

03/01/2024

TO: Town of Rolesville Planning Department
502 Southtown Circle
Rolesville, NC 27571

SUBJECT: Reserve at Mitchell Mill 3rd Submittal PSP-23-03 Planning Comment Responses

In response to review comments provided on 01/08/2024, we are providing the following comment responses:

1. Continue to Provide a Written Response to ALL the comments received.
SREG RESPONSE: As noted see attached sheets
2. Continue to Update/add revision Dates to all submittal documents.
SREG RESPONSE: As Noted.
3. Cloud and Bubble all areas of revisions in the plan set – this is critical for Staff to know what has/not been changed and to compare versions (which will be even more important comparing V3 to V2 and V1).
SREG RESPONSE: As Noted see New revisions.
4. Continue to Flatten or “OPTIMIZE” the PDF’s when creating (especially the PSP plan set).
SREG RESPONSE: As noted its keeps files smaller and more manageable.
5. FYI – TRC-STAFF always has the purview to make New comments on resubmittals, either based on changes made by Applicant, or newly realized lack of compliance. Applications are under review until they are approved.
SREG RESPONSE: Understood.
6. See PDF Memo from WithersRavenel with 28 written Comments – most are Repeats, some are New based on changes made.
SREG RESPONSE: Comment responses as noted, separate document of these responses.
7. See PDF from WithersRavenel of Mark-up comments on the PSP plan set – there looks to be about 30 entries/comments.
SREG RESPONSE: As noted.
8. **The NC-CZ District Townhome area, lots 119-189, requires its own distinct discussion for Applicant to explain the intent; see further Comment about TA 23-05 (Townhome Lot frontage/private access easements). The topic involves Planning, Engineer, Fire, CORPUD.
SREG RESPONSE: Meeting held at Rolesville Planning Office to discuss this topic plans, Jan. 17, 2024 for resolution of this issue agreed upon resolution is shown in the current plans.

9. **REPEAT - Phasing** - Staff strongly suggests a Phasing plan be created that is logical and constructable, and can relate to Construction Drawing approvals, Wake Co. stormwater permitting requirements, and recording lots in Phases to facilitate/speed up the home construction.
SREG RESPONSE: The client has not developed phasing plan at this time we are working towards a phasing plan but it is not final.
10. **REPEAT - Addresses & Street Names** – Contact Wake County GIS/911 to go through the Street Naming process and have Lot Addresses assigned. Every lot – residential, open space, HOA, etc. – should attain an Address.
SREG RESPONSE: Names were submitted to Wake County on February 23, 2024 and are in progress.
11. **All Sheets** – in the Vertical Right side bar, in the “title block”, it states “Preliminary Site Plan” – please change this to “Preliminary Subdivision Plat” as that is how this Application Type is called in Rolesville; it is understood that the term “site plan” is used interchangeably with “subdivision plat” in common language in this region; Town Staff is striving to separate the subdivision of land (“Subdivision plats”) from the physical development of land with non-residential uses (non Single-family detached or attached) and site features/structures/buildings (“Site Development Plans”) by not generically using the term “site plan” for either/both. Thank you.
SREG RESPONSE: Thank you we will make such changes.
12. **Cover Sheet/Site Data Table** – Site Information / Acreages for the two districts – MA 22-06 Exhibit 2 stated the NC District was 54.558 Net Acres and the RM District 84.033 Net Acres. Given this is the Preliminary Subdivision Plat of the land, items like the now Right-of-way dedication is determined, and any further fine-tuning of surveying is completed, the acreages of the 2 Districts should not be expressed as (EST), or estimates. Revise to include the actual surveyed acreage of both Zoning Districts. Either add/include the Exhibit 2 from MA 22-06 or add/include a new Survey of the entire subject property that includes the breakdown of the 2 Zoning Districts. Staff suggests adding [accurate/actual Acreages] to current Sheet C-3.0 unless that makes this drawing busier than it already is.
SREG RESPONSE: New calculated acreage listed on the drawings. A new survey is ordered and in-progress. To eliminate any confusion its best to keep the older survey exhibit separate from this submittal.
13. **Cover Sheet/Site Data Table** – line that reads “Minimum Single Family Homes Setbacks RH-CZ Cluster Option” – Revise “RH” to “RM” as this property has no RH District Zoning.
SREG RESPONSE: Duly noted it should read RM-CZ Cluster Option
14. **Cover Sheet/Site Data Table** – line that reads “Minimum Townhomes Setbacks NC-CZ (Employment of TA 23-06)” – there is no TA 23-06 (Text Amendment to the Land Development Ordinance – Staff assumes Applicant meant TA 23-05. Note that Text Amendment – revised

LDO Section 5.1.2.B.5.c.(1). – requires a property/project to go through the Rezoning process and be approved to utilize “private access easements” for Single-family Attached (townhome) lot frontage purposes. This property is subject to MA 22-06, which pre-dates TA-23-05 and thus, this project is ineligible to utilize TA-23-05. ****Clarify the intent – is Applicant indicating they plan to go through the Rezoning process so as to take advantage of TA-23-05 for Townhome lot frontage purposes? ****

SREG RESPONSE: See note 8, meeting of Jan 17, 2024 addressed this item. Plans on this submittal reflect the meeting agreement for the townhomes

15. **Cover Sheet/Site Data Table** – The LDO Section 3.1.2./Table 3.1.2. Development Standards for the RM District uses the terminology of “Building Setbacks (min)” and “Front/Side/Rear/Corner” – revise the Table, replacing “Front Yard”, “Side Yard” etc. with the appropriate terminology. Ex. For the RM-CZ if using the Cluster option - “Building Setback / Front – 20’ (Cluster)”.

