

Date: 2022-05-02
Project: Mitchell Mill, ANX 22-03, MA 22-06
Timmons Group Project #47342
Subject: Response to Preliminary Annexation and Map Amendment Review Comments
Project Contact: Patrick Barbeau
Phone: 919.866.4512
Email: Patrick.Barbeau@Timmons.com

Response to review comments have been added below each comment in **bold** font.

MAP AMENDMENT

Mike Elabarger, Planning

1. There is no clear and obvious point of pedestrian connectivity from the east side (its residents) to the west; please explain the intention to tie the two sides together into a cohesive neighborhood. Suggest condition to clarify intentions (signage consistency).

Response: Acknowledged. Pedestrian access across Jonesville Rd will be located at midblock greenway crossing, and intersection with Mitchell Mill Rd.

2. The stub street to PIN 1758880396 could be a future connection to a project called Hills at Harris Creek (MA 22-01) under review by TOR. Please consider the road section specifications in light of that connectivity.

Response: The road has been designed with a 60' right-of-way.

3. The specifics of the non-residential component of the request is less than clear. Suggest a condition to flesh this out and refer to Concept plan.

- a. No ground based apts - Suggest providing a permitted use list within the non-residential area.

Response: Noted.

- b. Set by ordinance inc. on plans – Suggest providing a connection / trigger for developing non-residential, similar to that for recreational amenities (cond. #4) as all residential could develop before any non-residential ; this would be a stage of issuance of certificates(s) of occupancy, not any of earlier benchmarks (i.e. submittal of a site plan, approval of a site plan, etc. all of which could be months to years prior to certificate of occupancy stage).

Response: LDO Sec. 3.4.3.D.4. includes commercial development triggers in NC zoning districts. A maximum fifty (50) percent of the residential units may be permitted until at least twenty-five (25) percent of the approved nonresidential square footage is permitted (issue of a building permit). The remaining residential units may be permitted upon approval (permit) of at least fifty (50) percent of approved non-residential square footage.

MAP AMENDMENT

JG Ferguson, Parks & Recreation

1. Regarding Greenways – Revise concept plan to show ALL of the residential areas (there are 5 distinct areas, orange, peach, 3 purple) having direct access to a greenway which in turn connects

to other greenway segments which lead to the extents of property (for connection to off-site greenways and further connectivity).

Response: Pedestrian access from northern residential lots to public greenway is proposed along bridge over Harris Creek. During the development plan approval process additional greenway crossings will be evaluated for inclusion with this project based on overall environmental impacts.

2. In all instances, proposed greenway shall be “off-street” (not connected to or doubling as sidewalks). General standard is minimum 10’ from back of curb/sidewalk if/when generally paralleling a street/road. Greenways ideally would be routed not parallel to streets.

Response: Due to the nature of the site, limiting wetland and stream impacts is critical to the design. During the development plan approval process additional off-street greenway crossings will be evaluated for inclusion with this project based on overall environmental impacts. Sidepaths may be needed based on USACE standards to minimize environmental impacts.

3. Ask/ Confirm with NCDOT on location for greenway crossing of Jonesville Road (ie min/max spacing from vehicular intersections).

Response: Approximately 500 LF of spacing is provided between the nearest intersection and the mid-block greenway crossing.

4. Greenway ‘stubs’ at major roadways like Jonesville should be centered/aligned for as direct-as-possible crossings (not major off-sets as currently shown).

Response: Greenway alignment revised.

5. On future development applications, the specificity and site limitations/options will arise for these proposed locations and routes, which is understandable and expected.

Response: Acknowledged.

6. It is suggested that a dedicated Condition about greenways, touching on the aspects above and referencing the Concept plan, would achieve the goal of showing intent to connect all parts of development via Greenway in the best manner possibility, while leaving flexibility for exact routing based on specificity that comes with future applications.

Response: We are currently in discussion with USACE of potential impacts for the development of this project. Final greenway alignment and features will be further developed and reviewed for specificity based on site limitations and environmental impacts during future development applications.

MAP AMENDMENT

Brian Laux / Jacqueline Thompson, Engineering

1. See 2 PDF’s – written memo, and then Concept plan mark-ups.
2. Roadway improvements will be required for Jonesville and Mitchell Mill per CTP.
Response: Acknowledged.
3. There is a concern with the dead-end roads that will not have future extensions and not having a turn around option, specifically for emergency vehicles. Dimensions will need to be provided

during preliminary plat plans to show whether these dead ends are feasible. Cul-de-sacs are preferred for permanent ends.

Response: The portion of the site zoned RM has been revised to not include dead ends without future extensions. All dead ends are limited to less than 150 LF.

MAP AMENDMENT

Tim Beasley, City of Raleigh Utilities

1. (via email) The proposed development has access to public sewer but does not have access to public water. A public water extension would be required from Mitchell Mill or Jonesville Rd. Raleigh will need to look into the feasibility of this development connecting to the 560 or the 495 pressure zone.

Response: Acknowledged.

