



March 1, 2024

Michael Elabarger  
Senior Planner, Town of Rolesville  
P.O. Box 250, 502 Southtown Circle  
Rolesville, NC 27571

**RE: *Response to Comments for Scooter's Rolesville***

Attached, please find the Applicant's written responses to comments from the Town of Rolesville, issued on February 6, 2024 for the above referenced project.

The responses are transmitted to you with the following information:

- One (1) Electronic Copy of the Plan set
- One (1) Stormwater Report

Please do not hesitate to contact me at (919) 653-2927 or [chris.bostic@kimley-horn.com](mailto:chris.bostic@kimley-horn.com) should you or your staff have any questions concerning our responses.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Chris Bostic", written over a horizontal line.

Chris Bostic, PE  
Kimley-Horn and Associates

## PLANNING/ZONING: PLANNING STAFF & WITHERSRAVENEL

---

### Cover Sheet

1. Revise case number from SDP-23-07 to SDP-23-09; SDP-23-07 *is the application # for the day care project at 302 S. Main St which the same developer is also planning at this time.*

**Response:** Case number corrected.

2. Within the Site Data Table, for Open Space - provide both the required and that provided. It appears there is a typo. Per LDO Section 6.2.1.D.3, a minimum of 5% of open space is required. For a development of this size, at least One (1) small open space 'type' is required. Sheet C2.0 has data table indicating that Required is 0.039 ac. (1,699 SF) and that Active of 0.03 ac. (1,307 sf) and Passive of 0.032 ac. (1394 SF) – or a total of 0.062 ac (2701 sf) is being provided. Carry the Required (0.039 ac/1,699 SF) and Provided (0.062 ac/2701 SF) over to the Cover sheet.

**Response:** Open space calculations corrected, see Cover Sheet and C2.0 Site Plan.

3. Revise Site Data Table for Buffers, which are incorrectly listed.

**Response:** Buffers updated within Site Data table.

4. Fix Layers (multiple locations)

**Response:** Layers adjusted for clarity, see all sheets.

5. Please provide submittal & revision dates.

**Response:** Submittal & revision dates added to Cover Sheet.

6. Please add case number SDP-23-09 to the cover sheet.

**Response:** Case number corrected.

7. Specify buffer type.

**Response:** Buffer type specified, see Site Data table.

8. This acreage is different from the overall site area provided earlier in the table.

**Response:** Acreages updated to match, see Site Data table.

### Existing/Demolition Plan

9. Per the Legend provided, please label removed trees with an "X". Plan notes that "Hatch and labels have been provided to show site items to be removed". Please update the Legend to remove "X" if this symbol is no longer going to be used.

**Response:** Legend updated to remove "X" as requested.

10. Since trees in this area are being removed yet existing trees on the adjacent property are to remain, tree protection fencing in the is area will be required and should be shown on the grading plans as well as the landscape plans.

**Response:** Tree protection fencing shown, see Sheet C3.0.

**Site Plan**

11. As mentioned previously, Section 6.2.1.D.3 requires the provision of Open Space for non-residential uses. One (1) small open space is required. Open space types can be found in Table 6.2.1.2. Please label the different open space(s) on the plan sheet. Acreage and type should be indicated as well as an amenities for active open space. Plan indicates that benches are being counted as part of Active Open Space, which must meet criteria in Table 6.2.1.3. Staff suggests a concrete gaming table or board games be available for use within the business to qualify as an “Active Space”.

**Response:** One small active open space area is proposed and labeled as type “Active Use Area” per LDO Sec. 6.2.1.E. To meet “Active Space” qualifications, a lawn game amenity per Table 6.2.1.3 will be provided in the space, in addition to benches for public seating and trash receptacle, as shown on Sheet C2.0. The passive open space stormwater facility is also labeled. Both passive and active spaces are labeled and tabulated in the table on the sheet and shown using hatches per the site legend.

12. LDO Section 6.4.3. – Parking – Per table in (G.), Applicant using the “Eating Establishment” standard of (MIN) 2.5 spaces per 1,000 SF / (MAX) 10.0 spaces per 1,000 SF. The building, at 700 SF, requires 2.5 spaces (not 2 as shown), as 2.5 is the bare minimum when there is a building of any size. The Maximum permitted number of parking spaces ( $10/1,000SF \times 700 SF = 7$ ) which the plan accurately portrays. The Provided (proposed) number of spaces is 8, which is 1 more than the Maximum permitted – explain how and why the plan is proposing to violate the LDO. See LDO 6.4.3.B, 3rd sentence, which states: “ However, consistent with Section 6.4.3.J: Alternative Parking Plan (APP), an Alternative Parking Plan may be submitted for review and consideration by the Land Development Administrator. “. Reduce the Parking to 7 spaces, or pursue an APP to exceed the Maximum with the Planning Director who is the Land Development Administrator.

