



V2 - PSP-23-02 -
response to
Comments (also see
mark-up responses)

June 1, 2023

Town of Rolesville, NC

Re: Parker Ridge

Dear Town Staff,

This letter is in response to the following comments provided by the Town of Rolesville.

Sheet C0-0:

1. Please include the submittal number on the cover sheet. (PSP-23-02)

Response: This has been added.

Sheet C1-1:

2. Please verify the sanitary sewer being shown on the ALTA/NSPS Land Title Survey. According to imaps, there is sanitary sewer that extends north.

Response: This sewer was completed after our surveyors were at the site but this line has been added.

3. The Town's preference is valley curb in neighborhoods like this due to the amount and frequency of driveways.

Response: This is also preferred by our client so BGE will propose this.

4. Street B, Long Melford Drive and Street H need to be dimensioned as collector roads (60' ROW with 35' back to back) for continuity of the collector roadway.

Response: This street has been modified to be a 60' R/W.

5. Please adjust the labels at Street H and the adjacent lot numbers for legibility.

6. ***Response: This has been revised.***

7. Please show and label the existing pond to the east and south of the site.

Response: The R/W is now shown.

Serving. Leading. Solving.™

8. Thank you for showing the future connection to Irina Drive on the south side of the site. Please show the existing ROW and street for reference.

Response: The R/W is now shown.

9. There appears to be a table intended on this sheet that plotted blank. Please revise accordingly.

Response: The table has been revised.

10. There should be no buffer at the greenway easement and sanitary sewer easement on the south side of the site.

Response: The buffer is not proposed to be planted.

11. Please show the existing ROW line for the south side of Long Milford Drive.

Response: This has been added.

Sheet C2-1:

12. Please show the existing street for School Street, north of the site.

Response: The existing street has been shown.

13. Please include the bearings and distance information for all streets, in addition to the curve radii.

Response: This is included in the table on sheet C2-0.

14. Please label the grey dashed line on the east side of Long Milford Drive.

Response: The sidewalk has been labeled.

Sheet C2-2:

15. Please show the adjacent property information for the parcels to the north of the site.

Response: The Town's property is now shown.

16. Please confirm if you have started looking into mitigation or the affects of placing the greenway within the stream buffer.

- a. It looks like the linework shows a stream to the north and south of the greenway but does not connect. Will there need to be a boardwalk over the stream? What impacts to the stream will this greenway have?

Response: There is an existing path with culverts here which is why this location was chosen to cross the stream to avoid an additional impact.

17. Please show the parking stall dimensions for the parallel parking on the alley. The linework doesn't look consistent for sizing.

Response: Parking dimensions have been added.

18. Is the alley connecting to Redford Place Drive? The linework makes it appear to not connect but if not, what is the intention for extending it that far? How will vehicles turn around?

- a. If it is to connect, will new curb cuts and driveway aprons be installed?
- b. This comment also applies to Sheet C2-4.

Response: The alley is connecting and the linework has been shown now.

19. Please confirm if the existing driveway aprons are to be removed or remain in place along Redford Place Drive.

- a. This comment also applies to Sheet C2-4 and Sheet C4-2.

Response: The driveway aprons shown will be removed

20. Please confirm if a pedestrian crossing will be provided at the location the greenway intersects Street E.

Response: The pedestrian crossing will be provided.

Sheet C2-4:

21. Please review the pedestrian crossing location on the west side of the roundabout. Consider moving it to where the sidewalk intersects rather than a “mid-block” crossing closer to the intersection of the alleys, or consider doing a bidirectional pedestrian ramp at the intersection of the alleys with Street E.

Response: The ramps have been moved closer to the intersection.

Sheet C2-5:

22. There is no existing sidewalk on the east side of Long Melford Drive where the south side is proposed to connect. Consider ending the sidewalk sooner and providing a ped ramp to cross for a continuous path.

Response: The sidewalk ended and a ramp will be added with the next submittal.

Sheet C2-6:

23. Please review the pedestrian ramp locations throughout the site. Consider locating them at the intersections to minimize mid-block crossings where unnecessary.

Response: They have been moved to the intersections where possible.

