



April 1, 2022

Michael Elabarger
Senior Planner
Town of Rolesville
502 Southtown Circle
Rolesville, NC 27571

Re: Lennar – School Street - Rolesville

Mr. Michael Elabarger:

We have received the letter from the Town of Rolesville, WithersRavenel, and ColeJenest and Stone, and have reviewed the comments therein. Based on the comments, we offer the following formal responses with your consideration for final rezoning approval:

Planning Department – Michael Elabarger

1. Please begin the TIA process by arranging scoping with the Planning Director.

Response: The TIA Process has been initiated with the Town.

2. Please add an Exhibit identifier to the Concept Plan document; submittal includes an Exhibit A, B, and D – Staff presumes it would be “C”.

Response: The Concept Plan has been marked as Exhibit C.

3. Exhibit B, Legal descriptions, details 3 tracts of land; there is no reference to a Proposed Zoning District relative to (Parcel A, B, or C). The Concept Plan is not relatable to these Boundary descriptions. Provide a survey or drawn exhibit of just the proposed Zoning District boundaries of the project site, and field notes of those boundaries if they are different than Exhibit B [2 Zoning Districts are proposed, and Exhibit B details 3 areas, so if 2 of the 3 = one of the Zoning Districts, this needs to be expressly clear on the documents]. Once approved by the Town Board, these new Zoning Districts will need to

be created in GIS for Zoning map purposes, relying on the boundary information provided.
Thank you.

Response: See revised sheet set.

4. Provide consistent Revision dates (and “Version #” possibly) to ALL documents to differentiate their multiple submittals. It is expected that the Concept Plan and Conditions will undergo multiple revisions and so this is critical to keep those in order. Thank you.

Response: Revision dates have been added. Reference border revision 1 mark dated 03/31/2022 on all sheets. The revision date has also been added to the Exhibit D zoning conditions.

5. Staff highly encourages Applicant to contact the applicant for MA 21- 03/Scarboro (KDM Development Corporation – find info here: <https://www.rolesvillenc.gov/projects/scarboro-property-aka-201-s-main-st>) to discuss common aspects of developing in this general vicinity.

Response: The Applicant for this project has been in contact with the applicant for MA 21- 03/Scarboro. The parties are coordinating common aspects between the two projects.

Planning and Zoning – Karen Mallo

1. See two PDF’s – written memo comments, and then mark-up comments on the proposed Concept Plan sheet.

Response: Noted.

Engineering - Brian Laux / Jacqueline Thompson

1. See PDF’s of written memo comments, and then mark-up comments on the Concept Plan.

Response: Noted.

Parks & Recreation - JG Ferguson

1. Provide Greenway connection from Cedar Lakes subdivision through development with connections to [Town Property](#) (future Town Hall & Park).

Response: A greenway connection has been added to the Concept Plan.

2. Coordinate with other property owners/developments on creating a connection to Main Street Park.

Response: A greenway connection to the park has been added to the Concept Plan.

3. Review [OSAG plan](#) for connectivity along plan north side.

Response: The OSAG plan has been reviewed. Based on discussions with Scarborough and the current design plans for the Point project, a corresponding greenway route has been added to the Concept Plan.

4. Revise to provide clarity on the Alignment of/with School Street. RES currently uses School Street for stacking for car pool and this aspect needs to be broached and addressed.

Response: The Applicant has begun discussions with the school. A proposed realignment has been added to the Concept Plan to better serve the areas.

Fire / EMS - Brittany Hocutt

1. STREET H & D - Provide turnaround unless connector is provided.

Response: We will end pavement at 150' and provide any necessary construction easements for adjacent projects to extend the road.

2. Provide Cul-de-sac Measurements.

Response: ROW and BOC Cul-de-sac measurements have been added to the Concept Plan sheet.

3. Show hydrant placement relative to proposed Wall Locations.

Response: Walls were conceptual and have been removed.

4. FYI – Any proposed amenity or other non-residential structure/use will have additional review and requirements applicable, TBD.

Response: Noted.

NCDOT – Matt Nolfo

1. There are no NCDOT roadways directly impacted by this project. If the Town requires a TIA to be done, the NCDOT would like to review the TIA for possible roadway improvements on S Main Street, E Young Street/Rolesville Road, or other nearby NCDOT roadways.

Response: Noted.

ColeJenest & Stone - Jacqueline Thompson, PE

Lennar – Rolesville Concept #8:

1. Please provide all adjacent property IDs around the site.

Response: Reference revised Concept Plan sheet set. Received adjacent property IDs based off survey.

2. Please confirm if the School Street ROW and Street D ROW will be aligned; Please adjust as necessary.

Response: The applicant is discussing School Street realignment with the school board. We have adjusted the alignment in the Concept Plan based on the current discussions. Ultimate realignment is contingent on school board approval.

