



September 2, 2025

Rolesville Planning Department  
c/o Michael Elabarger  
211 S. Main Street  
Rolesville, NC 27571

Subject: **Merritt Reserve – CID-25-02**  
**Construction Document Submittal #2 – Comment Response Letter**

Dear Michael,

Please find below the review comments received via email dated 8/10/25:

Planning and Zoning:

1. Continue to Provide a Written Response / Revise Dates / Cloud/bubble all changes.

***Response: Written response letter is provided with submittal.***

2. PREREQUISITE -- Approval of PSP-24-07 is required prior to approval of these CIDs.

***Response: Noted.***

3. **REPEAT** – V1 Comment 6a – On Buffer Types 1 and 2 a 6' fence is required and on buffer type 3 a 6' wall is required per Table 6.2.2.1. please include on buffer details.  
***V2 Response: A 6' wall has been added to the Buffer Type 3 detail. No fence has been added to the Buffer Type 1L detail as per the LDO it does not require one. We would like to propose the Type 2 buffer being 25' wide with no fence instead of the 15' with a fence. The Type 2 buffer is required along the property boundary adjacent to the Pointe Development. This adjacent buffer has already installed a fence. Increasing our buffer to 25' wide and forgoing the fence would remove an unmaintainable and unsafe strip of land between the two fences on each development. Please confirm a wider buffer will be acceptable***  
The LDA and Planning staff will take this request under consideration, holding comment as a reminder.

***Response: Waiting confirmation from Planning staff regarding buffer.***

4. **REPEAT** – V1 Comment 6d – Along the western property line, adjacent to PIN: 0639310437, a Type 1L buffer is required. Please provide. **V2 Response: PIN 0639310437 is not an adjacent property to the site. Unsure which buffer needs to be updated to a Type 1L. Please provide further clarification.** I am not sure either—it appears noted PIN does not exist. The comment may be referring to the western property line adjacent to the Neuse River Buffer. Existing vegetation may be considered in this area.

**Response: Noted.**

5. **REPEAT** – V1 Comment 8a – Per LDO 6.2.1.D. -- Vehicle use areas, streets, driveways, and sidewalks may not be used toward Open Space calculations unless explicitly stated in LDO 6.2. Currently, the site is providing 0.97 acres more than the required open space. It should be noted that elements such as parking spaces associated with the open spaces will NOT ALL be able to be counted towards open space requirements. Review LDO 6.2 to ensure open space requirements will continue to be met.

**V2Response: This is understood and once the amenity area has been defined we will ensure that the parking area is removed from the open space calculations.**

**Response: Same response as previous submittal.**

6. **REPEAT** – V1 Comment 8b – Internal Road striping, including crosswalks and stop bars as well as stop signs should all be included on plans.

**V2 Response: This has not been fully addressed at this time but will be provided.**

**Response: A pavement marking and signage plan has been added to the set as sheet CS-120 to reflect requested signage, crosswalks, and stop bars.**

7. New Comment – There may be additional comments on the Site Plan, Open Space Plan, and Landscape Plan depending on other revisions made.

**Response: Noted.**

Parks & Recreation - Eddie Henderson/Tanner Hayslette:

1. Please provide a rolled curb where the access road to the SCM at the park location stubs to the street for maintenance purposes.

**Response: Roll-curb is now shown and called out at SCM access point and entrances to the park areas.**

American Engineering Associates – Southeast, PA  
4020 Westchase Boulevard, Suite 450 Raleigh, NC 27607 ♦ 919-469-1101 ♦ [www.American-EA.com](http://www.American-EA.com)

Engineering – Jacque Thompson:

1. See the PDF of a written Memo dated July 30, 2025 – there are 75 numbered Comments. *There are no mark-up files.*

***Response: A separate response letter has been provided the comments provided by engineering.***

COR Public Utilities – Tim Beasley:

1. Some of Raleigh’s comments were addressed others were not. Considering this, Raleigh will hold off on providing additional comments until the design is finalized.

***Response: Please see separate responses included in this submittal. The only comments that have not been addressed are the manhole sizes and pipe materials based on depth. We are currently going through possible layout changes to reduce cost of the project. This will be corrected separately. The pipe material and manhole sizes will be updated when sewer design is finalized.***

Wake County Watershed Mgt – Elizabeth Powell:

1. Repeat -- Wake Co Watershed Disapproval Ltr dated **2025-05-19** was issued, awaiting next submittal for review.

***Response: Noted.***

NCDOT – Joshua Zhang:

1. 07/15/2025 -- Plans submitted several weeks ago, are still under review, TBD.

***Response: Noted.***

Wake County Fire / EMS- Stephen Wolf:

1. No fire services comments.

***Response: No response necessary.***

Sincerely,



Jakob Klein  
American Engineering Associates  
4020 Westchase Blvd. Ste. 450  
Raleigh, NC 27608