REZ-23-05 - Scarboro Apartments - V4 Submittal review cycle

START DATE: **MARCH 2024**DUE DATE: __04-08-24__ TRC/STAFF Comments issued on: __04/08/2024____

| Review Group /Staff | | Comments | Cleared Comments |
|---|--|---|---------------------|
| Planning & Zoning – Planning Staff & WithersRavenel | 2. Con 3. FYI 4. Con 5. Con Stal con Stal 6. Cor sub dww 7. Cor 8. Con are the | tinue to Provide a written response to ALL the comments. tinue to Add revision dates to ALL materials – add a Date/Revision date to the Conditions. — TIA Status – The TIA report is with NCDOT awaiting their review/comments. TIA must be completed before scheduling for Planning Board. dition #3 – Add words to clarify dwelling units as "Dwelling, Multiple Family" and "Dwelling, Upper Story unit" as the LDO describes them. dition #6 – Specific clarity is asked as to the planned location of the minimum 10,000 SF of non-residential GFA; the Concept Plan shows 1 nd-alone Retail building and 2 mixed use buildings (assuming the "Retail" is first floor) – is the lack of clarity meaning Applicant is not no numiting to putting retail in all 3 identified buildings? Staff would prefer to know some benchmark minimum amount per building shown. If would not want one of the mixed-use buildings to only have say one very small retail component. dition #6 – Staff notes that the commitment is now 10,000 SF relative to 240 multifamily dwelling units, an increase from previous mittal [5,000SF & 240], and is significantly less of a mix of res/non-res compared to Cobblestone Village (approx 53,000 SF against 188 elling units). Scarboro is ~ 2 acres > than Cobblestone. Cobblestone is the ONLY TC District in the Town; it is the only precedent. ditions #7 and 8 – Change "Applicant and/or Property Owner" to "Development" consistent with other conditions. ditions #10 and 11 – Staff finds that these simply enumerate and state regulations and standards that are already required in the LDO; they not voluntarily committing this Development to do anything "above and beyond the requirements of this LDO"; if Applicant disagrees, that re is a voluntary, above the minimum aspect, please explain/clarify. dition #17 – Revise to read "Dwelling, Upper-story units shall be prohibited from having balconies on those facades " | |
| Parks & Recreation - Eddie Henderson | rec 2. Sta urb 3. Cor | a 3/28/24, the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board [PARAB] reviewed the rezoning, specifically the Concept Plan, and they commend to keep the Greenway as currently shown on the east side of the new proposed N/S/ Collector road. If acknowledges response expressing that the Greenway will need to be designed closer to that of a Sidepath (being a more ban, developed setting). Staff intends to revisit this topic when project reaches Landscape plan level. Infirm that the trail around the stormwater pond is a privately owned and maintained trail, but will be publicly accessible (via a corded public access easement at later stages of development); Staff finds that this is the intent of Comment response. | |
| NCDOT – Trevor Darnell COR Public Utilities - | | No further Comments. 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. | ✓ ✓ |
| Tim Beasley Wake County Fire / EMS - Brittany Hocutt | | No additional issues or comments at this time. | ✓ |
| Engineering - 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 Co. Watershed Mgmt - Janet Boyer | | (V3) Wake Co. permits for Stormwater & Erosion / Sediment Control required prior to construction. | ✓ |