3. Rolesville Elementary School and Redford Place Park are not labeled. Please ensure existing sites are called out.

Response: Property areas are now shown.

4. Please show the school loop drive for reference.

Response: Areas are now shown as reference.

5. Please show the existing conditions and roadway for Irina Drive. Will there be a future connection to Long Melford Drive?

Response: View has been extended. The property is owned by the adjacent HOA and the road connection is not possible.

6. Is there a Master PUD that should be referenced as part of this rezoning to align with the Town's master plan?

Response: Please see the accompanying Exhibit C Concept Plan.

For preliminary plat, please consider the following:

Response: This project is in the rezoning stage and will require subsequent preliminary plat review and approval. Therefore, the preliminary plat details requested below will be determined at the subsequent preliminary plat stage. As described below, requested details shown on the current Concept Plan are conceptual and provided for illustration and context only. Final details shall be determined at the preliminary plat stage.

1. Please ensure appropriate road dimensions are included.

Response: Reference revised Concept Plan in sheet set. Final dimensions will be determined at the preliminary plat stage.

A. All ROW dimensions must be clearly labeled.

Response: Reference revised Concept Plan in sheet set. Final dimensions will be determined at the preliminary plat stage.

B. Proposed street sections should be provided.

Response: Reference revised Concept Plan in sheet set. Final sections will be determined at the preliminary plat stage.

- C. Please keep in mind the minimum curve radius for centerline is 230' for a level road condition.

Response: Centerlines have now been revised in the Concept Plan.

2. Lot sizes should be defined for single family and multi-family.

Response: Reference revised Concept Plan in sheet set.

3. Typical sections should be provided for single family, multi-family and alleys.

Response: Reference revised Concept Plan in sheet set.

4. Please consider the greenway connectivity for the site and define any trails or sidewalks, labeling dimensions.

Response: Greenway connections have been added to the Concept Plan.

5. Define the buffers between the developments for single family and multi-family.

Response: Please see the townhome tract aArea boundary on the Concept Plan.

WithersRavenel - Liza Monroe & Karen Morgan Mallo, AICP

A. Application Documents Provided

1. There are four total parcels [PIN's 1758988411, 1768091558, 1758884270, 1758983710] proposed as a part of this development yet on some application sheets, only three are mentioned. The Exhibit A in the application package lists all 4 of these parcels. If the intention is to recombine the parcels, existing property lines need to be shown on an existing conditions sheet as "to be removed".

Response: Plans have been updated to reference all four PIN numbers. Per the surveyor, PIN 1768091558 (the "Corner Parcel") is incorrectly shown on GIS as a separate tax parcel and is not a legal lot, but rather part of PIN 1758988411 ("Tract A"). There is no recorded plat showing the Corner Parcel as a separate lot and the Corner Parcel has no legal description or property corners. The deed to the Corner Parcel is the same deed for Tract A.

2. Within the narrative on page 8, the applicant mentions open space and active open space being provided. Location of open space should be shown on the concept plan.

Response: Open space is now shown.

3. The applicant has provided conditions with their submittal but has not noted that this would be a conditional zoning on page one of the application [“Requested Zoning District RM and RH “]. The Concept Plan does express “RM-CZ” and “RH-CZ”. Please correct these inconsistencies. If approved with the Proposed Conditions, the conditional zoning district shall be “RM-CZ” and “RH-CZ”, and must be aware and adhere to the following:

Response: Page one of the application has been updated and will be re-executed by the property owner. Updated signature pages will be submitted to the Town as soon as possible.

a. LDO Section 3.3., with note to Section 3.3.B.2 which indicates, “*Conditions and site specific standards imposed in a conditional district shall be standards above and beyond the requirements of the LDO; conditions shall not lesser the standards ~~in~~ LDO.*”

Response: The proposed conditions are not duplicative of LDO requirements and do not propose lesser standards than the LDO.

b. LDO Section 1.14 of Appendix A. Conditions of Approval

Response: Understood.

c. LDO Section 2.3 of Appendix A, with note to Section 2.3.F.8., which indicates, “*If a conditional rezoning, the BOC may also consider if the conditional rezoning addresses the impacts reasonably expected to be generated by the development use of the site, can reasonably be implemented and enforced for the subject property, and if it will mitigate specific issues that would likely result if the subject property were zoned to accommodate all the uses and the minimum standards of the corresponding general zoning district*”

Response: Understood.

4. To ensure that new development and redevelopment does not adversely affect the capacity of streets and intersections to accommodate vehicular traffic safely and efficiently, a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) is required to be submitted with the rezoning application per LDO Section 8.C. This has not been provided.

Response: Our traffic engineer is working with Town consultants regarding scoping of the TIA. A copy of the TIA will be submitted to the Town as soon as it's available.