Sheet C3-1:

24. Please confirm the intention of putting a blow off assembly within the pavement at the Street D cul-de-sac. Consider extending and placing a hydrant.

Response: This has been revised.

25. Confirm the location of the catch basin that is at the neck of Street D cul-de-sac; it is currently over the sanitary sewer and within the sewer easement.

a. This comment also applies to Sheet C4-1.

Response: This has been revised.

26. Sanitary sewer from SMH-38 to SMH-39 will need a sewer easement.

Response: The easement has been added.

27. The existing cleanouts should be abandoned in place if not being used for this development; the City of Raleigh will provide final approval for the sewer.

Response: The note has been added to abandon the cleanouts on C3-1.

Sheet C3-2:

28. No part of a retaining wall, including the tie backs, can be within ROW. Please confirm the location and elevations of the proposed wall near Lots 54 & 55.

Response: The area has been regraded so the retaining wall is no longer proposed.

29. Confirm that the storm and sewer locations meet the minimum separation requirements both vertically and horizontally.

a. This comment applies to Sheet C3-3, C3-4

Response: The street section and R/W has been revised so that the existing sewer may be utilized.

30. Confirm the placement of the tee near EXSMH-02; it does not appear to align with the main.

Response: The

31. Work with the City of Raleigh on the location of the retaining wall adjacent to the sanitary sewer easement.

b. Top and bottom wall elevations will be required for all retaining walls.

Response: The elevations have been labeled.

32. Please label all easement widths.

Response: Easement widths have been added.

Sheet C3-3:

33. Review the hydrant location near SMH-49 and SMH-48 to remove them from the storm easement.

Response: This has been revised.

Sheet C3-5:

34. There is a storm and water conflict on the north side of the intersection of Street B and Long Melford Drive.

Response: This has been revised.

35. A City of Raleigh easement will be needed around the hydrant near Lot 128.

Response: An easement has been added.

Sheet C3-6:

36. Please review the sewer and easement locations west of Street G. Will a revision to the recorded easements be made?

Response: yes, we plan to update easements to include the sewer if it isn't currently located within the easement.

37. Please review and revise the angle label near SMH-27.

Response: This is at a 90 degree angle currently

Sheet C4-1:

38. Please review the grading behind lots 169 and 170. There appears to be a low point with no drainage.

Response: An inlet has been added.

39. Please confirm if the linework near Lot 175 is supposed to be a retaining wall or if the contours are incorrect.

Response: Yes, there is a proposed retaining wall there and it is labeled now.

40. Consider providing storm inlets prior to intersections to avoid drainage flow through them.

Response: The inlets have been added.

41. Confirm the placement of CB-312A and CB-302; they appear to be at high points.

Response: These have been removed.

42. A multi-use path will require a 10' width. Final approval will be with the Parks Department.

Response: Noted.

43. All proposed contours should tie into existing contours.
a. The contour at the very end of the stub to the northeast appears to be cut off. Please review and revise accordingly.

Response: This has been revised.

44. Please confirm if the trees are to be cleared near the stub to the northeast. An existing conditions/demo plan should be included showing this, along with any impacts to Redford Place Drive.

Response: The clearing limits have been added as well as a demo plan.

45. Confirm the grading near CB-316. It appears there is a low point behind the sidewalk.

Response: An inlet has been added.

46. Confirm the intent for drainage at the low point of the retaining wall at Lot 204.

Response: An inlet will be added at the next submittal.

47. The City of Raleigh has specific grading requirements within their sanitary sewer easements for access. Please review and revise accordingly.

Response: This area has been flattened as much as possible.

48. It appears the grading is impacting wetlands; revise accordingly or provide the information for your wetland permitting.

Response: The wetland maps/drawings have been revised from the previous submittal.

49. There appears to be a low point on the south side of the greenway, near FES-400. Please review and revise for drainage.

Response: This low point has been removed.

Sheet C4-2:

50. Any storm sewer outside of the ROW will need a public easement if the storm is to be public.

- a. This applies to culverts also.

Response: The easement was added.

51. There appears to be a low point behind Lot 32. Please review and revise accordingly for drainage.

Response: An inlet has been added.

52. Please adjust all labels for legibility.

Response: Labels have been revised.

