

## 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:** June 1, 2022

**Project:** Hills at Harris Creek  
MA 22-01

**Subject:** Rezoning Application – 2<sup>nd</sup> Review Comments

---

We have completed a review of the rezoning application completed by Ellis Development Group for the development of Hills at Harris Creek located on Mitchell Mill Road. The accompanying site plan was completed by Strongrock Engineering Group. The project proposes the creation of a 157,952 square foot commercial lot, a one-acre amenity lot, and 320 residential lots (211 Single-Family Dwellings and 109 Townhouses), on approximately 115.94 acres. The current zoning of the site is Wake R30. The proposed zoning is Neighborhood Center Mixed Use (NC).

When resubmitting, please cloud or highlight in another color any revisions to the plan set as well as flatten the plan set. This application has been reviewed against the requirements found in the Town of Rolesville Land Development Ordinance (LDO). A comment response letter was not received with the second submittal so many of the review comments are repeat in nature as a response was not received. We offer the following:

### A. Application Documents Provided – ALL Comments are Repeat Comments

1. The application is signed by Timothy Smith but Register of Deeds shows that the Watkins are still the property owners. A Property Owner Authorization from should be submitted for each of the parcels noted.
2. Within the narrative on page 3, the applicant mentions “connectivity and walkability”. The location of greenway trails should be noted on the plan to show how they are proposing connection to existing and proposed trails.
3. The Parcel Identification Number (PIN) “**1757738648**” does not populate on iMaps nor the Register of Deeds website. Correct the application and legal description.
4. The address “**5326 Mitchell Mill Road**” as noted on the application and legal description of is for the property across the street. The correct PIN for this address/parcel is (PIN **1757738451**). This appears to be an error as this parcel is not a part of the site design.
5. There are two parcels within the site design with the address “**0 Mitchell Mill Road**” yet only one is mentioned. PIN 1757758529 is missing from both the application and the legal description.
6. In accordance with Section 8.C, a TIA is required prior to approval of any zoning map amendment (rezoning).

**B. Concept Plan – ALL Comments are Repeat Comments**

**In accordance with Section 3.4.3.B., a Site Plan is required as part of the Zoning Map Amendment.** 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.

The applicant shall amend the application to include, at a minimum, a site 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 potential 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 (Project Number: MA 22-01)
    - ii. Applicant and owner contact information
    - iii. Site data table including acreage, existing and proposed zoning, proposed units/housing types, maximum density allowed (8 units/acre per LDO 3.4.3D), proposed density per housing type, open space required, open space proposed, parking required, parking proposed, building height allowed, building height proposed, percentage of gross area for nonresidential uses, percentage of gross area for residential areas, 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 property lines to be removed
    - viii. Existing environmental features
    - ix. Zoning district and use of the property and adjacent properties
    - x. North arrow
    - xi. Scale
  - c. 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. There should be at least three (3) small open space types and two (2) medium open space types according to the LDO Section 6.2.1.D.2.
  - vi. Environmental features and associated buffers. The 30-foot-wide streetscape buffers should be dimensioned. Also, the mixed-used perimeter compatibility transition areas should be dimensioned per LDO 6.2.3.1B.
  - vii. Setbacks (per LDO 3.4.3 & LDO 6.8.5H for structures with street-facing garages)
  - viii. Lot widths and areas compliant with LDO 3.4.3
  - ix. Mailbox Units and associated parking
  - x. North arrow
  - xi. Scale
- d. Landscape Plan and Preservation Plan in accordance with 6.2.4.2.A.
- e. Architectural designs –Provide an architectural design sheet that includes the following (and consent statement if applicable),
  - i. Building heights compliant with LDO 3.4.3
  - ii. Facades of single-family 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 compliance with Architectural Variability standards noted in LDO 6.8.5G
- 2. Development zoned Neighborhood Mixed Center (NC) shall feature a minimum fifteen (15) percent allocation of gross area for nonresidential uses AND shall be a maximum seventy-five (75) percent of gross acreage can be dedicated to residential uses. Provide the correct percentages to ensure compliance with LDO Section 3.4.3.C. and D.
- 3. A 25' buffer is shown around the perimeter of the site. However, Mitchell Mill Road is subject to a streetscape buffer of a minimum of 30' in accordance with Section 6.2.2.2.
- 4. A note shall be added to the plans indicating compliance with Section 3.4.3.D.4. and 5 as it relates to the timing of development.
- 5. The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the Frontage requirements of the NC Zoning District outlined in Table 3.4.3.
- 6. The applicant should address the purpose of the proposed parking area. Is this for the amenity only? Is this for mailboxes? Is this for Townhouse guest parking? Note that if it to be used for guest parking, Section 6.4.3.L requires parking to be within 750 feet of the principal use.
- 7. The applicant should note that although the minimum required front building setback is 15', if garages are designed at the front setback and a driveway is provided, a 15' driveway length is insufficient to count as a parking space. A parking space shall be a minimum of 19' in length and shall not be permitted to overhang into a public or private right-of-way.
- 8. The proposed number of units served by one street access is of concern. We would recommend, at a minimum, the provision of a stub street to connect to future

development on the parcel to the north. Further, the length of the “cul-de-sac” does not appear to be in compliance with the requirement of Section 9.2.1.B.6. We ask that the applicant clarify the proposed Fire Access Easement. Is this for all emergency vehicles or only Fire? What is the pavement method? We request the Town Engineer and Fire Department / Emergency Services provide additional comment on this issue.

9. Sidewalks shall be provided in accordance with 9.2.1.C.
10. The plans should be revised to demonstrate compliance with the open space requirement of LDO Section 6.2.1E. There should be at least three (3) small open space types and two (2) medium open space types as outlined in Table 6.2.1.2. and meeting the design standards of 6.2.1.G.
11. The applicant should address the location and provision of Central Mailboxes and associated parking.

#### **C. 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 *medium density residential* on the FLUM.

Medium density is defined as predominately single-family residential uses with portions of duplex, townhouse or multifamily residential. These are lots or tracts at a density range of three to five dwelling units per gross acre including preserved open space areas along with limited non-residential uses under planned unit development or form base code provisions.

#### **D. New Comments Based Upon Changes to Plan**

1. Update the site data to include the breakdown of the number of lots between single family and townhomes.
2. Update the site data table to include the breakdown of parking spaces between uses.
3. By providing the architectural drawings, staff can assume that the applicant intends to comply with the architectural design guidelines noted into LDO Section 6.8.5. If an applicant chooses to comply with the guidelines of this section, the applicant shall include the consent statement within LDO Section 6.8.5C on any required application/permit and on the final plat.

It is worth noting that the materials should be included on the architectural drawings. The “Single Family #3” drawing appears to have vinyl which is prohibited except where used as an accent material, up to five (5) percent maximum of the façade per LDO Section 6.8.5.F.