



June 2nd, 2025

Town of Rolesville Planning
c/o Michael Elabarger
PO Box 250,
Rolesville, NC 27571

Subject: **The Preserve at Moody Farm**
CID-24-09 – V3 Comment Response Letter

Dear Mr. Elabarger,

There are several noteworthy design changes within this submittal to bring to your attention prior to beginning your review:

- a. After further discussion with the project team, the grading plan has been revised to remove all stem walls from the CID plan set. Individual lots are to have custom-built homes making us currently unable to propose a building footprint within the site plan. Due to this, lots are now graded to be fit for crawls or basements, determined by the contractor on a lot-by-lot basis. Lots that are naturally sloping down hill (fill lots) have been given a 3-10% grade to establish the preferred foundation type. Lots that are sloping up hill (cut lots) have a pad elevation established, allowing for the foundation to be built above finish grade elevation while maintaining the preferred drainage design.
- b. Erosion control plan sheets have been added back into the CID plan set. Stage 1 now includes sediment traps and runoff control measures. Stage 2 now includes intermittent grading. Due to the project "V2 Comment Response Letter" not specifically addressing Engineering erosion and sediment control related comments, we would like to take the time to respond to those before addressing V3 comments (see below).

START V2 COMMENT RESPONSE: Please find below the review comments received dated 03/05/2025:

1. Comment: Repeat: Ensure erosion control plans follow NCDEQ design criteria. There are areas where the silt fence appears to be handling a decent amount of area without any other erosion control measures. Table 6.62a in NCDEQ's NC Erosion and Sediment Control Planning and Design Manual specifies the maximum areas silt fence can be designed for without adding additional measures. Consider adding additional diversion ditches routed towards the proposed sediment basins.

Response: Additional measures have been added to reduce contributing areas to a maximum of 0.25 acres per silt fence outlet.

- 2.Comment: Ensure silt fence outlets are located at low points along the silt fence. Please add a silt fence outlet at the low point south of the existing pond on this sheet, similar to what was shown in the previous submittal.

Response: Silt fence outlets have been revised to ensure they are located at low points on site. A silt fence outlet has been added to the location requested, south of the existing pond.

- 3.Comment: Repeat: Dewatering bag should not be placed in way that the water will naturally flow back into the sediment basin. If water is being routed around the basins, ensure it is able to remain in the limits of disturbance and not conflicted with other erosion control measures.
- a. This comment also applies to Sheets C3.8 and C3.9.

Response: Dewatering bags have been relocated to an area that satisfies this comment.

- 4.Comment: There is a leader indicating "existing soil path," however the path is not showing. Please show the path or remove the leader based on intentions for this phase of erosion control.

Response: The "existing soil path" callout was erroneous and has been removed from sheet C3.7.

- 5.Comment: Repeat: Specify how access to existing houses will be maintained throughout construction. If the existing dirt drive is to be maintained during Phase 1 of erosion control it should be shown on the plans.

Response: Notes have been added to the plans that access should be maintained to homes along Amazon Trail during construction, see snip below. A note has also been added to the project E&SC construction sequence. The contractor is to schedule construction activities accordingly. The existing dirt drive is to be maintained during Stage 1 of erosion control.

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ACCESS TO HOMES ALONG AMAZON TRAIL SHALL BE MAINTAINED THROUGHOUT CONSTRUCTION. THERE IS TO BE NO CONTRACTOR PARKING, STOCKPILING, STAGING, OR BLOCKED ACCESS AT ANYTIME DURING CONSTRUCTION.

- 6.Comment: The SB#3 dewatering bag should be moved outside of the extents of the sediment basin.

Response: Dewatering bags have been relocated accordingly.

- 7.Comment: Repeat: Provide inlet protection around all inlets that do not have any.

Response: Inlet protection has been revised.

- 8.Comment: Please add additional contour labels northeast of SB#4.

Response: Additional contour labels have been added to the northeast of SB #4 and contour labels have been added to each of the sediment basins for clarity.

9.Comment: Clarify what the line through the southwest corner of SB#2 represents. If it is a contour, it should be adjusted so as not to overlap with other contours.

Response: The loose line has been resolved.

10.Comment: Extend the WP#2 access easement to include the full extents of the access path around the pond.

Response: The access easement has been revised to include the full extents of the path around the pond.