53. Please confirm if the intent was to remove the crown along Street E (west side of the roundabout).

a. Please add a street label.

Response: Yes, since there is an existing sewer, the street will not be crowned in this area. A street label has been added.

54. Please provide proposed contour labels.

Response: Additional contour labels have been added.

55. It appears there is a low point at Lot 155; please review and revise accordingly for drainage.

Response: An inlet has been added.

Sheet C4-3:

56. Please review the grading at Lot 228 for drainage.

Response: An inlet has been added.

57. Provide catch basins at the end of the dead-end road to the south to collect drainage prior to running off site.

Response: CBs have been added.

Sheet C4-4:

58. Please review the grading at the north cul-de-sac of Street F.

Response: The inlet has been relocated to the low point.

59. Please review and confirm all streets are labeled on the grading plans.

Response: Street labels have been added.

Sheet C4-5:

60. Please confirm your grading and low points for drainage.

Response: This has been revised to add inlets at low points.

61. A 10 ft access around SCM 2 should be provided for maintenance.

Response: There is a graded access for SCM 2.

62. Please confirm what the coloring near CB-209 represents.

Response: That is the existing wetland that is proposed to be impacted.

Sheet C4-6:

63. Please confirm if the slope at the end of the cul-de-sac is 2:1. Please consider adjusting this for maintenance. Is this expected to be mowed?

Response: This has been flattened some by lowering the road. We will specify plant material on the next submittal.

Sheet C5-0:

64. Will the buffers be extended to Open Space #1?

Response: We do not intend to plan Open Space 1 since it will be dedicated to the town.

65. Please confirm the leader location and linework at the 50' Neuse River Buffer behind Lots 195-197.

Response: This has been revised.

Sheet L1-0:

66. Please confirm street buffers.

Response: These were confirmed already during the master plan review/approval.

67. Please confirm if a drainage easement is being shown in Open Space #1.

Response: This is the existing easement that is shown.

Construction Drawings:

Please consider the following for CDs; These comments are shown as green in the markups and are not required for approval of the preliminary plat:

A. Once the alignment of the greenway is decided, please show the existing conditions and what the greenway will be tying into.

Response: This is shown on the existing conditions sheet and the proposed greenways will tie to existing grade.

B. The future greenway in the north corner of the park at Open Space #1 and the greenway to the school will need easement.

Response: This will be provided.

C. Please provide the minimum cover at all road culverts. The design calculations will be required for 10-year storm for all storm sewer and 25-year storm for all culverts. All HGLs will need to be contained within the pipes.

Response: Noted.

- D. The top and bottom wall elevations will need to be provided.

Response: These are provided.

- E. Please label the storm sewer as private vs. public if both are being included in these plans.

Response: These are labeled.

- F. Please review the angles of pipes within the storm system and the direction of flow. Redirecting flow less than 90 degrees is not ideal.

Response: This has been revised.

- G. Drainage easements will be required if a swale is crossing 2 or more lots.

Response: Easements have been added.

- H. Profiles for all streets and greenways will be required. All greenways should meet ADA requirements if possible with existing topography.

Response: This will be provided.

Response:

Planning & Zoning – Planning Staff & WithersRavenel:

1. Provide a Written Response to ALL the comments; a mark-up response to mark-up comments is acceptable.

Response: Noted.

2. Revise dates of the Preliminary Plat plan set.

Response: This has been revised.

3. See two PDF's – (1.) Memo dated 5/4/23 of written comments, many of which relate/mirror the mark-ups; (2.) Mark-up comments on the plan set itself.

Response: Noted.

Parks & Recreation - Eddie Henderson:

As part of the Staff review, this application was presented to Parks and Recreation Advisory Board (PARAB) on April 26, 2023; the Board endorsed that these Comments be brought forward by Staff. Please see also the PDF of mark-ups to go along with the following Comments:

1. Revise Greenway that runs along the north side of the pond towards Long Melford Drive to continue further north and cross on the north side of Street H. Revise to show this Greenway converting to a Sidepath along north side of Street H to the

[Town Campus] property line, demonstrating connectivity to the [Town property] and compliance with Greenway Plan.

Response: The sidepath has been added.

