

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: January 18, 2022

Project: Former Thales – Wait Avenue Subdivision - Pulte

Subject: Preliminary Plat – 3rd Review Comments (PR 21-01)

We have completed a review of PR 21-01, the third submittal of the Preliminary Plat for Thales – Wait Avenue, completed by Stewart, dated December 23, 2020, and last revised on December 23, 2021. The project proposes the construction of 105 Single-Family Dwellings and 191 Townhouses, on approximately 93.23 acres, located on Wait Avenue. The current zoning of the two-parcel site (PIN #1850-95-0449 and 1860-04-5778) is R-PUD. The project site is subject to a previously approved Special Use Permit (SUP 18-01). A revised Special Use Permit application (SUP 21-01) is being considered concurrently with this Preliminary Plat application.

There have been several submissions of the revised Special Use Permit and Preliminary Plat. With each application, the proposed conditions have changed, the number of units has been revised, and the overall layout is redesigned slightly.

Application Type	Approved	1st Submittal	2 nd Submittal	3 rd Submittal
Special Use Permit	143 single-family lots (SUP18-01)	288 units (SUP21-01)	329 units (SUP21-01)	315 units (SUP21-01)
Preliminary Plat (PR21-01)	N/A	292 units	298 units	296 units

Please note that comments have been included directly on the plan set as well as within this memorandum. There are several comments that request information not previously shown on the plan as well as addressing the change in the number of units. We reserve the right to provide additional comments based upon new information provided with this submission or in response to comments made in this review and submitted at a later date. When resubmitting, please **CLOUD OR HIGHLIGHT IN ANOTHER COLOR ANY REVISIONS** to the plan set and **FLATTEN THE PLAN SET** before submitting. Repeat comments are shown *italicized*. We offer the following:

A. Special Use Permit

A resubmittal of the Special Use Permit, SUP21-01, has been received and has been reviewed. Comments are provided under separate cover. Many of the comments addressed within this memorandum and on the marked-up plan set are contingent upon the approval and issuance of the SUP or other method of relief, as determined by the Town’s Planning Director and Attorney.

Note: The SUP Master Plan indicated that a minimum lot size for the single-family, detached lots is proposed at 5,000 square feet. It should be noted that no SFD lots shown on the Preliminary Plat are less than 6,000 square feet.

B. Cover Sheet

1. The Site Data Table should show the standard, the UDO requirement, and what is being proposed, for each of the standards (eg. open space, setbacks, and building height). Standards such as lot size and lot width should be added to the Site Data. Where there is a deviation or relief from the UDO, a note should be added to the plans indicating the method and date of approval allowing such deviation.
2. Include actual building height in feet within the site data table. UDO Section 8.3.2 notes different separation requirements for townhomes depending upon structure height.
3. The UDO 6.2.3.2(h), states that 15% of the gross area dedicated for townhouse uses is required as open space and of that open space, 35% should be improved recreation area. UDO Section 15.4.8.2 indicates that a minimum of 10% of the gross acreage shall be dedicated for open space and that 50% of the dedicated land shall be suitable for active recreation.

The plans should be updated to show the correct amount required & provided in BOTH acreage AND percentage. It should be noted that the applicant is proposing a “design commitment” / “condition” of the SUP to provide 30% of the gross acreage as open space and 100,000 square feet of active recreation area.

4. The minimum building setbacks listed in the Site Data table are those proposed by this application. However, as stated in Item 1 of this memo, the UDO requirements should be listed. Further, it should be noted that this design element is contingent on the approval of the associated, revised SUP (SUP 21-01) or other method of deviation or relief.
5. Within the Amenity Area/Active Recreation calculations:
 - a. What is this future amenity? Details of this area should be shown on the plans and noted on the calculations. If it is a structure or programmed gathering space, parking is required and needs to be reflected in the site data table.
 - b. The acreage shown here is not consistent with what is shown on the site plan. (ie. AA 8 is shown as 1.65 acres on C3.03)
6. Within the parking section of the site data table:
 - a. In Phase 1, there are 35 spaces shown in phase one on the site plan sheets; 9 mailbox spaces. Correct the number within the table.
 - b. Include the required number of visitors spaces per phase and note what is being provided.
 - c. Breakout the number of units that are over 2 bedrooms to ensure the correct amount of parking is provided within each phase. List what is required by UDO Section 10 and what is being provided.

C. Typical Sections & Buffers

1. Per UDO 6.2.(e), bike paths, a minimum of four feet wide, shall be installed along both sides of minor and major thoroughfares or an eight-foot-wide bike path may also be

installed paralleling the minor or major thoroughfare. The bike path can replace the sidewalk normally required on the same side of the roadway. The applicant should indicate if a bike path is proposed for installation along Wait Avenue, as that road section has not been shown on the plans.