SREG RESPONSE: Thank you we will make use the correct vocabulary.

16. **Cover Sheet/Site Data Table** – The LDO Section 3.4/Table 3.4.3. NC District Development Standards uses the terminology of “Building Placement (min/max)” and “Front/Side/Rear” – revise the Table replacing “Front Yard”, Side yard”, etc. with the appropriate terminology. Ex for NC-CZ – “Building Placement / Front – 15’ minimum”.

SREG RESPONSE: Thank you we will make use the correct vocabulary.

17. **Cover Sheet/Site Data Table** – LDO 3.4.3.D.1. requires an NC District to have a Minimum 15% allocation of gross area for nonresidential uses – This expresses 8.18 acres, which calculates as 15% of the expressed 55 AC (Est) – This is the minimum requirement, but what is the Proposed amount? Add this and annotate each as “Min. Req./Proposed”. It would be appropriate to also cite the LDO for these requirements so it is clear as where they originate (as opposed to something voluntarily committed to via a Zoning Condition for instance).

SREG RESPONSE: It’s been revised to show 15% of the NC Zone as Commercial parcel. This excludes buffers and SCM area.

18. **Sheet C-1.1/C-1.2** – These Conditions of Approval are un-signed; if they are going to include signature blocks, they should be signed. Staff notes that the Version of Conditions included in the Town Board packet for January 17, 2023 were also unsigned; a Signed Version of these Conditions should be supplied to Town Planning for final records of the Rezoning, and those Conditions included in the PSP plan set.

SREG RESPONSE: This was voted on and the Town already has signed documents. They have been revised for this submittal.

19. **Sheet C-1.2** – Right Side Table – the line of “Code Cluster Requirement 3.1.B.1.” – This Section is only eligible to apply to the RM District portion of this subdivision (which is 84.033 per MA22-06); hence the minimum 40% Open Space requirement is of the RM District, not the overall Gross acreage of the subdivision (which include the other, NC-CZ, District, which is Ineligible for the Cluster Option). $40\% \text{ of } 84.033 = 33.613$ acres. Revise, reorganize, better express this information.

SREG RESPONSE: We will revise to meet such requirements.

20. **Sheet C-1.2** – Right Side Table – Per LDO 6.2.1.D.2., the NC District as a Mixed-Use

District requires minimum 15% Open space, and based on the NC-CZ District size of 54.558 acres; 15% of 54.558 acres = 8.18 acres. This calculation is NOT observed in this Table at all – Explain or Revise to Add. The 5 different Open Space types {3 small, 2 medium} ARE detailed, thank you.

SREG RESPONSE: We are revising the open Space as per individual Zoning Districts.

21. **Sheet C-5.0 through C-5.9** – Every Lot shall be labeled – Block and Lot – nearly all of the non-residential lots appear to have no such Lot # reference, some have descriptions in them (“SCM #x, Wet Pond” and such) here are some examples. Revise so that All Lots are referenceable.

- a. The 64,341 SF “Club House” – Label this lot (Block ?/Lot ?); being over an acre, add size in acres also; revise name/label to ‘Amenity Lot’ or at least ‘Club House lot’ to clarify its use. Note that this lot will process its own Site Development Plan prior to development.

SREG RESPONSE: As noted we will show it as ‘Amenity Lot’ with acreage listed. We will call it Block 2 Lot A

- b. There are host of Parks lots that are numbered – a table should be provided somewhere that references them by these numbers; clarify if/where this is, or Revise and Add.

SREG RESPONSE: We will be adding numbers to the parks as going forward.

22. **Addresses** – Like lot number references, there are host of lots with no addresses; defer to Wake Co. GIS/911 as to whether or not they will provide an address to every open space or park lot, but in Staff’s opinion, they should have an address just like a Lot reference.

SREG RESPONSE: We will coordinate with Town and Wake CO. GIS/911 on park addresses as soon as we get confirmation on the street names. Thank you.

Parks & Recreation - Eddie Henderson

1. Sidewalks within NRB crossing areas - Revise Plans to show the width of these sidewalks; they appear to be wider than a “normal location” sidewalk, but lack dimension call-out. FYI, the Town considers a/any 10’ wide off-street-but-parallel-to-street pedestrian facility to be a Sidepath, regardless of concrete or asphalt..

SREG RESPONSE:

2. Greenway crosswalk engineering detail - Rolesville has no unique detail for this; use NCDOT standard.

SREG RESPONSE: We are using NCDOT Standard at the CD Level.