2. Revise the shown Sidepath on Street H continue west along the north side of Long Melford Drive; at the space between lots 175 and 176, convert Sidepath to a Greenway and continue it Redford Place Park property line. This provides a true off-street Greenway to Redford Place Park and thus complies with Greenway plan.

Response: The 10' sidepath has been added to Street H, Long Melford and up along the culdesac for Street D as it is shown on the approved Master Plan.

3. Revise the Greenway trail stub between lots 166 and 167 (leading from Long Melford to Redford Place Park) to be PRIVATE, not public. Staff likes this location for residents to use, but is not preferred as the ONLY means to connect residents to Redford Place Park. Previous Comment #2 provides the Town's preferred means.

Response: This easement has been labeled as private.

4. Revise Greenway behind Field A to instead parallel Redford Place Drive as a Sidepath. This Sidepath shall continue the length of Redford Place Drive, from the Redford Place Park entrance to the Villages of Rolesville subdivision entrance to comply with Greenway Plan.

Response: These side paths have been revised.

5. Revise proposed Greenway in Parcel A (donated as park land) to run out to Redford Place Drive then convert to a paralleling Sidepath along the parcel's entire road frontage.

Response: This would require an impact that can be avoided by placing the greenway over the existing pipes as we have shown in the 1st submittal drawings. There is a wetland that will prevent it from meandering from the crossing to Redford Place Drive so we have instead proposed a sidepath along Redford Place Dr and a greenway stub to the future town park.

6. Revise Greenway in the southwest corner (*South of SCM 1) to continue to the property line with PIN 1758777301 – it is presently shown to end prior to property boundary. Greenway Plan identifies this connecting – discuss with Staff the practicalities of building Greenway to this point.

Response: NCDEQ will not permit a greenway going to nowhere, so we have stopped the greenway short of the stream buffer but offered the easement for future extension

7. Revise to show Bike Lane striping in the existing Redford Place Drive roundabout to comply with Bicycle Plan.

Response: We are currently checking to see if the existing street is wide enough for a bike lane and will follow up with you separately regarding this.

Engineering (CJS/B&M) - Brian Laux / Jacque Thompson:

See two PDF's of comments – 1.) Memo dated 05-02-2023, and 2.) Mark-ups of the Preliminary Plat.

Response: Noted. We have responses to the memo in this letter and to the markups separately.

Wake County Watershed Management - Janet Boyer:

1. Move Greenway trails and retaining walls out of Neuse River Buffer (NRB).

Response: We will be proposing to get the impacts permitted for the greenway trail and the retaining wall at the crossing.

2. Post Development Drainage Area map does not match contours on Grading Plan. Label topography to clearly show that drainage areas match and that all lots drain to SCMs.

Response: The drainage area map has been revised. Also, lot grading has not been completed but we still propose for all of the lots to drain to SCMs.

3. Provide Municipal Stormwater Tool

Response: This has been provided.

4. Please label NC Dam Safety Inventory ID for existing dam.

Response: This has been added to the site plan sheet.

5. Please note: Flood prone soils are mapped on the site. Please contact Rolesville Floodplain Administrator for requirements.

Response: Per the Rolesville floodplain administrator, the floodprone soil types must be shown on the plans. These have been added and labeled.

COR Public Utilities - Tim Beasley:

See PDF of mark-up comments on Sheet C3-0 only.

Response: Noted.

Wake County Fire / EMS - Brittany Hocutt:

1. Fire department requests 96 ft cul-de-sacs

Response: The culdesac diameter was scrutinized in the master plan review and then increased to 90' to meet the NCDOT requirements since Rolesville does not have a detail.

Serving. Leading. Solving.™

2. Fire hydrants located down alley 2 & 3 should be moved closer to Redford Place drive as the alleys are not fire department rated or for fire truck use.

Response: Alleys 2 and 3 will be rated for fire truck use.

NCDOT – Holt Willis:

NCDOT District Office has no comments for case PSP-23-02 submittal V1 (Preliminary Subdivision Plat - Parker Ridge).

Response: Noted. Thank you.