2. Per UDO Section 6.2.1.2(c)(3), a minimum rear setback of 25 feet is required for lots not serviced by alleys. The typical R1 Lot shows a 15' rear yard setback. This design element is contingent on the approval of the associated, revised SUP (SUP 21-01) or other method of deviation or relief.
3. Per UDO Section 6.2.3, a minimum rear yard setback of 15 feet is required for townhomes. The typical R3 Lot shows a 10' rear yard setback. This design element is contingent on the approval of the associated, revised SUP (SUP 21-01) or other method of deviation or relief.
4. Per UDO Section 6.2.1.2 (c)(2) and 6.2.3.2, corner lots will have a minimum of ten feet side setbacks for the sides facing public streets. The typical drawings for the R3 Townhouse lots indicate that the corner lots will have a 3' setback. This design element is contingent on the approval of the associated, revised SUP (SUP 21-01) or other method of deviation or relief.

D. Existing Conditions Plan

1. *Label tree protection fencing location and provide a detail. This may be shown on the landscape plan or site plan sheets as well. REPEAT COMMENT.* Tree save area has been labeled but TPF is not shown around these areas. Provide TPF around any existing vegetation to be preserved and add a symbol to the legend.
2. Are the structures shown to be removed? If so, a demolition plan should be provided OR the structures need to be marked on the existing conditions plan sheet as "To be removed".
3. Tree line is shown on the plan sheet but does not have any sort of protective fencing shown. Please clarify if the applicant intends to utilize existing vegetation to meet buffer requirements. If so, TPF needs to be labeled. Please ensure these areas are also reflected on the landscape plan.

E. Overall Site Plan

1. Building separation is required based upon the height of the structure per UDO 8.3.2. Additionally, no more than 8 THs are permitted in a single structure. On the site plan sheets, it appears there are more than 8 THs shown per structure. For clarification, setbacks should be shown for lots where building breaks will occur, in addition to the graphic at the top of the plan sheet.
2. The trail is shown meandering across the front of the property and is within both the ROW and the required buffer. The trail should be removed from the buffer and must be completely located within the ROW. There does not appear to be enough ROW to accommodate the curved nature of the trail and we recommend the path run straight, parallel to the right-of-way, with minimal curvature for safety and aesthetics.

3. As noted on the most recent plan provided with the SUP21-01 application, the number of units being shown per phase on the Master Plan is not consistent with the number of units being shown on the preliminary plat in those same locations.
4. Bike paths, a minimum of four feet wide, shall be installed along both sides of minor and major thoroughfares (minor and major arterials).
5. Lot 15 is in encroaching into the greenway easement.
6. Lot 35 appears to be encroaching into the wetlands area.
7. The limits of disturbance line runs through Lots 185, 288, and 289.
8. There is an easement or trail shown going through Lots 177 to 182 and in front of Lots 133-156 that appears to be a drainage or storm sewer easement. This should be labeled as such and building envelopes on these lots should not include any area within an easement.

F. Site Plan Northwest

1. *Cul-de-sacs shall not exceed 250 feet in length from the nearest intersection with a street providing through access (not a cul-de-sac) unless necessitated by topography or property accessibility. Cul-de-sac lengths longer than 250 feet will be reviewed for approval on a case-by-case basis. Cul-de-sacs are permitted where topography makes a street connection impracticable.* **REPEAT COMMENT.** The proposed cul-de-sacs are not in compliance with UDO Section 6.2. This design element is contingent on the approval of the associated, revised SUP (SUP 21-01) or other method of deviation or relief.
2. *Label setbacks for all single-family lots. UDO Sec 6.2.1* **REPEAT COMMENT.** The setbacks shown are not in compliance with UDO Sec 6.2. These design elements are contingent on the approval of the associated, revised SUP (SUP 21-01) or other method of deviation or relief.
3. *Label setbacks and lot width for all townhome lots / structures.* **REPEAT COMMENT.** The setbacks shown are not in compliance with UDO Sec 6.2. These design elements are contingent on the approval of the associated, revised SUP (SUP 21-01) or other method of deviation or relief.
4. *Townhouses are limited to eight (8) units per structure. The separation between structures shall be a minimum of 30 feet. UDO Sec 6.2.3* **REPEAT COMMENT.** Townhome structures are shown in greater than 8 units per structure. Also, building separation is noted at 20 feet which is not complaint with UDO Sec 8.3.2. Labeling the side yard setbacks could clarify if there is building separation and how much.
5. *Label existing vegetation and tree protection fencing location.* **REPEAT COMMENT.** TPF is not labeled around the wetland area, the riparian buffer, and some of the tree save areas that are shown to be preserved on the Existing Conditions plan sheet.
6. Label the acreage amount of each tree save area as it is shown on the existing conditions sheet and the overall site plan sheet.

7. Lot 35 is shown encroaching area that is noted as being preserved on other plan sheets.
8. Lots 288 and 289 have the LOD line running through them.