**Response:** Maximum number of parking spaces corrected. Provided number of parking spaces reduced from 8 to 7 spaces.

13. LDO Section 6.2.4.4.C. – Revise to demonstrate compliance with Parking lot landscaping.

**Response:** Tree added to landscape plan for parking lot coverage. All parking spots are now within 60’ of a tree.

14. LDO Section 6.2.2.1 - Perimeter Buffer
  - a. Rear Property line adjacent RL Zoning District requires Type 3 Landscape buffer ( 6.2.2.1.F.3. and 6.2.2.1.G/Table 6.2.2.2.). Plan shows a 25’ Width Buffer per the

Type 3, but the proposed stormwater facilities are located within this same area, greatly reducing the actual area in Buffer available to be planted with the prescribed trees and shrubs.

- b. Staff expects the stormwater facility will require an access and drainage easement in order to be serviced and maintained and to account for the piping to be installed.
- c. Per LDO Section 6.2.4.3.C, - "Nothing shall be planted or installed within an underground or overhead utility or drainage easement without town approval and easement holder approval. "
- d. The Buffer is omitting the required 6' wall (see other REPEAT comment on this).
- e. The Applicant's choice/design to place stormwater facility in a required Perimeter Buffer is creating this significant conflict – explain the resolution to demonstrating compliance with the various requirements.

**Response:** Variance request application will be submitted under separate cover.

15. The partially existing landscape island on the northeast side of the site contains existing trees on the (Sonic) property. Revise to clearly show Tree protection fencing (TPF) installation along the property line to protect the existing vegetation as no additional planting is currently proposed in this location.

**Response:** Tree protection fencing shown, see Sheet C3.0.

16. Understanding that the space available on this site is limited, the loading space shall best comply with Section 6.4.5.2.

**Response:** Noted.

17. Drainage/access easements needed for piping and necessary access to the SCM.

**Response:** Drainage/access easement for storm drainage piping and SCM shown and labeled, see Sheet C3.0.

18. Clarification should be provided for this area. Is this the required open space? What active amenities are being shown.

**Response:** The open space type and area have been labeled, and hatches included to differentiate passive versus active. The lawn game amenity required for the active open space has also been labeled.

## Grading Plan

19. If there is vegetation to be preserved, label the Tree Protection Fencing (TPF). This includes protection from vegetation on adjacent property if the tree protecting zone is on the subject site.

**Response:** Tree protection fencing added to Grading Plan.

## Landscape Plan

20. Per LDO Section 6.2.2.1.F.3, a 6-foot wall is required with a Type 3 buffer. See comments on Sht C2.0/Site Plan above as many of them reference changes to the Landscape Plan. This is a significant, and Repeated, Comment – do not resubmit this application without the wall.

**Response:** A 6' wall is provided.

21. This area is subject to an drainage / access easement in order to maintain the adjacent storm water management facility. The required landscaping will be unable to fit in the area as shown. It is recommended that the applicant install a fence instead of the proposed plantings to minimize the negative effects of development upon the adjacent owner.

**Response:** A 6' wall is provided.

## **ENGINEERING: BRIAN LAUX/JACQUELINE THOMPSON**

---

### Sheet C0.0 Cover Sheet

1. Update case number to SDP-23-09.

**Response:** Case number corrected.

2. Clean up the overlaying “#” in revisions section of title block.

**Response:** Pound symbols removed from revision section of title block.

### Sheet C1.0 Existing Conditions

3. Sidewalk/pavement/gravel removal hatch used for removing landscape and wooded areas. Update hatching or legend to show a wooded/landscape area removal for clarity.

**Response:** Legend updated to include vegetated area removal.

### Sheet C2.0 Site Plan:

4. Provide shared access easement between the parcels. Show and label access easement recorded in DB 15441, PG 01221.

**Response:** Proposed shared access easement shown. The recorded access easement is a blanket easement for the Scooters parcel and adjacent parcels identified as PIN #1759807165 (Sonic Drive-Thru) and PIN #1759808293 (Vacant). No boundary for this easement is recorded so it cannot be shown on the plan.

5. Show ADA ramps as they appear in the legend or update legend to match. Reference ADA ramp details from NCDOT 2024 – 848.06.