Planning/Zoning Comments

PSP-23-02 / Parker Ridge / Major Preliminary Subdivision Plat
1st Submittal TRC REVIEW
Date: May 4, 2023

The following is the first review of the preliminary subdivision plat for Parker Ridge, completed by BGE for Lennar Carolinas LLC., dated April 3, 2023. The project proposes the construction of 161 single-family detached dwellings and 114 townhouse dwellings, on approximately 87 acres, located on School Street and Redford Place Drive. The subject site was recently rezoned under case number MA22-03 to RM-CZ, Cluster option and RH-CZ. As part of the rezoning, a number of conditions were attached to the approval.

Review Comments:

Application and Submission Requirements

1. The application indicates that the number of phases is unknown. However, phase lines are labeled on the site plan as Phases 1, 1B, and 2. We ask that phase lines be clarified and clearly indicated on a separate sheet/phasing plan as these will be matched with final plats at time of approval / recordation and the application be updated accordingly.

Response: A phasing plan has been added. See sheet C2-7.

2. Wetlands Sketch Map indicates areas of rock outcroppings that are not indicated on the site plan nor on the site survey. See comment #10 below.

Response:

3. A Tree Survey (Section 6.2.4.2.A) and Tree Preservation Plan (Section 6.2.4.5.C) are required as a portion of Landscape Plan submitted with this application.

[Serving. Leading. Solving.™](#)

5440 Wade Park Boulevard, Suite 102 · Raleigh, North Carolina 27607 · 919-276-0111

Response: We are currently working to complete the Tree Survey and Preservation plan and intend to submit with the next review.

4. Copies of all environmental permits for disturbances and encroachments shall be submitted to the Town.

Response: These will be submitted after the site plan / construction drawing submittal.

Conditions of the Map Amendment / Rezoning

5. 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 the LDO.”

It should be noted that Rezoning Condition #8, reduces the required buffer by allowing fences to be substituted for walls. It reads, “Perimeter buffers shall be provided as shown on the Concept plan. Type 3 and Type 4 perimeter buffers may include 6’ fences instead of walls.” The plans, however show the proposed Class 4 buffer with 3’ fence and no berm as required by the ordinance standards.

Response: The Class 4 buffer has been revised to include a 6’ fence and a berm wherever existing vegetation is not being preserved.

Cover Sheet and Site Details

6. Add the current project number to the cover sheet. Also add any historical case numbers to the sheet, including but not limited to the recent map amendment / conditional rezoning.

Response: The project # has been added.

7. All the approved conditions of the Conditional Zoning should be listed on the cover sheet.

Response: These have been added

8. Please add the following information to the Site Data Table and/or correct the information as shown on the mark-ups:

- a. Note whether this parcel is within Town Limits or the ETJ.
- b. Note the current impervious surface, and the proposed total impervious surface amounts.
- c. Provide maximum building height permitted for each dwelling type and the height proposed.
- d. Indicate where the designation of Future Land Use originates.

- e. Update "Proposed zoning" to read, "Current zoning" and "Existing Zoning" to "Previous Zoning"
 - f. Current Zoning should read, "RH-CZ and RM Cluster-CZ"
 - g. The Net Area and the Total Area should be equal.
 - h. Cluster Open Space should be 12%, not 10%
 - i. Parking requirements, parking calculations, and spaces provided to demonstrate compliance
 - j. Calculations and acreage to demonstrate compliance with the maximum 15 gross acres dedicated to the Townhouse Development.
- b. Response: These have been added to the site data table and/or the Open space calculations.**

9. In the Site Data Table, the minimum area for Single-Family Detached is listed as 4,800 square feet. Per LDO Section 3.1.2, RM Development Standards, the minimum lot area is 5,000 square feet. Please revise the lots that do not meet the minimum standard.

Response: The lots have been revised to meet the minimum square footage.

10. List the minimum lot area for RH-CZ (Townhomes) in the Site Data Table. This should be 2,000 square feet, per LDO Section 3.1.3, RH Development Standards. Ensure that all townhome parcels meet this requirement.

Response: All of the townhome parcels meet the 2,000 sf minimum requirement.

11. Open Space Calculations should include a demonstration of compliance with the requirements for Section 3.1.B.1., Cluster Open Space as well as LDO Section 6.2.1.D-G. The Open Space Plan should also be provided with this information and an additional level of detail.