MAP AMENDMENT

Matt Nolfo, NCDOT

1. (Via email) The NCDOT does not have an issue with the annexation or zoning of 5109 Mitchell Mill Road. The proposed development would need to be studied under a TIA prior to development.

Response: Acknowledged. TIA is included with this submittal.

MAP AMENDMENT

Liza Monroe, WithersRavenel; Karen Mallo, Planning & Zoning

Application Documents Provided

1. 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: TIA has been prepared by Ramey Kemp and is included with this submittal.

2. The applicant should indicate if the proposed rezoning is a Conditional District or a straight rezoning by using "CZ" following NC. On the application, the applicant has written "NC CD".

Response: Noted.

3. Clarify which zoning districts are requested on the application. The concept plan has the site divided between NC zoning and RM zoning, but RM zoning is not mentioned on the application documents.

Response: Zoning request has been revised to include a split zoning.

Concept Plan Sheet

1. Within the conditions, it states that "no dwelling, single family, attached (townhome) building shall exceed six (6) dwellings. On several occasions on the concept plan, there are buildings with over 6 dwellings.

Response: Layout revised to provide maximum of 6 units per townhouse building.

2. The site data table notes that the density allowed for the RM district is 5 units/acres. The maximum density allowed is 3 units/acre by-right. A density of 5 units/acre is only permitted with a cluster development.

Response: Data table revised.

3. In accordance with LDO Section 3.4.3.C, a maximum seventy-five (75) percent of gross acreage can be dedicated to residential uses within the NC District. Provide a breakdown of the percentages and acreages for each use type.

Response: A breakdown of uses is included on data table. Approximately 45% of NC zoning is dedicated to residential uses.

4. The LDO requirements for open space are as follows:

- a. For residential developments greater than fifty (50) acres in size, required open space shall include at least one (1) small or medium open space type and one (1) large open space type, or shall include one (1) small open space type and two (2) medium open space types. At least fifty (50) percent of dwelling units must be within one-half ($\frac{1}{2}$) mile of a medium or large park.

Response: Active open space areas are provided. Final open space options/features will be specified based on site limitations during Development Plan review process.

- b. For mixed-use developments greater than fifty (50) acres in size, required open space shall include at least three (3) small open space types and two (2) medium open space types. (Section 6.2.1.D.2)

Response: Active open space areas are provided. Final open space options/features will be specified based on site limitations during Development Plan review process.

- c. There appears to be a pool area, small parklets, and two dog parks. These areas could be utilized as open space types to demonstrate compliance. The acreage of these areas should comply with limits established in LDO Section 6.2.1.E.

Response: Acknowledged. Final open space options/features will be specified based on site limitations during Development Plan review process.

Update the site data table so show compliance with LDO Sections 6.2.1.D(2) and (3). Within the table currently, there is a required acreage that does not match the LDO requirements.

Response: Per LDO 6.2.1.D.2. Mixed-use districts are required to include 15% OS. The ~55-acre portion of the project that will be zoned NC includes 8.25 ac (15%). No nonresidential zoning districts are proposed with this application.

5. The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the requirements of LDO Section 3.4.3.D regarding the mixture of proposed uses and the timing of development. For purposes of the rezoning, the applicant shall provide this information in the hearing testimony.

Response: LDO Sec. 3.4.3.D.4. includes commercial development triggers in NC zoning districts. A maximum fifty (50) percent of the residential units may be permitted until at least twenty-five (25) percent of the approved nonresidential square footage is permitted (issue of a building permit). The remaining residential units may be permitted upon approval (permit) of at least fifty (50) percent of approved non-residential square footage.

6. The applicant should note that building architectural elevations will be required to determine compliance with the requirements of Table 3.4.3

Response: Elevations will be submitted with Site Plan review.

7. Applicant should note that a street wall will be required for the parking area fronting on the public street.

Response: Acknowledged.

8. The applicant should revise the plans to show the adjacent street / access easement to which the parking area and Road 3 will connect.

Response: Sidewalks will be included streets per Rolesville transportation plan. Sidewalks not shown for clarity due to scale of concept plan.

9. The concept plan only has parking indicated for the commercial section. For single-family, attached units parking is required at 2.0 spaces per dwelling unit, plus 0.25 spaces per unit for guests (Table 6.4.3.G). The parking required and the parking provided should be included in the site data table.

Response: Since garage parking is currently excluded from required parking, all parking is either located on the lot or in a surface parking lot. Residential parking in NC zoning will be provided on each lot. Townhomes are shown with 18'x19' driveways. NC zoning allows a 15% reduction in parking requirements.

Resident parking in RM zoning will be provided on each lot. Guest parking is shown in parking lots in the subdivision. Specifics such as location, size, and quantity of these parking lots will be reviewed during Development Plan review process, and are subject to change.

10. The plan does not indicate that two parking spaces are provided in the driveways. However, staff can assume they will be placed there as no other parking is labeled. A single, 90-degree parking space shall be 19' by 9' according to LDO Section 6.4.4.C. The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the parking requirements.

Response: The plan is conceptual in nature and will be further developed in accordance with LDO requirements during future development review processes. Any Development Plan would be expected to comply with the LDO unless a specific zoning condition is approved.