11.Comment: Repeat: slopes are not to exceed 3:1 without additional steps taken for stabilization. Slopes of 3:1 or less are recommended. The geotechnical report also recommends that permanent slopes do not exceed 3:1. Due to environmental impacts, if the engineer chooses to go steeper we will allow it, but a railing must be installed adjacent to sidewalk. In addition, appropriate stabilization needs to be provided on the steeper slopes, such as rolled erosion control products.

Response: A pedestrian safety rail has been added to the project design, see C4.2 and C4.3. A rolled erosion control product has been incorporated into future E&SC design where slopes steeper than 3:1 are utilized. Please see sheets C3.7 and C3.9.

START V3 COMMENT RESPONSE: Please find below the review comments received dated 04/28/2025:

Planning & Zoning – Planning Staff:

1.Comment: *Continue to* Provide a Written Response, cloud & bubble changes, and Add revision dates to all submittal materials.

Response: Will do, thank you.

2.Comment: FYI- per the Lighting Plan sheets provided as the last 2 sheets of the Plan set (ES100 and ES101) there are 26 street light poles proposed; it is unclear; and the Applicant has not clarified or made it expressly clear, if any of those 26 are NOT WITHIN new Town public right-of-ways. Applicant can determine now and the Final Subdivision Plat (PSP) review, when it becomes imperative to know that number so that the Applicant can be Invoiced for and pay the required \$650 per pole one-time fee, payable at the time of FSP recordation.

Response: The project intent is that all street light poles are to be within public right-of-way. The Duke plan sheets are in progress of being revised to make this clear and will be provided to the Town as soon as they are complete.

CORPUD – Tim Beasley

1. Comment: C13.1 – there appears to be a graphical glitch with the horizontal bend for the waterline to avoid the storm pipe conflict that should be cleared up.

Response: The profile has been revised. Thank you.

2. Comment: Permit numbers and development fees were emailed on 4/22/25. Development fees should be paid prior to signatures.

Response: Thank you. We were notified that Caruso Homes delivered the check to the City of Raleigh Public Utility office on 5/09/2025.

Parks & Recreation – Tanner Hayslette/Eddie Henderson

1. Comment: Please change the hammerhead to a loop with enough room for a maintenance vehicle to turn around as depicted below.

Response: The hammerhead has been revised to a mini cul-de-sac as discussed in the 05/08/25 TRC meeting. Please see applicable CID sheets.

Engineering Comments:

Sheet CVR:

12. Comment: Erosion control sheets should be added back into this submittal. While we understand Wake County is reviewing the plans, the Town of Rolesville also needs to be aware of and approve the erosion control measures of new developments. The approved CID plans need to be all inclusive so the Town inspector can enforce what is proposed, as well as the contractor can construct the required infrastructure from land disturbance to restoration.

Response: ESC sheets have been added back into the plan set as a part of this resubmittal.

Sheet C4.0:

13. Comment: The proposed impervious on the site information tables does not match what is shown on the cover sheet. Ensure values are kept consistent throughout the plans.

Response: The table on sheet C4.0 has been removed from the plan set due to it providing redundant information and to avoid error as project data is revised. The site table provided on sheet C1.0 is a complete list of current and applicable project data.

Sheet C4.3:

14. Comment: There is a dimension by Lot 38 that is undefined. Please specify what it is labeling or remove the dimension. This label was no on the previous submittal.

Response: The dimension has been revised.

15. Comment: Please remove overlapping text to keep plans clear and easy to read.

Response: Overlapping text has been fixed to improve readability.

Sheet C5.0:

16. Comment: Repeat: Slopes not to exceed 3:1 without additional steps taken for stabilization. Slopes of 3:1 or less are recommended. The geotechnical report also recommends that permanent slopes do not exceed 3:1. Due to environmental impacts, if the engineer chooses to go steeper we will allow it, but a railing must be installed adjacent to sidewalk. In addition, appropriate stabilization needs to be provided on the steeper slopes, such as rolled erosion control products.

- a. Thank you for showing the railing, please ensure permanent slope stabilization measures are also shown on the plans.

Response: Permanent slope stabilization utilizing rolled erosion control products can be seen in the erosion control sheets, see sheets C3.7 and C3.9.

Sheet C5.1:

17. Comment: Stem walls have been added. Please provide more clarity as to how stem walls are designed. The plans should show the extent of the wall, specifically including the start and end points, as well as indicate the values of bottom of wall elevations. If "STEM" is meant to be the bottom of wall elevation, please clarify this on the plans.

Response: Stem walls have been removed from the project design/sheets. Please see noteworthy design changes (a.), above, for a more elaborate explanation.