Response: Open space plan and calculations have been revised to include this added level of detail.

Existing Conditions

12. The ALTA land title survey does not show the information needed for a complete Existing Conditions Plan. The Existing Conditions plan sheet must include topographic contours that extend 100' past property limits, setbacks, environmental site features, tree lines, items to remain and those to be removed as a portion of this project, etc. Please refer to the application checklist for a full list of the expected information to be shown on an Existing Conditions and/or Demolition Plan sheet.

Response: The ALTA has been replaced with a topographic survey.

Site Plan Sheet(s)

13. Add a Legend to the Overall Site Plan and remove the unpopulated chart.

Response: The legend and table have been updated.

14. Remove the note on the right hand side of the Overall Site Plan sheet. That note was intended for the rezoning which has now been approved.

Response:

15. Adjust the Lot Typicals shown on Sheet 2-0 to address the following:

- a. Move the '10' Corner Lot Setback' to be within the shown property line for the diagram.

Response: The lot typicals have been updated.

- b. Applicant has indicated a 15' setback. However, if a car is to park in the driveway, minimum of 19' length clearance from front of garage shall be provided in accordance with 6.4.4.A.3 and 6.4.4.C.1.c. The lot typicals should be adjusted accordingly.

Response: The units have all been moved back to 19' to be counted

- c. The minimum lot size for each of the typicals should be provided. It should also be noted that the dimensions shown for the SF lot does not meet the minimum lot size required by the ordinance.

Response: The minimum sizes are now shown on the lot typicals.

16. The applicant shall provide additional information on the provision of both public and private alleys. The plans shall also demonstrate that the use of these alleys by emergency and delivery vehicles is sufficient and safe.

Response: The alleys have been checked for truck turning movements and have been adjusted where necessary.

17. Provide parking calculations showing the total number of parking spaces required for the townhomes and single-family dwellings and the number of spaces provided. It should be noted that garages may not be used as a portion of the parking calculations as noted in Table 6.4.3.G.

- a. Specify how many parking spaces in the lot adjacent to the Future Amenity/Clubhouse will be required for townhome parking, and how many spaces will be available for the Future Amenity/Clubhouse area.

Response: Calculations have been added.

- b. The applicant should verify the size of the proposed parallel parking in the alleys.

Response:

- c. It does not appear that any ADA accessible parking has been provided on the site.

Response: These have been added.

18. Remove the phasing lines, clarify, and identify proposed phases on a separate Phasing Sheet.

Response: The phasing sheet is now C2-7.

19. Provide the Zoning District designations for adjacent parcels.

Response: The designations have been added.

20. It appears that the retaining wall near Lot 256 has sidewalk proposed on one side; is this going to be part of a trail or open space?

Response: This is proposed to be a private sidewalk that is a ramp down to the public greenway.

21. On the Overall Site Plan sheet, a 'Zoning Line' is shown at Lot 139. What is the purpose of this marker?

Response: This marker was not in the correct spot so it has been removed.

22. The minimum lot area for the RM zoning district, which covers single-family dwellings in this project, is 5,000 square feet. Numerous single-family lots on the enlarged plan sheets do not meet this minimum requirement and need to be adjusted accordingly. This includes Lots 153, 220-236, and Lots 240-255.

Response: These lots have been revised to meet the minimum size requirement.

23. Street D and Lots 176-179 were not shown on the sketch plans submitted as a portion of the conditional rezoning application recently approved by the Town. The applicant should address the addition of Street D and the reconfiguration of the lots.

Response: The final submittal to the town (through the attorney) showed this reconfiguration and this is what was approved. It appears that the website showed a previous submittal and not the final submittal.

24. It is recommended that Lots 148-150 be slightly redesigned to remove the easement areas from the lots.

Response:

25. It is recommended that lot line between Lots 256 and 257 be adjusted to allow for additional lot frontage on Lot 256.

Response:

26. The location of all proposed mail kiosks should be identified on the plans.

Response:

27. The thick grey dotted line shown on the plans should be labeled and added to the legend.

Response: This has been added to the legend.