11. Buffer widths and types should be labeled and measured to ensure compliance with LDO Section 6.2.2.1 (RM Perimeter Buffers), Section 6.2.2.2 (Street Buffers), and Section 6.2.3 (NC Mixed-Use Perimeter Compatibility Buffers).

Response: Buffers are included on the conceptual plan. Any Development Plan would be expected to comply with the LDO unless a specific zoning condition is approved.

Comprehensive Plan Consistency / FLUM

The proposed rezoning is mildly consistent with the 2017 Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map distinction which shows these parcels as Medium Density on the FLUM. The applicant has provided a letter (Exhibit C) that notes how their proposed development may be supported by The Board given a previous expressed desire “to include more commercial uses within Rolesville”.

Response: Acknowledged.

Medium Density is classified as predominantly single-family residential uses with portions of duplex, townhouse or multifamily residential. These are lots or tracts at a density range of three to five dwelling units per gross acre including preserved open space areas along with limited non-residential uses under planned unit development or form base code provisions

Response: Acknowledged.

We will note that the proposed development also along Mitchell Mill Road, the Hills at Harris Creek, also provides the mix of residential uses to support the proposed commercial

Response: Acknowledged.

MAP AMENDMENT Via Email 2022-03-18

Derek Versteegen, Open Space and Greenways Committee

Response: We have reviewed the recommendations in conjunction with the Town’s parks and recreation comments. We look forward to further discussion with regards to your comments.

With this property there is at least one public greenway that I do not see so I marked that in red - (Red Line A). This would be on the north side of Harris Creek going east/west using the existing sewer easement as much as possible, if not entirely.

Response: After reviewing the current Town of Rolesville recommended greenway plan, it was noted that the Harris Creek Greenway ran parallel to Harris Creek along the south side of the creek, except for this portion of the route. Reviewing possible routes for the extension of the Harris Creek greenway, it is unlikely the greenway would be extended north along Harris Creek due to existing single-family lots and extensive environmental impacts. The public greenway was routed south of Harris Creek towards undeveloped land. It could then extend along the south of Harris Creek and tie into the proposed extension of Harris Creek that runs south of Harris Creek to the east. This would remove at least one crossing, which would reduce the environmental impacts to Harris Creek.

The second possible public greenway would be off Mitchell Mill Road. This is currently marked on the map but it shares the neighborhood road. If the BMP was tucked along the road and had the pollinator flowers planted on its inside banks, some bush and tree buffering would make the entrance to the

neighborhood more secluded/private especially as the vegetation matures. With the adjacent lot designated for commercial (probably a gas station) the secluded entrance will be welcomed. If the Mitchell Mill Road trail (Red Line B) was designated as public there would be, ideally, another small designated area for public parking. This would be one of the southernmost access points to the Rolesville Greenway network and some public parking there would give a lot of access to the greenway to residents in the Rolesville RTJ. I think this along with the surrounding area being looked at in a study for being more industrial, it will be easier to sell the town on the lower density. The stub out to the west will turn north, following that creek until it hits the future Fowler Road extension and/or runs into the bypass.

Response: A trailhead with parking is included on the conceptual layout. Final greenway alignment and features will be further developed and reviewed for specificity based on site limitations/options during future development applications.

The black line would be the private trail. A unique amenity with a lollipop. At the top, dead end of the private greenway, the turnaround could have a fishing dock or scenic viewing spot - again, this would be a private amenity. This black line would also provide access to the public greenway for the east side of the development while the west side has access from within the neighborhood.

Response: Final greenway alignment and features will be further developed and reviewed for specificity based on site limitations/options during future development applications.

Additional Notes:

#1

Having a trail head with public parking would give a lot of the surrounding resident's access to Rolesville's greenway network. Ideally. That corner lot (to the west) could be sacrificed as a natural buffer for the neighborhood too - giving it a little more country feel and an opportunity for a nice entrance sign/monument while making more room for public parking. And the parking isn't access from a main road or from a neighborhood road (at least where there are houses. Sacrificing the corner lot also creates more separate from the commercial space.

Response: A trailhead with parking is included on the conceptual layout. Final greenway alignment and features will be further developed and reviewed for specificity based on site limitations/options during future development applications.

#2

Consider donating this area to the town. A covered pavilion could be constructed along with a small parking lot.

Response: This would require agreement by Town and Developer. Final open space options/features will be specified based on site limitations on a future development plan.

Lastly, The park on Gro-peg Lane should remain untouched, not clear cut (as implied by the image). Adding two or three parallel parking spots on the road to give direct access to a covered pavilion - again, another one donated to the town.

Response: Final open space options/features will be specified based on site limitations on a future development plan.

Additional Consideration



TIMMONS GROUP

5410 Trinity Road
Suite 102
Raleigh, NC 27607

P 919.866.4951
F 919.859.5663
www.timmons.com

Making this section (red along pond) of the trail public, crossing the street, and stubbing out to the east so that property can connect.

Response: Final open space options/features will be specified based on site limitations on a future development plan.