18. Comment: Adjust the greenway grading to reflect the hammerhead that was added east of Lot 20.

Response: The hammerhead has been revised to be a mini cul-de-sac with a 15' radius for this resubmittal per 5/8/2025 TRC conversation with Park & Recreation. The mini cul-de-sac has been graded and is properly reflected in the greenway profile. The greenway easement has been revised to allow a minimum of 10' distance from edge of greenway pavement.

Sheet C5.2:

19. Comment: Please add back in the spot elevations shown in Inset A so it is clear that the stormwater is being routed towards a drainage structure.

Response: The spot elevations have been added back into Inset A on sheet C5.2.

Sheet C5.4:

20. Comment: The greenway to the west of WP#4 is creating a low point with no outlet. Please revise to ensure stormwater is able to flow freely without pooling.

Response: The greenway low point has been raised to allow for adequate pipe cover. A 15" culvert has been provided to allow surrounding area to equalize hydraulically. It is noteworthy that that water discharging from SCM #4 will first flow underneath northern boardwalk and not through 15" culvert, leading to a smaller sized culvert than maybe anticipated. See updated Inlet "Post Development Inlet Areas" and modeling within the project SIA Report.

Sheet C6.3:

21. Comment: Ensure separation is provided between sewer services and storm structures. This applies to all utility sheets.

Response: All sewer and water services seen in project utility sheets have been verified to have adequate/constructable separations.

Sheet C7.1:

22. Comment: Repeat: Ensure minimum drop requirements in storm structures are met. A minimum of 0.1' is required for angles between 0-45 degrees and a 0.2' drop is required for angles between 45-90 degrees.

Response: Structures have been updated to provide 0.1' drop for angles between 0-45 degrees and a 0.2' drop for all angles between 45-90 degrees, where applicable. The modelling seen in SIA Report has been revised accordingly.

Sheet C8.5:

23. Comment: Pipe separation should be dimensioned from the outside edge of the pipe so that pipe thickness is taken into account. Ensure cover is calculated correctly and that minimum separation requirements are being met.

Response: Dimensions have been revised, and pipe minimum separations are met.

Sheet C13.0:

24. Comment: Ensure stationing is shown on all profiles.

Response: Stationing has been added to all profiles.

Sheet C13.1:

25. Comment: Ensure minimum separation is provided between water and storm pipes.

Response: The profile seen on sheet 13.1 has been revised. Minimum separation is now provided.

Sheet C14.0:

26. Comment: There is a structure and pipe missing in the CB 503 to FES 500 profile. Please show and label the pipe and structure in the profile view, as well as label the structure in the plan view.

Response: Structure YI 501A has been added to the plan and profile "CB 503 to FES 500" on sheet C14.0.

Sheet C15.0:

27. Comment: Per the Town's Standards Manual, the greenway is required to have a minimum slope of 0.50%. This was previously provided but has changed to this submittal.

Response: The greenway slope has been updated to match the longitudinal slope of Woodlyn Park which is now above the minimum slope of 0.50%. Please see the updated plan and profile.

28.Comment: Please show the Tansley Crest Loop proposed grade where the greenway crosses the street.

Response: Road labels have been added to the plan and profile for clarity, where applicable. Tansley Crest Loop proposed grade has been revised within the profile. Please see plan and profile sheet.

SIA Report:

29.Comment: Repeat: Ensure all inlet drainage areas accurately match contours.

Response: Inlet areas have been revised to match contours. Storm sewers modeling seen within the project SIA Report has been updated accordingly.

30.Comment: Please show all proposed contours on the Post-Development Inlet Areas sheet.

Response: All proposed contours are now shown on the Post-Development Inlet Area Exhibit.

31.Comment: Repeat: The drainage area for PDD #4A on the Permanent Diversion Ditch Drainage Areas map does not match existing contours. Please update drainage area to accurately reflect the area draining towards PDD #4A.

Response: PDD #4A has been updated.

Wake co Watershed Mgt – Kevin Zelaya/Elizabeth Powell

V3- Letter of Disapproval (SEC-137279-2024/SWF-137381-2024) that was provided to Applicant by Wake County is uploaded.

Response: We are in the process of resubmitting SEC-137279-2024/SWF-137381-2024 documentation to Wake County for review.

NCDOT – Jacob Nicholson

V3 – NCDOT Driveway Permit / Encroachment Agreement – revised plans received on 2025-04-07 under review.

Response: We have received comments from NCDOT and are in the process of resubmitting.

Sincerely,



Roman Cook

Project Engineer

American Engineering Associates – Southeast, PA