REZ-23-05 – Scarboro Apartments – V3 Submittal review cycle

Review Group /Staff	Comments	Cleared Comments
Planning & Zoning – Planning Staff & WithersRavenel	 Provide a written response to ALL the comments. Add revision dates to ALL materials – add a Date/Revision date to the Conditions. FYI – TIA Status – Applicant has begun conversation with Planning Director; further review TBD. Condition #2 – this references an "Exhibit A" for permitted / special use / prohibited uses – Staff does not find such Exhibit submitted. Staff has a framework document for this purpose, attain off-line. Condition #6 – See V2 Comment on (what was then Condition #5 regarding timing of development). Current condition language only commits to construction of 5,000 SF with zero timing relation to the Residential, and hence, it may never occur, thereby being a hollow Condition. Staff finds 5,000 SF relative to 240 dwelling units greatly out of balance for the Town Center District. Cobblestone has a balance of ~165 multifamily units and ~50,000 SF of non-residential, for example. Condition #8 – by the proposal, which is Multifamily dwellings and potentially some non-residential, the building types would/could be either mixed use (if multifamily units and non-residential are in the same building) or non-residential buildings, as multifamily buildings are not considered "residential" by site development process nor Building Code. Revise last sentence to remove "residential" by site development process nor Building Code. Revise last sentence to remove "residential". See original Comment – is this really committing to anything not already minimally required in the LDO? IS this removing a Permitted material and "promising" not to use (that one, or two, etc.?) IF NOT, this is not a Condition, and should be removed. Condition #11 – Add/Clarify Greenway material is 'at discretion of Town staff at time of development approval'. FYI – At the next step Development, anticipated to be Site Development Plan as there is no shown intention to perform Preliminary Subdivision of the property, a Tree and/or Vege	

REZ-23-05 - Scarboro Apartments - V3 Submittal review cycle

- 10. **FYI** As mentioned previously, mixed use buffers will be required in accordance with Section 6.2.3. It appears the placement of dumpsters and enclosures may not be in compliance with these standards.
- 11. FYI The Site Development Plan shall demonstrate compliance with the parking landscaping of 6.2.4.4.
 - a. It is highly recommended that the rows of parking spaces be broken up to provide interior islands in accordance with Section 6.2.4.4.E. It is recommended that islands be provided every 10-20 spaces.
 - b. Section 6.2.4.4.C. requires all parking spaces to be within 60' of the trunk of a tree.
 - c. Perimeter parking plantings in accordance with 6.2.4.4.G. will be required where parking areas are visible from adjacent properties and right-of-way.
- 12. **FYI** The northernmost parking area is partially located in the required 15' street buffer. The applicant should demonstrate compliance with Sections 6.2.2.2.D. and 6.2.4.4.G.
- 13. FYI Will a separate lot be created for the commercial building(s) or will it be part of the larger development?
- 14. **FYI** Non-residential building standards (Section 6.8.2 and 3) will apply to the commercial buildings and the Multi-family design standards of Section 6.8.6 will apply to the apartment buildings. It should be noted that the design should reflect the Building Orientation and Placement standards of Section 6.8.6.E.
- 15. **FYI** Sidewalk and pedestrian connectivity should be considered in the design.
- 16. **FYI** The dumpster areas located on terminal island of the parking areas will create conflict with any landscaping, specifically canopy or shade trees) intended for these islands.
- 17. **FYI** Additional parking may be required for the additional retail space and recreational areas provided (eg. parking for the pool or clubhouse). Applicant shall address location or designation of these spaces.
- 18. FYI Streetwalls are required per LDO Table 3.4.1. :
 - a. Streetwalls shall be constructed of brick, masonry, stone, wrought iron/aluminum, or other decorative material and shall be designed with the same building materials and architectural appearance as the primary structure. Wood, fencing, and chain link are prohibited materials for a streetwall.
 - b. Streetwalls shall be a minimum of three (3) feet and a maximum of four (4) feet in height. Breaks in streetwalls are permitted to allow for pedestrian or vehicular access, recessed storefront entrance, plazas, or for tree protection.
 - c. Street walls may be a maximum of fifty (50) feet in length. Breaks must be provided using columns or offsets, including landscaping/trees, of at least ten (10) feet in width, up to a maximum of twenty (20) feet in width. On corner parcels, the corner of the building may be recessed from the front and side property lines on a diagonal. Streetwalls or combination of streetwalls and canopy trees with hedge not to exceed three (3) feet in height can be substituted for a continuous streetwall. Streetwalls shall constitute at least two-thirds (2/3) of the frontage where a streetwall/tree/hedge design is used.

REZ-23-05 - Scarboro Apartments - V3 Submittal review cycle

Parks & Recreation - Eddie Henderson	 On Concept Plan and/or in written conditions, express a clear intent to make the Greenway paralleling the new north/south Collector road as "non-sidewalk-like" as possible (Response to V2 Comment did NOT address this specific). Staff suggests an aggressive landscaping scheme involving land berms, natural items such as boulders, natural canopy tree placement (i.e., not rigid 50' spacing on a straight line), etc. Staff's goal is to make this Greenway as close to a true Greenway (where intent is to run through as-natural-as-possible locales) while still being parallel to this road. Provide a written response to this comment to clearly indicate this direction is understood. Staff is open to meet to help develop a cross section for this area. Staff will NOT support the Rezoning if this is not satisfactorily provided. Confirm the trail around the stormwater pond is a private, non-paved trail, clarifying intended surface material and width. 	
NCDOT – Trevor Darnell	DOT shall be party to and approve of the scope of a traffic impact analysis (TIA) and shall review the completed TIA and may make further comments at that time.	
COR Public Utilities - Tim Beasley	FYI - a downstream sewer capacity study will be required prior to CD Approval. Any improvements identified are required to be designed for replacement with the CDs.	
Wake County Fire / EMS - Brittany Hocutt	No additional issues or comments at this time.	<
Engineering (CJS/B&M) - Brian Laux / Jacque Thompson	See PDF of Memo comments offered more so as FYI about future development plans for the proposed project; there are no corrections required from this review/these comments.	✓
Wake County Watershed Management - Janet Boyer	(V3) Wake Co. permits for Stormwater & Erosion / Sediment Control required prior to construction.	✓