B. Proposed Conditions

1. Remove the plan preparation date from the conditions as it is considered a draft until approved or include a last revised date.

Response: The Concept Plan preparation date has been removed.

2. No comments on condition #2.

Response: Noted.

3. Please provide the maximum density proposed for this parcel / zoning area.

Response: The proposed rezoning conditions include maximum unit counts for both proposed zoning districts. The Concept Plan has been updated consistent with the proposed conditions.

4. No comments on condition #4.

Response: Noted.

5. Please provide the maximum density proposed for this parcel / zoning area.

Response: The proposed rezoning conditions include maximum unit counts for both proposed zoning districts. The Concept Plan has been updated consistent with the proposed conditions.

C. Concept Plan Sheet

While a site plan is not required as a portion of the conditional zoning application it is extremely helpful, not only the staff and reviewers but to the Planning Board and Board of Commissioners in the review of the proposed rezoning. The proposed concept plan does not show the detail necessary to determine any mitigation efforts of the impacts of the requested rezoning, such as buffers, traffic improvements, recreation, and environmental resource protection. As mentioned previously, LDO Section 2.3.F.8. of Appendix A of the LDO, indicates, *“If a conditional rezoning, the BOC may also consider if the conditional rezoning addresses the impacts reasonably expected to be generated by the development or use of the site.* We suggest that the applicant amend the application to include, at a minimum, a sketch plan addressing the following items, for staff and the Board to determine the impact of the proposed rezoning, compliance and/or exceedance of ordinance requirements, and what additional conditions are needed to reduce the impacts from the proposed rezoning and eventual development of this site.

Response: The Concept Plan has been updated to show greater detail including conceptual open space locations, greenway connections, street locations, and proposed buffers. The Concept Plan, together with the proposed rezoning conditions provides the information necessary to determine whether the proposed rezoning is in the public interest and whether impacts of the permitted uses are appropriately mitigated. The Town’s recently adopted LDO includes extensive requirements for buffers, open space, and protection of environmental resources which will be met at the subdivision phase. Traffic impacts and recommended mitigation measures will be evaluated through the TIA process.

1. A Sketch Plan set including:

a. Cover Sheet– Should include the following:

- i. Project name and project number
- ii. Applicant and owner contact information
- iii. Site data table including acreage, existing and proposed zoning, proposed units/housing types, proposed density per housing type, open space required, open space proposed, parking required, parking proposed, building height allowed, building height proposed, etc.
- iv. Vicinity Map
- v. General Notes
- vi. A box for dates of the original submittal and any resubmittals
- vii. North arrow

Response: This information has been added to the Concept Plan Cover Sheet.

b. Existing Conditions Sheet– Should include the following:

- i. Environmental features and associated buffers. There appears to be several streams and wetland areas shown on iMaps
- ii. Existing structures (& a note whether they are to be demolished)
- iii. Existing ROW
- iv. Existing easements (& a note whether they are to be demolished)
- v. Existing utilities (& a note whether they are to be demolished)
- vi. Existing vegetation locations & size
- vii. Existing structures to be demoed
- viii. Existing property lines to be removed
- ix. Existing environmental features
- x. Zoning district and use of the property and adjacent properties
- xi. North arrow
- xii. Scale

Response: This information has been added to the Existing Conditions sheet.

c. Concept Sketch/Site Plan Sheet– Should include the following:

- i. Proposed building locations including height and building footprint (houses and any proposed amenities)
- ii. Proposed rights-of-way and parking
- iii. Proposed easements
- iv. Proposed utilities
- v. Open space areas
- vi. Environmental features and associated buffers
- vii. Setbacks (per LDO 3.1.2 & LDO 6.8.5H for structures with street-facing garages)
- viii. Lot widths and areas compliant with LDO 3.1.2
- ix. North arrow
- x. Scale

Response: The submitted Concept Plan includes much of this information. As discussed above, proposed building locations, footprints, and heights will be shown in later development phases. Due to the inherent uncertainty of the site plan process, it is not feasible to commit to all design elements during the rezoning phase.

d. Architectural designs –Provide an architectural design sheet that includes the following (and consent statement if applicable),

- i. Building heights compliant with LDO 3.1.2
- ii. Facades of single-family structures that comply with the standards of LDO 6.8.5D & 6.8.5I
- iii. All materials noted and used in compliance with LDO 6.8.5E & 6.8.5F
- iv. A sketch of a block that shows compliance with Architectural Variability standards noted in LDO 6.8.5G

Response: Building designs will be provided in later development phases and will be required to meet LDO standards.

C. Comprehensive Plan Consistency/FLUM

The proposed rezoning is consistent with the 2017 Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map distinction which shows this area of Rolesville as high density residential on the FLUM.

