacts reasonably expected to be generated by the development use of the site, can reasonably be implemented and enforced for the subject property, and if it will mitigate specific issues that would likely result if the subject property were zoned to accommodate all the uses and the minimum standards of the corresponding general zoning district*"

4. To ensure that new development and redevelopment does not adversely affect the capacity of streets and intersections to accommodate vehicular traffic safely and efficiently, a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) is required to be submitted with the rezoning application per LDO Section 8.C. This has not been provided.

## **B. Proposed Conditions**

1. Remove the plan preparation date from the conditions as it is considered a draft until approved or include a last revised date.
2. No comments on condition #2.
3. Please provide the maximum density proposed for this parcel / zoning area.
4. No comments on condition #4.
5. Please provide the maximum density proposed for this parcel / zoning area.

## **C. Concept Plan Sheet**

While a site plan is not required as a portion of the conditional zoning application it is extremely helpful, not only the staff and reviewers but to the Planning Board and Board of Commissioners in the review of the proposed rezoning. The proposed concept plan does not show the detail necessary to determine any mitigation efforts of the impacts of the requested rezoning, such as buffers, traffic improvements, recreation, and environmental resource protection. As mentioned previously, LDO Section 2.3.F.8. of Appendix A of the LDO, indicates, *“If a conditional rezoning, the BOC may also consider if the conditional rezoning addresses the impacts reasonably expected to be generated by the development or use of the site.”*

We suggest that the applicant amend the application to include, at a minimum, a sketch plan addressing the following items, for staff and the Board to determine the impact of the proposed rezoning, compliance and/or exceedance of ordinance requirements, and what additional conditions are needed to reduce the impacts from the proposed rezoning and eventual development of this site.

1. A Sketch Plan set including:
  - a. Cover Sheet– Should include the following:
    - i. Project name and project number
    - ii. Applicant and owner contact information
    - iii. Site data table including acreage, existing and proposed zoning, proposed units/housing types, proposed density per housing type, open space required, open space proposed, parking required, parking proposed, building height allowed, building height proposed, etc.
    - iv. Vicinity Map
    - v. General Notes
    - vi. A box for dates of the original submittal and any resubmittals
    - vii. North arrow

b. Existing Conditions Sheet– Should include the following:

- i. Environmental features and associated buffers. There appears to be several streams and wetland areas shown on iMaps
- ii. Existing structures (& a note whether they are to be demolished)
- iii. Existing ROW
- iv. Existing easements (& a note whether they are to be demolished)
- v. Existing utilities (& a note whether they are to be demolished)
- vi. Existing vegetation locations & size
- vii. Existing structures to be demoed
- viii. Existing property lines to be removed
- ix. Existing environmental features
- x. Zoning district and use of the property and adjacent properties
- xi. North arrow
- xii. Scale

c. Concept Sketch/Site Plan Sheet– Should include the following:

- i. Proposed building locations including height and building footprint (houses and any proposed amenities)
- ii. Proposed rights-of-way and parking
- iii. Proposed easements
- iv. Proposed utilities
- v. Open space areas
- vi. Environmental features and associated buffers
- vii. Setbacks (per LDO 3.1.2 & LDO 6.8.5H for structures with street-facing garages)
- viii. Lot widths and areas compliant with LDO 3.1.2
- ix. North arrow
- x. Scale

d. Architectural designs –Provide an architectural design sheet that includes the following (and consent statement if applicable),

- i. Building heights compliant with LDO 3.1.2
- ii. Facades of singlefamily structures that comply with the standards of LDO 6.8.5D & 6.8.5I
- iii. All materials noted and used in compliance with LDO 6.8.5E & 6.8.5F
- iv. A sketch of a block that shows compliancewith Architectural Variability standards noted in LDO 6.8.5G

**D. Comprehensive Plan Consistency/FLUM**

The proposed rezoning is consistent with the 2017 Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map distinction which shows this area of Rolesville as high density residential on the FLUM.

High density is defined as a mixed-use neighborhood of single family, duplex, condominium, townhouse or multifamily residential. These are lots or tracts at a density range of six to twelve dwelling units per gross acre including preserved open space areas along with nonresidential uses under planned unit development or form base code provisions.

**E. General Design Comments**

Although specific details are not provided on the sketch plan, we offer the following so that the applicant may make adjustments to design and/or conditions PRIOR to rezoning. We reserve the opportunity to provide additional comments once a site plan is submitted:

1. Although the LDO is silent on the requirements for mailbox kiosks, we ask that the applicant indicate the location of proposed kiosks, the number of mailboxes provided, and the location and number of associated parking spaces to be allocated for mailbox parking.
2. If any additional landscaping is to be provided, we ask that a Landscape Plan be submitted with subsequent submission.
3. In previous submittals and meetings, there was a commercial [non-residential] component to the site mentioned. Please clarify if/that this is no longer the intent?
4. LDO Sections 6.2.2. / 6.2.2.1.G. requires the provision of buffers between zoning districts. If this project is creating two distinct zoning districts, the applicant should provide for a 25', Type 3 buffer between the RM and RH zoning districts. We will defer further comment on the provision of buffers to the Town Staff.
5. Street D and School Street are not shown in alignment. The alignment of these streets should be considered as a condition of rezoning. Further, the applicant should address the status of physical access to the existing homes [PIN's 1758997386, 1758998460, 1758999444, 1768090349/1768080437 (common ownership) on School Street and the potential provision of a streetscape buffer (LDO Section 6.2.2.2).
6. The length of the cul-de-sac of Street G / Long Melford Drive, in particular beyond the intersection with Street H, causes issue, considering that Street H is only a stub street and has no proposed timeline for connection. Further, we believe a turn-around at Street H is warranted until such time that the connection is made. Roads and blocks should be designed in accordance with LDO Section 9.2.1 and 9.2.2.
7. Per LDO Section 3.1.2., the minimum lot width for [Single-family Detached use in] the RM Zoning District is 85'. However, the lot widths on the concept plan do not appear to meet the minimum width, unless the applicant is requesting a cluster development, in which case the plans shall be designed in accordance with LDO Section 3.1.B. [and per LDO Section 3.1.2.B., Lot width minimum for cluster is 40']. Further, the open spaces in a cluster development need to be examined during the rezoning; the applicant should identify all recreation spaces and open spaces clearly on the plans and provide open space calculations, in accordance with Section 6.2.1.D.
  - a. IF Cluster Development is proposed, revise documents very explicitly and clear as to which – or both – proposed Zoning Districts (the RM and/or the RH) is sought to be developed under Cluster Development standards.
  - b. If Cluster Development is being proposed, we would further suggest that the applicant demonstrate compliance with the dimensional standards for the zoning districts, specifically setbacks.
  - c. The applicant should note that, in the RH District per LDO Section 3.1.3.B, that although a 15' front setback is required, this setback does not allow for sufficient length to park a car in the driveway. Thus if front-loaded driveways are proposed, that

driveway shall be required to be the minimum 18' in depth, and thus a 15' front setback could not actually be utilized.

8. LDO Section 3.1.3.B ("Special Standards") indicates that no more than 15 gross acres may be assigned to attached or multiple family uses. This acreage limit shall be applied to the total of all attached and multifamily uses within a subdivision. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the acreage limit may be divided within and/or distributed throughout a subdivision. The applicant should demonstrate compliance with this requirement.