

REZ-24-02 – Hills at Harris Creek – 1st Submittal review cycle

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| START DATE: FEBRUARY 02-05-24 | DUE DATE: _03-11-24 | TRC/STAFF Comments issued on: __03/11/2024__ |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|

| Review Group / Staff | Comments | Cleared Comments |
|---|--|------------------|
| Planning & Zoning – Planning Staff and WithersRavenel | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide a written response to ALL the comments. 2. Revise the dates on the Conditions and the Concept Plan drawing. 3. Open Space chart – <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Contiguous Open Space</u> - this makes mention to “Required __ 40%” – please clarify the intent by stating this, as per LDO 6.2.1.D.1., the RM District minimum open space requirement is 12%; LDO 3.1.B.1. has a minimum 40% open space requirement when choosing the “Cluster Development” option. As LDO 3.1.B. states: “Cluster development is approved as part of the Major Subdivision Preliminary Plat and shall be clearly indicated on the application.” b. <u>Site Density</u> – this mentions “Cluster RM Zoning” and a units/acre (U/A) of 5; it appears the “Proposed High” and 1.97 U/A. Note that 114.47 acres x 5 U/A = 572.35, not 687. c. Make it clear that this proposal is seeking to utilize 3.1.B. at time of Subdivision. 4. <u>Conditions of Approval</u> – See PDF of mark-up comments; Reminder LDO Section 3.3.B.2. states: “Conditions and site-specific standards imposed in a conditional district shall be standards above and beyond the requirements of this LDO; conditions shall not lesser the standards in this LDO. Conditions shall be limited to those that address the conformance of the development and use of the site to the Rolesville comprehensive plan or the impacts reasonably expected to be generated by the development or use of the site” – Conditions can commit to things greater than LDO minimums, or items not required by the LDO – but they cannot propose deviations or ‘lesser thans’ LDO minimums. Condition 6 regarding Transportation Improvements entails several aspects that may deviate from the LDO – Town Attorney review will occur to vet these (see mark-up). 5. See PDF of mark-up comment on the ‘Metes and Bounds report’. 6. See PDF of Memo comments with 4 comments. | |
| Parks & Recreation - Eddie Henderson | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See PDF of mark-up comments on the Concept Sketch Plan drawing that relates to 2.e. below. 2. Staff & the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board (PARAB) reviewed (REZ-24-02) on 02/28/24, and offer the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Greenway does follow the general route laid out in the 2022 Greenway plan. b. Staff notes that the location of the Greenway is not always ideal; in particular when it goes in between residential lots or in front of residential lots and their driveways. c. It is understood that due to the wetlands in this area, the ideal routing may not be feasible. If there is some way to avoid some of these crossings, please let us know. Staff can sit down for a meeting to discuss if needed. | |

REZ-24-02 – Hills at Harris Creek – 1st Submittal review cycle

| | | |
|---|---|-----|
| | <p>d. A Sidepath is now shown along Mitchell Mill Road – The 2022 Bicycle Plan calls for a bike lane along this road (not a sidepath). The 2022 Greenway Plan <u>does NOT call for</u> a Sidepath along Mitchell Mill Road. Please clarify if Applicant’s intent is to provide a Bike Lane (& thus complies) or is seeking to provide a Non-Required Sidepath instead of/in lieu of a Bicycle Lane.</p> <p>e. PARAB notes that only part of the (proposed Subdivision/ community) has access to the off street connectivity shown in the Concept Plan. More connectivity to the Greenway trail is requested, suggestion to provide a Sidepath connection to the amenity center or providing a trail head with parking somewhere near the amenity center. A markup showing their thoughts it attached. This trailhead would allow better centralized access to the Greenway trail for the residents who live on the other side of the neighborhood.</p> | |
| Engineering (B&M) - Brian Laux / Jacque Thompson | See PDF of minor mark-up comments on the Concept Sketch Plan. | |
| COR Public Utilities - Tim Beasley | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) At the time of development plan submittal, a Downstream Sewer Capacity Study may be required to determine adequate capacity to support the proposed development. Any improvements identified by the study would be required to be permitted prior to the issuance of Building Permit & constructed prior to release of a Certificate of Occupancy. 2) Verification of water available for fire flow with a water model required by Raleigh Water prior to CD approval. Any water system improvements recommended by the analysis to meet fire flow requirements will also be required of the Developer. 3) Harris Creek improvements under design by Kalas Falls must be approved, constructed and accepted by Raleigh prior to this development recording lots. | |
| NCDOT – Jacob Nicholson | NCDOT shall review the Revised TIA - further comments may result at that time. | |
| Wake County Fire / EMS - Brittany Hocutt | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>*DEAD ENDS GREATER THAN 150 FT SHALL HAVE A DESIGNATED FIRE TRUCK TURNAROUND- SEE APPENDIX D FOR EXAMPLES.</i> 2. <i>*ROADWAYS SHALL BE 20 FT MINIMUM (EOP) REGARDLESS OF PUBLIC/PRIVATE</i> 3. <i>*CUL-DE-SACS SHALL BE 96 FT DIAMETER</i> 4. <i>*SUBDIVISION SHALL MEET NC FIRE CODE REQUIREMENTS- THESE COMMENTS ARE NOT ALL INCLUSIVE*</i> 5. <i>**SCALE NOTED ON SKETCH PLANS DO NOT MATCH ACTUAL MEASUREMENTS**</i> | |
| Wake County Watershed Management - Janet Boyer | No comments were provided, which is probable appropriate as this stage of development. | N/A |