G. Site Plan East

1. *Label setbacks for all single-family lots. UDO Sec 6.2.1 REPEAT COMMENT.* The setbacks shown are not in compliance with UDO Sec 6.2. These design elements are contingent on the approval of the associated, revised SUP (SUP 21-01) or other method of deviation or relief.
2. *Label setbacks and lot width for all townhome structures. REPEAT COMMENT.* The setbacks shown are not in compliance with UDO Sec 6.2. These design elements are contingent on the approval of the associated, revised SUP (SUP 21-01) or other method of deviation or relief.
3. *Label existing vegetation and tree protection fencing location. REPEAT COMMENT.* TPF is not labeled around the wetland area, the riparian buffer, and tree save areas that are shown to be preserved on the Existing Conditions plan sheet.
4. Label the acreage amount of each tree save area as it is shown on the existing conditions sheet and the overall site plan sheet.
5. If serving 62 townhomes, the CBU would require a minimum of 3 signed parking spaces per UDO Section 9.16.3.
6. Per UDO Section 6.2, planting strips between six to seven feet in width shall be established between sidewalks and curbing in all residential areas. The width of the planting strips may be reduced to no less than a minimum of four feet as allowed by the available right-of-way. Label planting strips on all streets shown on this plan sheet.
7. Lots 133-156 appear to have a storm sewer or drainage easement along the rear/front property line. The easement should be labeled, and the building envelope should be free of any easement area.

H. Site Plan Southwest

1. The amenity center area is labeled, however there is not a structure shown. What are the applicant's intentions for this space? A structure would need to be shown as there are parking and access requirements that must be met.
2. *Label setbacks for all single-family lots. UDO Sec 6.2.1 REPEAT COMMENT.* The setbacks shown are not in compliance with UDO Sec 6.2. These design elements are contingent on the approval of the associated, revised SUP (SUP 21-01) or other method of deviation or relief.
3. *Label setbacks and lot width for all townhome structures. REPEAT COMMENT.* The setbacks shown are not in compliance with UDO Sec 6.2. These design elements are contingent on the approval of the associated, revised SUP (SUP 21-01) or other method of deviation or relief.

4. *Label existing vegetation and tree protection fencing location. REPEAT COMMENT.* TPF is not labeled around the wetland area, the riparian buffer, and tree save areas that are shown to be preserved on the Existing Conditions plan sheet.
5. Label the acreage amount of each tree save area as it is shown on the existing conditions sheet and the overall site plan sheet.
6. What is the line/easement shown running through Lots 177 to 182? Building envelopes should not contain any area encumbered by an easement.
7. Please clarify if there is a retaining wall behind Lot 182 as the arrow is pointing to the limits of disturbance.
8. Limits of disturbance is shown running through Lots 185, 288, and 289.
9. Bike paths, a minimum of four feet wide, shall be installed along both sides of minor and major thoroughfares (minor and major arterials). Alternatively, an eight-foot-wide bike path may be installed paralleling the minor or major thoroughfare. In this instance, the bike path can replace the sidewalk normally required on the same side of the roadway. An 8-foot-wide concrete sidewalk is shown on Thales Way and Austin Ridge Parkway. Is this meant to be labeled as the bike path?

I. Pavement Marking & Signage Plan Sheets

Required bike paths should be shown on the plan sheets with the appropriate pavement markings and/or signage.

J. All Grading Plan Sheets

1. *Label existing vegetation and tree protection fencing location on all grading plan sheets. REPEAT COMMENT.* TPF location is not shown at all required locations on the overall grading plan sheet. Also, there are trees shown as being preserved on the Existing Conditions plan sheet that are not shown on the grading plan (a layer may have been turned off accidentally).
2. Label the proposed path along the Wait Avenue frontage.

K. All Landscape Plan Sheets

1. Within the planting schedule, clarify what requirement each planting will be fulfilling. (ie. Buffer, parking shrub, street tree, etc.)
2. Provide landscape calculations showing what is required and what is provided.
3. The street trees are shown on individual properties. Street trees should be located within the planting strips (only if greater than 6 feet wide) or within a landscape easement. It is our recommendation that a blanket landscape easement be a condition of the SUP approval.

4. Street trees and/or buffer plantings are not shown on along the Wait Avenue frontage though required in UDO 14.6.7. The typical buffer, shown on Sheet 3 of 27, does indicate that a buffer is intended and that existing canopy trees will be used to fulfill the buffer requirements where applicable. We ask that the applicant show where existing trees are to be saved, the location of tree protection fencing, and where and what new landscaping is proposed.
5. The perimeter landscape buffer plantings are not shown on the landscape plan sheets. Both the location of plantings as well as number of plantings was not able to be determined.
6. The placement of street trees should avoid interference with storm sewer and other utilities where applicable.
7. The applicant should address the double frontage lots 133-156 and if any additional landscaping, fencing, or privacy treatment is proposed.

L. Other comments

1. *Street lighting plan required from utility provider during the plan review process per UDO Section 14.8.2. REPEAT COMMENT.*
2. Additional site details to be provided at CDs: TPF, planting detail, Mailbox signage, lighting detail, curb and gutter details, sidewalk details, retaining wall detail, Cluster Box Unit detail, etc.