28. There are a few areas labeled as existing streams that do not have an associated riparian buffer. The necessity for the provision of these buffers should be verified and if required, buffer areas shall be added to the plans.

Response: These are not jurisdictional streams per the environmental consultant.

29. The applicant should verify the number of parking spaces in each of the lots matches The label.

Response: This has been revised.

30. Line work on Redford Pace Drive in the area of Lots 39-46 should be revisited and corrected.

Response: This has been revised.

31. The distance between proposed structures on Lots 50 and 51 should be verified as 30'. If less, please revise plans as necessary.

Response: This has been revised.

32. Roads and blocks should be designed in accordance with Section 9.2.1 and 9.2.2

Response: This has been reviewed based on the approved master plan.

Open Space Plan

33. The plans shall demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 6.2.1.D-G, specifically in terms of the open space sizes and types as well as the design standards in Subsection G.

Response: Open space plan has been revised to include this information.

34. The applicant shall revise the plans to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of LDO Section 3.1.B which requires 40% open space be provided. Further, the plans should be revised to show the required open space as a conservation easement.

Response: Plan has been revised as requested.

35. As mentioned previously, the RM cluster requires 12% open space. Calculations shall be updated accordingly.

Response: Plan has been corrected.

36. Staff recommends proposing actual lot lines and creating a separate parcel for all open space lots, specifically Open Space #6 and include the building layout/square footage of this future amenity center in the current plan set, to properly plan for adequate parking and access for this facility as well as permitting in the future.

Response: This information has been added to the plans.

37. Will the trail throughout the project be an improved trail (clearly marked, paved, impervious), or a primitive trail? Note this on the Open Space sheet.

Response: This will be a paved greenway trail.

38. For Active Open Space areas, designate what type of Open Space opportunities will be provided and any specific programming identified. (ie. Pocket park, dog park, etc.)

Response: The developer is currently working to program these spaces and will include this information with the next submittal.

39. If the trail to the left of Long Melford Drive is intended to be an Active Open Space trail, please continue the shading of the trail as it's done on the trail to the right of the street.

Response: Corrected.

40. Is this part of the active trail? Do you intend for it to stop in the natural resource buffer?

Response: This is part of an active trail. We have stopped the trail short of the natural resource buffer and provided an easement for the future connection.

41. Alley 1 and Alley 4 are shown as open space, please revise.

Response: This has been removed.

Landscape Plan

42. LDO Section 3.1.2, requires a Type 2 buffer to be provided around the RM-cluster portions of the site. It appears in some areas, the buffer intensity is over and above what is required.

Response: The buffers shown match the approved masterplan that was part of the zoning.

43. In accordance with Table 6.2.2.1 and Section 6.2.2.1.F Section, the buffers require the provision of a fence or wall. Type 2 buffers require a 6' fence, Type 3 buffers require a 6' wall and Type 4 buffers require a 3' wall with a 5' berm. The Landscape Buffer Notes and the Typical Buffer Sections should be updated to reflect these requirements.

Response: All buffer sections have been updated to match these requirements except for the following. Zoning Condition #8 reduces the required buffer by allowing fences to be substituted for walls. It reads, "Perimeter buffers shall be provided as shown on the Concept plan. Type 3 and Type 4 perimeter buffers may include 6' fences instead of walls." In addition, a berm will not be provided where existing vegetation is being preserved within the buffer as this would kill the trees.

44. Areas of existing vegetation which are to be preserved shall be indicated on the plans. All areas shall be clearly marked with tree protection fencing and fencing details should be added to the plans.

Response: All areas of existing vegetation are shown surrounded by tree protection fencing and the associated details.

45. Landscape plans or Preservations plan (as required by 6.2.4.2.A.10) shall demonstrate compliance with the preservation standards of LDO Section 6.2.4.5.B. Calculations of the required 10% shall be included on the plans.

Response: This information will be provided with the Preservation plan at the next submittal.

Additional Comments and Requirements

46. A Lighting Plan, prepared in accordance with Section 6.6 shall be submitted.
Proposed location of lighting standards shall be included on the site plan and any necessary easements shall be indicated.

Response: This will be submitted with our next submittal.

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Debbi Ferm', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Debbi Ferm, PE