

PSP-23-01 – TUCKER WILKINS – 2nd Submittal review cycle

START DATE: NOVEMBER 11-3-23	DUE DATE: <u>12-11-23</u>	TRC/STAFF Comments issued on: <u>12/06/2023</u>
-------------------------------------	---------------------------	---

Review Group / Staff	Comments	Cleared Comments
Planning/ Zoning – Planning Staff	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide a written response to ALL comments; mark-ups to mark-ups is fine. 2. Revise the DATE/add revision date to the Plan set. 3. Regarding the approximately 60’ wide “finger” of property between PIN 1767360281 & 1767350918 – <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Revise all plan sheets to dedicate minimum Right-of-way in this location same as being done for the other Rolesville Road frontage of this subdivision. b. Due to NCDOT precluding a Driveway for the parking lot conceived in this location under MA 21-06, and the subsequent relocation of Condition #12 required Parking lot & Picnic Shelter and Condition #9 requirement for screening at trailhead parking (all supported by Staff given the circumstance), revise to show Streetscape Buffer in this location same as being done for the other Rolesville Road frontage of this subdivision. c. Plans do not show Frontage Improvements for this area; if this absence is the Applicant seeking to pay a fee-in-lieu (FIL) of Construction for this, prepare and submit Cost estimate for that unbuilt infrastructure for Town to consider. 4. <u>V1 Comment #2, regarding Open Space</u> – Applicant response is see Sheet 2.1 for Open Space calculations; Staff does not observe any such calculations on Sheet 2.1. Clarify/explain/revise. Regarding intention for HOA ownership of (open space lots), suggest adding this as a Cover Sheet General Note (and anywhere else in plat set it makes sense to mention it). 5. <u>V1 Comment #3, regarding Block/Lot numbering</u> – Number/label the “open space lots” (ie, the land that is not residential dwelling lots); see original comment; Staff finds there are 7 Open Space lots (1 in Block A, 3 in Block B, 2 in Block C). See Staff exhibit on this. 6. <u>V1 Comment #4, (Type of Street) Written Maintenance Agreement</u> – Response is ‘provided under separate cover’; this was NOT part of V2 resubmittal; REPEAT. 7. <u>V1 Comment #5, Applicant response of ‘private roads will be within Private Access Easement, These are now noted in the Plans’</u> – First, this doesn’t answer the main comment about numbering the non-development lots, but Staff cannot locate the term “Private Access Easement” anywhere in the drawings that show the “Private Streets” within the Townhome area. Clarify/explain/revise accordingly. 8. <u>V1 Comment #11, Regarding Phasing</u> – Applicant response was that there is NO Phasing to this project; Sheets 4.0, 4.3 continues to show in either/both the Utilities Legend and Existing Legend a “Phase line” and “-----” icon. Explain or remove Phase info from Sheet 4.0 and anywhere else. 9. <u>V1 Comment #18 regarding distinguishing “improved” and “unimproved” Open Space</u> - Response is “now noted”. Staff does not observe any such distinguishing Revisions; REPEAT. If Applicant wishes to defer this to CID 	

	<p>stage, where full Landscaping Plans and constructable Open Space “improvements” will be fully detailed, state/clarify that to clear this comment for now.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. <u>V1 Comment #19, regarding Street A stubbing to south</u> – Response is ROW is being dedicated and cul-de-sac is temporary; Staff observes NO information (drawings or words) indicating these intentions; REPEAT. 11. <u>V1 Comment #22, regarding ‘private streets’</u> – Response is <i>‘private roads will be covered in a public access easement’</i>; see also Comment #7, which relates to V1 Comment #5 – Clearly add/show “Public Access Easement” language all over the “private streets” throughout this Plan set; continue that on the CID plans; and then the eventual Final Subdivision Plat will Record a public access easement for/over the entire planned 46’ Private ROW that Sheet 2.2 has a typical cross-section of/for. The land under the Easement is thus private property to be owned by the HOA; to distinguish it from the adjacent and touching Open Space lots, it should be calculated out as a separate piece of land (calling it ‘Private Street’ is OK as that terminology was already approved via MA 21-06). 12. <u>V1 Comment #23, regarding adding “Public Access Easement” over Streets C& D</u> – There was NO response to this, and the drawings do NOT show any such Easement called out. See other/previous comments on this same topic. 13. <u>V1 Comment #24, regarding extending Street A to south</u> – Response is ROW is being dedicated for a through street, but drawings do NOT indicate this; see previous comment on this same topic. 14. <u>V1 Comment #27 regarding UDO 6.5(b.)/planting strips</u> – Confirm in writing the intention is to provide this level of detail on the future CID plans (see previous comments about pushing full Landscaping details to CID plan set). 15. <u>V1 Comment #32 Regarding Sidepath</u> – Per previous comment, include Fee-in-lieu estimate for Sidepath for this area between PIN 1767360281 & 1767350918. 16. <u>V1 Comment #34, Sheet 6.0, line work</u> – See PDF of a Staff sketch with some questions about the line work and V2 added notations. 17. New – Based on lack of Phasing, confirm that one Final Subdivision Plat to record all 91 residential lots (and 6 open space lots) is the intention. IF not, then create Phasing Plan to match the intention of Final Plat recordation. 18. New – Sheet 2.1 (and several others) “Site Chart” – 3rd line “Impervious Per Lot” – clarify if this applies to SFD or TH lots; the figure of 3,200 SF is larger than the area of many TH lots, so presume this is solely for SFD. 19. NEW – FYI – MA 21-06 Condition #9 and #11 shall be demonstrated in the future Construction Infrastructure Drawing (CID) plan set. 20. NEW – FYI – MA 21-06 Conditions #10 and 12 have locations shown in this PSP, but the future CID plan set shall include all details and specs of those features/items. Staff observes Sht 3.0 having a Mail Kiosk Exhibit – please carry this forward into the CID plans also. 	
--	---	--

PSP-23-01 – TUCKER WILKINS – 2nd Submittal review cycle

Parks & Recreation - Eddie Henderson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please confirm that the Sidepath going north into Kalas Falls ties into Greenway in that subdivision. 2. Please confirm Sidepath stubs to both the Jarman and Pearce lots. 3. Please confirm that the Greenway ties into the Sidepath. 	
Engineering (CJS/B&M) - Brian Laux / Jacque Thompson	See two (2) PDF's – (1) Memo dated 11/30/23 with 18 numbered comments; and (2) Mark-up comments (34) on the PSP plan set.	
COR Public Utilities Tim Beasley	See PDF of one (1) mark-up comment on Sheet 5.0 only.	
Wake Co Fire / EMS - Brittany Hocutt	**Please include the cul-de-sac specifications with dimensions in next submittal.	
NCDOT – Jacob Nicholson	A left turn lane on Rolesville Rd will be required of this development. Please revise plans or explain to DOT if/how that off-site improvement is already understood and in the works.	
Wake County Watershed Management - Janet Boyer	12/5/23 – no additional comments.	