**Response:** Legend updated to match proposed ADA ramps. ADA ramps in ROW added per NCDOT details.

6. NCDOT driveways are to be 12' minimum in width from edge of pavement to edge of pavement.

**Response:** Ingress driveway width increased to 16' measured from edge of pavement to edge of pavement.

7. Connection to NCDOT right of way requires a 30' minimum radius. This is typical for NCDOT ROW connections.

**Response:** NCDOT ROW connection radii width increased to 30'.

## Sheet C3.0 Grading Plan

8. Additional structure may be needed to capture stormwater. Based on proposed grading much of the drainage does not appear to get to structure CB-3 and instead flows to the recorded cross access and off site.

**Response:** Additional structure (CB-3) added to prevent drainage from flowing offsite at the west cross access.

9. Provide SCM contours.

**Response:** SCM contours added.

10. Tree line from existing conditions and demo plan shown on sheet running through SCM. Remove this line or update SCM location.

**Response:** Tree line removed.

11. Follow up with Wake county on SCM detail.

**Response:** Wake County SCM details added, see Sheets C5.2-5.3.

12. A proposed drainage easement will be needed for storm sewer bypass. The easement is needed for both proposed and existing pipes.

**Response:** Proposed drainage/access easement shown and labeled.

13. Please clarify how the proposed landscaping buffer will be managed in this area in accordance with section A-A on sheet C2.0.

**Response:** A variance request application will be provided under separate cover.

14. Provide pipe labels and structure labels for bypass.

**Response:** Bypass pipes and structures labeled.

15. Pipe CO-1 (from CB-1 to FES-1) is shown at 4% in storm package and labeled 5% on this sheet. Verify which is correct. Storm pipes should have a minimum slope of 0.5%.

**Response:** Slope updated in storm package to match 0.5% shown in plans.

16. Repeat: Provide positive drainage throughout the yellow highlighted area. Provide additional spot grades for evaluation.

**Response:** Additional spot elevations added to demonstrate positive drainage.

Sheet C4.0 Utility Plan:

Sheet C5.0 Erosion Control Plan Phase 1:

17. Repeat: Sediment basin or other erosion control measure needed for disturbance of greater than 0.5 acres. Wake County to approve if no basin or other means of SEC are required.

**Response:** A basin is not currently proposed for the project, and will be discussed with Wake County as part of the upcoming Erosion Control submittal.

Sheet C5.1 Erosion Control Plan Phase 2:

18. Silt fence appears to have been moved but outlets appear to have stayed in the same spot. Update silt fence outlets accordingly.

**Response:** Silt fence outlet has been relocated.

19. Repeat: Please show calculations to determine if Rip Rap Dissipater pad will be needed to control inflow to SCM.  
Include velocity dissipator calculations

**Response:** Rip-rap dissipator pad added, see C5.1. Dissipator detail shown on Sheet C5.3. Calculations summary included within Stormwater Report.

Sheet C5.2 Erosion Control Details:

20. Repeat: Some details are numbered, and others just have "XX". Please update accordingly.
  - a. This comment applies to all detail sheets.

**Response:** Detail numbering updated, see detail sheets.

Sheet C8.0 Site Details:

21. Please use 2024 NCDOT ramp standards detail 848.06.

**Response:** NCDOT ramp detail 848.06 added, see Sheet C8.4.

## Storm Calculation Package and StormCAD:

22. Gutter spread should not exceed half the lane width from centerline to face of curb. Gutter spread for structure CB-3 is too large, adjust storm as needed.  
Gutter spread is too large, 6ft max

**Response:** Gutter spread reduced to less than 6 ft, see Stormwater Report.

## **WAKE COUNTY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT: JANET BOYER**

---

1. Wake County permitting SEC/SWF permits required.

**Response:** Noted.

## **COR PUBLIC UTILITIES: TIM BEASLEY**

---

1. Please email me for the Raleigh development fees associated with this project. These fees should be paid prior to signatures.

**Response:** Development fee sheet has been received and fees will be paid prior to signatures.

2. Please include the Raleigh digital signature block on cover and utility plan sheets.

**Response:** Digital signature block added.

3. Tap size and domestic water meter size must match. If 1" tap, this would be a direct tap. If 2" tap, you would need a 2" water meter and this tap would be a 2" full circumference service saddle.

**Response:** 2" tap label revised to state "2" full circumference service saddle."

## **WAKE COUNTY FIRE / EMS: BRITTANY HOCUTT**

---

1. Reviewer stated they were communicating with Applicant; no further word was received. Discuss at TRC online meeting.

**Response:** Per correspondence with Brittany Hocutt, the proposed site layout is satisfactory for fire truck access.

## **NCDOT: JACOB NICHOLSON**

---

No Further Comments

**Response:** Noted.



**PARKS & RECREATION: EDDIE HENDERSON**

---

No Further Comments

**Response:** Noted.