High density is defined as a mixed-use neighborhood of single family, duplex, condominium, townhouse or multifamily residential. These are lots or tracts at a density range of six to twelve dwelling units per gross acre including preserved open space areas along with nonresidential uses under planned unit development or form base code provisions.

Response: Agreed.

D. General Design Comments

Although specific details are not provided on the sketch plan, we offer the following so that the applicant may make adjustments to design and/or conditions PRIOR to rezoning. We reserve the opportunity to provide additional comments once a site plan is submitted:

1. Although the LDO is silent on the requirements for mailbox kiosks, we ask that the applicant indicate the location of proposed kiosks, the number of mailboxes provided, and the location and number of associated parking spaces to be allocated for mailbox parking.

Response: Mailbox kiosk locations will be shown at Preliminary plat.

2. If any additional landscaping is to be provided, we ask that a Landscape Plan be submitted with subsequent submission.

Response: Landscaping plans will be submitted at the Preliminary Plat phase.

3. In previous submittals and meetings, there was a commercial [non-residential] component to the site mentioned. Please clarify if/that this is no longer the intent?

Response: The proposed zoning does not envision commercial/non-residential uses other than the neighborhood amenity center.

4. LDO Sections 6.2.2. / 6.2.2.1.G. requires the provision of buffers between zoning districts. If this project is creating two distinct zoning districts, the applicant should provide for a 25', Type 3 buffer between the RM and RH zoning districts. We will defer further comment on the provision of buffers to the Town Staff.

Response: A buffer has been added between proposed zoning districts.

5. Street D and School Street are not shown in alignment. The alignment of these streets should be considered as a condition of rezoning. Further, the applicant should address the status of physical access to the existing homes [PIN's 1758997386, 1758998460, 1758999444, 1768090349/1768080437 (common ownership) on School Street and the potential provision of a streetscape buffer (LDO Section 6.2.2.2).

Response: We are exploring generally the alignment of School Street and access to the parcels described. We have had preliminary conversations with the developer of the Scarboro Property about potential collaborative efforts.

6. The length of the cul-de-sac of Street G / Long Melford Drive, in particular beyond the intersection with Street H, causes issue, considering that Street H is only a stub street and has no proposed timeline for connection. Further, we believe a turn-around at Street H is warranted until such time that the connection is made. Roads and blocks should be designed in accordance with LDO Section 9.2.1 and 9.2.2.

Response: Road locations are conceptual and will be finalized at the Preliminary Plat phase in conformance with LDO requirements.

7. Per LDO Section 3.1 .2., the minimum lot width for [Single-family Detached use in] the RM Zoning District is 85'. However, the lot widths on the concept plan do not appear to meet the minimum width, unless the applicant is requesting a cluster development, in which case the plans shall be designed in accordance with LDO Section 3.1.B. [and per LDO Section 3.1.2.B., Lot width minimum for cluster is 40']. Further, the open spaces in a cluster development need to be examined during the rezoning; the applicant should identify all recreation spaces and open spaces clearly on the plans and provide open space calculations, in accordance with Section 6.2.1.D.
 - a. IF Cluster Development is proposed, revise documents very explicitly and clear as to which – or both – proposed Zoning Districts (the RM and/ or the RH) is sought to be developed under Cluster Development standards.
 - b. If Cluster Development is being proposed, we would further suggest that the applicant demonstrate compliance with the dimensional standards for the zoning districts, specifically setbacks.
 - c. The applicant should note that, in the RH District per LDO Section 3.1.3.B, that although a 15' front setback is required, this setback does not allow for sufficient length to park a car in the driveway. Thus, if front-loaded driveways are proposed, that driveway shall be required to be the minimum 18' in depth, and thus a 15' front setback could not actually be utilized.

Response: It is anticipated that the cluster development option will be used for the proposed RM-CZ district. Accordingly, the project will be required to meet all LDO standards for Cluster Development at the Preliminary Plat phase. Although, lot widths and setbacks will be shown on the Preliminary Plat, we anticipate the project will include 18-foot front setbacks for front load townhouses and 18-foot rear setbacks for rear loaded townhouse to provide adequate parking area for each lot. Open space calculations have been added to the Concept Plan.

8. LDO Section 3.1.3.B(“Special Standards”) indicates that no more than 15 gross acres may be assigned to attached or multiple family uses. This acreage limit shall be applied to the total of all attached and multifamily uses within a subdivision. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the acreage limit may be divided within and/or distributed throughout a subdivision. The applicant should demonstrate compliance with this requirement.

Response: The Concept Plan has been updated to show compliance with this requirement.

Please contact our office should you have any questions regarding the attached submittal.

Sincerely,

S. Shayne Leathers, P.E.
Senior Project Manager
Land/Site – Raleigh