3. Harris Creek Farm project (ANX-22-05/MA 22-08) – This is being presented to the Town Board of Commissioners on 02/05/2024 with a recommendation of Approval from the Planning Board – follow Staff Comment/direction regarding connecting Greenways until and unless this project receives Denial or is officially withdrawn (Contact Planning Staff).

SREG RESPONSE: From Town of Rolesville Website: The Harris Creek Farms Voluntary Annexation Petition and Rezoning (Map Amendment) Application are not on the agenda for the Town Board of Commissioners meeting to be held March 5, 2024. The applicant is actively making revisions to the Rezoning application request; proper notification for

both the Annexation petition and Rezoning application will occur in advance of a future Town Board of Commissioners meeting.

Source: <https://www.rolesvillenc.gov/project/harris-creek-farm-fka-4928-universal>

4. Previous Bike Lane comment/clarification – (A.) Revise Plans (or confirm that they are presently shown) to show Bike Lanes within Right-of-ways of adjacent Jonesville Road and Mitchell Mill Road. (B.) Revise Plans to show Bike Lanes on Street J, as a street with bike lanes that connects/stubs to Gro Peg Lane in this area is shown on the 2022 Bike Plan (see Page 59 specifically).

SREG RESPONSE: It is our understanding that NC DOT has asked for multi-use paths outside the travel lanes on Mitchell Mill Road. We have not gotten confirmation on Jonesville Road bike lanes and look for comments to address this issue forthcoming with this submittal. Bike lane is confirmed to Street J running toward Gro Peg Lane.

Engineering (CJS/B&M) -

See three (3) PDF's of: (1.) Memo written comments (99 + some for future CID plans) dated 01/04/2024; (2.) Mark-up comments on the PSP Plan set; and (3.) Mark-ups on the Response to V1 Comments document.

Summary of TRC-Staff Review Comments Revised: 01-08-24

PSP-23-03 – Reserve (fka5109) @ Mitchell Mill – 2nd Submittal review cycle

Brian Laux / Jacque Thompson

COR Public Utilities -

Tim Beasley

V2 Comment - Previous comments were not addressed – REPEAT the V1 Comments.

V1 COMMENT -- See PDF of mark-up comments on 10 select sheets – C6.0, C6-1, C6-2, C6-3, C6-4, C6-5, C6-6, C6-7, C6-8, C7-0.

Wake County Watershed Management - Janet Boyer

1. Provide SIA including drainage area maps and Municipal Stormwater Tool.

SREG RESPONSE:

2. Retaining walls need to be outside SCM easements – Revise Plans.

SREG RESPONSE:

3. All SCMs – show minimum 10 ft flat perimeter that is off the slope and within the easement.

SREG RESPONSE:

4. SCM access easements must extend to the right of way. Remove SCM easements from Neuse buffer.

SREG RESPONSE:

5. The “dry pond” is shown as USGS blue line; Provide NC DEQ buffer delineation or show 50' Neuse buffer.

6. Provide Neuse buffer, 401/404 approvals.

7. Provide USCOE jurisdictional determination or remove disturbances to wetlands.

8. Provide copy of the USGS Quad Map with delineated project limits

9. Provide copy of the Wake County Soil Survey map with delineated project limits.

10. Clearly show the Limits of Disturbance (LOD).

11. Label dam safety ID numbers for the dams.

12. Remove greenway from Neuse buffer.

13. How will drainage to the wetland be treated?

14. How will this project be phased? Please label phases.

15. Please contact Town of Rolesville floodplain administrator regarding required flood studies.

Wake County Fire / EMS -Brittany Hocutt

1. NEAR LOT 47/45- TURNAROUND NEEDED.
2. Cul-de-sacs shall measure 80 FT Min. per responding Fire Truck (THIS IS NOT RALEIGH RESPONSE).

NCDOT – Jacob Nicholson

1. “Street B” was originally [MA 22-06) a functional loop/collector road within SFD residential portion; now it is just a short stub from a cul-de-sac street. “Street B” only serves the 23 lots on “Street C”; all other trips would (almost immediately) end up on “Street A” about 100’ north of Mitchell Mill (ISP?). DOT understands “Street B” may be the means to make “Street C” meet Town subdivision standards. IF “Street B” could be eliminated, then the TIA-required right turn lane for that access moves to “Street A”. Even if “Street B” remains, it throws off the trip distribution such that all of the right turn movements would shift to “Street A”. Discuss further with Town Staff – can “Street B” be eliminated.

SREG RESPONSE: At TRC meeting it was discussed to remove street B as its provides for better traffic management and movement along Mitchell Mill Road.

2. See PDF Attachment (Division Traffic crossing guide) -- Need further evaluation on the amount of crosswalks on Jonesville.

SREG RESPONSE: We are in progress with NCDOT on this road crossing

3. REPEAT – V1: Proposed laneage on Mitchell Mill Road is unclear. DOT Staff is not aware of any pending improvements to Mitchell Mill Rd. as Applicant states in the response; please explain either in writing or at future TRC online meetings.

SREG RESPONSE: