



March 29, 2022

Planning and Zoning – Karen Mallo
Parks and Recreation – JG Ferguson
Engineering – Brian Laux/Jacqueline Thompson
Wake County Watershed Management – Jeevan Neupane
COR Utilities – Tim Beasley
NCDOT – Matt Nolfo
Fire/EMS – Brittany Hocutt

Re: SP 22-01 – Hampton Pointe Dental Office (1st Submittal Review Cycle)

Dear reviewers,

Thank you for the comments on our submittal. Enclosed are updated drawings addressing your comments. Below you will find all of your comments and advisements and our corresponding responses. Please note: this resubmittal (second submittal) includes a first submittal of our storm and erosion control package as it was inadvertently left out of our first submittal.

Ms. Mallo -

- 1. Comment:** When resubmitting, please cloud or highlight in another color any revisions to the plan set. Staff suggests doing so in red for an easier review.
Response: The revised set of plans has clouded revisions.
- 2. Comment:** COVER SHEET – Update the cover sheet to include the project number SP 22-01 on the cover sheet.
Response: Please see revised Cover Sheet.
- 3. Comment:** COVER SHEET – Remove the individual contact information for the Town of Rolesville staff. All communication shall be sent to planning@rolesville.nc.gov.
Response: Please see updated contact information on the revised Cover Sheet.
- 4. Comment:** COVER SHEET – Include date of revision on plans.
Response: Please see revised Cover Sheet.
- 5. Comment:** Within the site data table, correct the minimum lot width and area. Per LDO Section 3.2.1B, the minimum lot width shall be 100 feet and minimum lot size shall be 20,000 square feet.
Response: Please see revised sheet C0.2.
- 6. Comment:** Within the site data table, correct the open space minimum noted. Per LDO Section 6.2.1D, a minimum 5% of open space shall be provided.
Response: Please see revised sheet C0.2

7. Comment: Within the parking table in the LDO, the following shows up for Office and Medical. Per the use table and the definitions, a dental office is not a medical office nor a professional office. It is missing from the parking requirements. However, based on determination by the Planning Staff: **Parking shall be 2.00 spaces per 1,000 square feet.**

- a. Staff also received the parking letter requesting for a higher maximum. There is no Section 5.11 in the UDO nor the LDO as noted in the letter. However, the applicant may need relief from the parking maximum as outlined in LDO 6.4.3. or provide an Alternative Parking Plan in accordance with 6.4.3.K

Response: The parking letter requesting the higher maximum has been updated to reflect the 2.00 spaces per 1,000 square feet ratio and included in this resubmittal.

8. Comment: DEMO SHEET - Within the notes on C0.2, existing vegetation to remain is noted as being protected. Limits of disturbance, limits of tree disturbance, and locations of tree protection fencing (details and notes as required) should be added to the plans as required in LDO Section 6.2.4.5.

Response: Please see revised demo sheet for location of tree protection

9. Comment: DEMO SHEET - Any tree removal will require a tree removal permit. No person shall cut, remove, or relocate any trees on any public or private property unless a preservation plan or tree removal permit has been approved. (LDO Section 6.2.4.5D)

Response: Understood – please provide the tree removal permit application to be completed.

10. Comment: DEMO SHEET - Deciduous and evergreen trees shall be preserved to the greatest extent possible. There are two trees over 18 inches dbh that are proposed to be removed. Per LDO Section 6.2.4.5B.3, these trees shall be replaced on site with at least four (4) or more trees of similar species and size.

Response: Please review updated L2.1.

11. Comment: DEMO SHEET - Label existing and proposed land uses, zoning districts of the subject site and surrounding parcels.

Response: Please see revised sheet C0.3.

12. Comment: DEMO SHEET - The extent of existing vegetation on the site is not indicated. A preservation plan shall be required as part of any landscaping plan submitted to the Land Development Administrator and meet the standards noted in LDO Section 6.2.4.5C.

Response: Please see revised sheet C0.3 for area of protection to be maintained during proposed construction.

13. Comment: LANDSCAPE/BUFFERING - In accordance with Section 6.2.2., buffers are required between the new parcel containing the proposed dental office and the remaining commercially zoned vacant lot. The applicant shall label and provide the required buffer widths on the overall site plan.

Response: After further conversations with the Planning Staff, this comment is no longer valid.

14. Comment: LANDSCAPE/BUFFERING - The required Type 1 Perimeter Buffer between the two parcels shall not contain any development, impervious surfaces or site features that do not function to meet the standards of this section (LDO Section 6.2.2.2). The required 10' (or wider) buffer shall remain free of other improvements. It appears that the shared access easement is located within the buffer. Contact Rolesville Planning Staff for further information.

Response: After further conversations with the Planning Staff, this comment is no longer valid.

15. Comment: LANDSCAPE/BUFFERING - Within the planting schedule on the Landscape Plan sheet, clearly note what requirement each planting is fulfilling to demonstrate compliance with the varying requirements of the LDO.

Response: Refer to update L2.1

16. Comment: LANDSCAPE/BUFFERING - Although provided, it should be noted that street buffers are not required along private drives, driveways, alleyways, or single lot infill within existing residential subdivisions (LDO Section 6.2.2.2C). Therefore, a streetscape buffer is not required along Eagles Scholar Drive and South Main Street.

Response: Understood, buffer note was removed. Trees are still being planted to fulfill tree replacement requirements.

17. Comment: LANDSCAPE/BUFFERING - LDO Section 6.2.4.6. requires screening of service areas. The plans should be revised to demonstrate compliance with this Ordinance section:

- a. Provide a detail of the dumpster enclosure including the height and materials used.
- b. Provide screening for the transformer shown to the right of the entrance

Response:

- a. ***Dumpster detail included in this resubmittal.***
- b. ***Refer to updated sheet L2.1***

18. Comment: SITE PLAN - Label all site distance triangles

- a. If the applicant intends to have a ground or monument sign, its proposed location should also be shown on site plan. The sign itself will be permitted through the sign permitting process however, its location shall be reviewed during the site plan review process to ensure it is not within the site distance triangle (LDO 6.1.2D & 6.1.5B.4)
- b. All monument signs shall be located a minimum of 10' from the road/right-of-way and located outside of the visibility triangle.

Response: Noted. Please see revised sheet C2.1 for the site triangle location.

19. Comment: Include the right-of-way width for all streets shown.

Response: Please see revised sheet C2.1 for both existing and proposed public ROW width for SR 401 and the easement width for private streets surrounding the proposed site.

20. Comment: Label the acreage of each open space area to ensure they total the amount shown within the site data table

- a. For commercial developments less than twenty-five (25) acres, required open space shall include at least one (1) small open space type. (LDO Section 6.2.1D)
- b. The small open space area shall be a minimum of 500 square feet.

Response: There are plenty of eligible open spaces on-site. Please see updated landscape plan for open space square footage calculations.

21. Comment: Include a symbol in the legend for the proposed light poles.

Response: *Please see updated legend on sheet C2.1*

22. Comment: Applicant should verify the number of parking spaces shown matches the labels.

Response: *Please see revised number of spaces on sheet C0.2.*

Mr. Ferguson -

23. Comment: Site/lot frontage along Main Street requires sidewalk – revise to show; this may require coordination with DOT Project U-6241 (LAPP funding improvement to Main Street corridor in this vicinity.)

Response: *Please see revised sheet C2.1.*

24. Comment: Provide pedestrian crossing (pavement markings) of private drive between site and Bojangles, tying into sidewalks near Main St.

Response: *Please see revised sheet C2.1.*

Mr. Laux/Ms. Thompson -

25. Comment: Sheet C0.1 – This submittal is not the final drawing; please remove the label for now.

Response: *Please see revised set of drawings*

26. Comment: Sheet C0.2 – Wake County Sediment and Erosion control standards and notes should be used for the grading and drainage notes.

Response: *Please see revised erosion control note pointing to the details with the relevant erosion control notes and details for Wake County.*

27. Comment: Sheet C0.3 – The text for the leader indicating the storm easement by S Main St. is cut off. Please adjust so that the text can be clearly read.

Response: *Please see sheet C0.3.*

28. Comment: Sheet C0.3 – All removals should be shown on the demolition plan.

- a. Include any hatching/notes for the demolition related to the sanitary sewer relocation.
- b. Please adjust the scale to not cut off the tree located in the southern portion of the plan.

Response: *Please see revised sheet C0.3.*

29. Comment: Sheet C0.3 – Please ensure there is communication and coordination regarding the proposed S Main Street road improvement.

Response: *There has been since this project started and coordination will continue until construction is complete.*

30. Comment: Sheet C0.3 – Please adjust the 20' City of Raleigh Easement leader/dimension so it is visible in the lower left corner of the sheet.

Response: *Please see revised sheet C0.3.*

31. Comment: Sheet 1-1 - The cover sheet labels this sheet as C0.4. Please adjust as necessary.

Response: Please see revised cover sheet using external surveys sheet number.

32. Comment: Sheet C1.2 - The cover sheet labels this sheet as C1.1. Please adjust as necessary.

Response: Please see revised sheet C1.1.

33. Comment: Sheet C1.2 - The temporary silt ditch reference shown in the legend is not correct. Please update.

Response: Please see revised legend on sheet C1.1.

34. Comment: Sheet C1.2 - The referenced details should be for Wake County's sediment and erosion control standard details. Please update the references and details as necessary. This comment also applies to Sheet C1.3 and C1.4.

Response: Please see revised Erosion Control and Detail sheets.

35. Comment: Sheet C1.2 - Please provide protection in the existing ditch on the west side of the site.

Response: Please see revised sheet C1.1 where there is a note telling the contractor to "use existing or replace with..." the rock check dam.

36. Comment: Sheet C1.2 - Consider putting silt fence along the side of the existing ditch.

Response: Please see revised sheet C1.1.

37. Comment: Sheet C1.2 - The note for "Provide Temporary Silt Ditch to Basin" should refer to the diversion ditch detail.

Response: Please see revised sheet C1.1.

38. Comment: Sheet C1.2 - Silt fence should be provided outside of the work for the sanitary sewer. The limits of disturbance should also be adjusted to account for this work. This comment applies to Sheet C1.2 also.

Response: Please see revised sheets C1.1 and C1.2.

39. Comment: Sheet C1.2 - Continue the diversion ditch along the silt fence to the southeast.

Response: Please see revised sheet C1.1.

40. Comment: Sheet C1.2 - Provide a silt fence outlet.

Response: There is no need for an outlet here, slope runs parallel to the erosion control silt fence and is picked up via the temporary diversion ditch. Please see revised sheet C1.1.

41. Comment: Sheet C1.2 - Stockpiles should not be up against a BMP. Please consider revising the location.

Response: Please see revised sheet C1.1 for revised location.

42. Comment: Sheet C1.2 - Construction is shown to occur outside of the proposed property line. Please ensure that this is considered, and any necessary adjustments made. This comment applies to all sheets.

Response: The temporary agreement will exist within the sale of the property for the grading purposes adjacent to the site and for utility access purposes. The purchase

agreement contract is being amended to include this temporary access and will be provided upon completion.

43. Comment: Sheet C1.2 - The symbol for the scour protection at end section is missing.
Response: The Scour protection is shown on C1.2. See added detail 6 on sheet C1.3.

44. Comment: Sheet C1.2 - Consider freezing or turning off demolition layers to help clean up the drawing since at Phase 2 of the erosion control, they should be already removed.

a. This comment also applies to Sheet C3.1 since the removals will be complete when utility installation is occurring.

Response: This comment was taken into consideration and not found to be part of the client's or the engineer's interest. This information is important to remain so that the contractor has proper reference on-site both before and after demolition has occurred. Please feel free to give us a call if there is a strong reason to why this should be done from a Town of Rolesville point of view.

45. Comment: Sheet C1.2 - Consider adding a storm structure prior to the entrance to the site off S Main Street per NCDOT 840.02.

a. This comment also applies to Sheet C3.1 and Sheet C4.1.

Response: We analyzed this section and determined that no drain is necessary. The existing inlet infrastructure will pick up the runoff.

46. Comment: Sheet C2.1 – All sidewalks directly behind the curb should be 6' wide. Please adjust sidewalks accordingly.

a. Based on the location and adjacent work of the sidewalk being attempted to keep in place, consider removing and replacing this section as well to allow for a consistent sidewalk between both entrances.

b. Please show proposed sidewalk the entire length of the property along Louisburg Rd.

Response: Per conversation with reviewers, this is no longer required to be 6' wide since the existing walk is 5'. For areas that require wheel stops for the requirement, they have now been added. Please see revised sheet C2.1.

47. Comment: Sheet C2.1 – Show all proposed improvements including street work due to the sanitary sewer relocation.

Response: Please see revised location of sanitary sewer manhole and pipe on sheet C3.1. The street will not be touched. Required improvements are per sheet C2.1.

48. Comment: Sheet C2.1 – It is recommended to use 30" standard curb and gutter throughout the site per Town standards.

a. Please adjust the details on C5.1 if the curb is adjusted.

Response: Respectfully a recommendation is not a requirement, and we are going to stick with the curb type that follows the interest of the client. If this is a requirement please call us to discuss.

49. Comment: Sheet C2.1 – Consider adjusting the dumpster location for truck access; Please provide proof of vehicle turning movements through the site.

Response: The dumpster location will be fine as is, please see truck turn exhibit showing the path through the site.

- 50. Comment:** Sheet C2.1 – All ADA ramps should reference NCDOT 848.05 and 848.06. Please confirm the layout depicted will meet ADA requirements.
Response: *Please see revised sheet C2.1 and associated details.*
- 51. Comment:** Sheet C2.1 – Please revise the note for “Curb Turnout” to “Curb Cut” to match the detail label.
Response: *Please see revised detail name.*
- 52. Comment:** Sheet C2.1 – The existing 30’ Utility Easement along the south side of the site should be labeled as power easement.
Response: *Please see revised easement note. Please note that the easement is now partially within the new ROW for US 401.*
- 53. Comment:** Sheet C2.1 – Include a light duty asphalt symbol in the legend and add label on the plan to define the location, similar to the Heavy Duty Pavement.
Response: *Please see revised sheet C2.1 pointing out light duty areas typical of spaces.*
- 54. Comment:** Sheet C2.1 – Please change the text in the rightmost leader to read “Town of Rolesville” rather than “City of Rolesville.”
Response: *Please see revised sheet C2.1.*
- 55. Comment:** Sheet C2.1 – Please add a label and/or line type in the legend for the dark dashed line that is called out as an irrigation sleeve on Sheet C3.1.
Response: *Please see revised sheet legend on C3.1.*
- 56. Comment:** Sheet C2.1 – How is the buffer along the southeast side of the site 30 ft when it is shown within a 30’ power easement?
Response: *Please note that the ROW has changed here and that the existing power utility easement will be partially absorbed by the dedication of the ROW.*
- 57. Comment:** Sheet C2.1 – Please label the existing ROW. This comment also applies to sheet C3.1.
Response: *Please see revised sheet C2.1 and C3.1 for this information.*
- 58. Comment:** Sheet C2.1 – Please add a label for NCDOT U-6241 (Louisburg Rd). This comment also applies to Sheet C3.1.
a. Please verify with NCDOT any improvements as part of the main street section.
Response: *Please see revised sheets with a reference callout to the NCDOT improvements.*
- 59. Comment:** Sheet C2.1 – Consider adjusting the radii to a minimum of 28’ for fire truck access. If proceeding with less than 28’ radii, the Town Fire Chief will have to provide approval.
Response: *Per conversation with the Fire Department, there is no issue with the current design of the access to the site. There are two attached exhibits showcasing the auto turn of the dump truck and the fire truck around the site.*
- 60. Comment:** Sheet C3.1 – City of Raleigh will provide comments related to the sanitary sewer relocation, but storm sewer structures are not allowed in a sanitary sewer easement. Please revise the sanitary and storm sewer layout, considering all existing infrastructure.

a. City of Raleigh will also define the required easement width.

Response: The easement width has been discussed and solidified. A stormwater crossing is required, but the required stormwater easement will not overlap with the sanitary per the comment above.

61. Comment: Sheet C3.1 – Please confirm the cover over the sanitary pipe passing through the bioretention basin.

Response: Minimum cover will be provided.

62. Comment: Sheet C3.1 – Confirm whether the 6” GV and Tee connection on the east side of the site near Louisburg Rd should be a tapping sleeve and valve assembly per detail W-14 on C5.3, instead of tee and valve.

Response: Please see revised note on sheet C3.1.

63. Comment: Sheet C4.1 - Proposed contours should tie into existing contours; Please trim contours as appropriate.

Response: Please see revised sheet C4.1.

64. Comment: Sheet C4.1 - Since the storm sewer runs along the property line, a storm sewer easement will be required.

a. Please confirm who will be maintaining the pond and storm system.

Response: The existing owner will be maintaining the storm system and pond. Bojangles will have access to the storm sewer system within the easement.

65. Comment: Sheet C4.1 - Please add riprap on the end of the FES that crosses the entrance from Eagle Scholars Drive.

Response: Please see Erosion control plan for permeant RIPRAP location.

66. Comment: Sheet C4.2 - Please confirm the cover over the storm pipe passing through the bioretention basin.

Response: The storm sewer will have plenty of cover per code minimum.

67. Comment: Sheet C4.2 - Please provide a reference for the OCS detail on Sheet C5.2.

Response: Please see note on revised sheet C4.2.

68. Comment: Sheet C4.2 - Please consider using RCP for storm sewer underneath the roadway.

Response: Considered, but determined to remain. Let us know if this a requirement.

69. Comment: Sheet C4.2 - Please provide a detail for the installation of HDPE pipe to show the bedding, installation, and backfill requirements. Please reference this detail or notes on Sheet C4.2.

Response: Please see note added to sheet C4.2 below the legend.

70. Comment: Sheet C4.2 - A storm sewer package is required for review with construction drawings.

Response: Noted, we have submitted this to Wake County as of 03/10/22.

71. Comment: Sheet C5.2 - Add City of Raleigh detail S-3 for Asphalt.

Response: Please see revised sheet C5.3 with the added detail.

72. Comment: We need to see HGL for the 10-year storm design. All HGL should remain inside the pipe for the design and that is what we will be looking for. Please provide a 25-year storm design for the culvert and include the HGL for this. For the HGLs we will need a chart or graph that provides the pipe inverts upstream and downstream, as well as the pipe size so we can see what is happening upstream and downstream, not just that the pipe has flow capacity.

Response: The flow capacity calculations should meet these requirements because they are less than 100% meaning all flow is occurring within the top of the pipes. No elevations required. This information will be better reflected and spoke about in the drainage report after we get comments back from the county. HGLs follow capacity within pipe pretty closely in a parabolic shape. Peak flows occur around 85% of the cross section filling the pipe. So as long as we are less than 100 % of peak flow you can assume that the flow is filling less than 85% of the height of the pipe diameter. If a graph is still required after this explanation, please call us to discuss how we can do this. Usually, projects of this size do not require modeling and are only in spreadsheet calculations. Thanks!

73. Comment: We will need to see gutter spread and will be looking to make sure that the gutter spread meets the allowable spread which is a maximum ½ the lane width. We would like to see gutter spread for the access road. While we understand the speeds are slow on this site, we would still like to see what the flow are doing and what the proposed storm layout provides for drainage

Response: Again, this information will be provided after we get comments back from the County. It is likely that things change and we would not want to repeat work. Leave this as an outstanding item until then. Thanks!

74. Comment: Your plan appears to possibly have underground storage under the parking lot (highlighted in red in the screenshot). Please provide information related to these such as volume calculations. Are these being used for storage or treatment or both? Are the pipes connected to these in any way? More detail for these features is needed to be reviewed.

Response: Yes, this is underground storage. We have not selected a vendor. Both systems that are being considered have typical sections attached. We do plan on this being a BMP for the site as well. The model results include the affects of the BMP and meet the control requirements. Volume calculations are in the attachments.

75. Comment: Wake County will have to provide final approval related to the pond.

Response: Understood

Mr. Neupane -

76. Comment: Provide Sediment control plan for demolition plan.

Response: Please see erosion control details phase 1 on sheet C1.1.

77. Comment: Provide Drainage areas.

Response: Please see drainage report and exhibit.

78. Comment: Stockpile should be at least 50 ft away from basin, silt fence on low sides.

Response: Please see revised location of stockpile on sheet C1.1.

- 79. Comment:** Provide appropriate drainage pipe underneath the entrance.
Response: *Please see drainage plan on sheet C4.2*
- 80. Comment:** Provide outlets on low points.
Response: *Please see drainage plan on sheet C4.2.*
- 81. Comment:** Provide soil map.
Response: *Please see soils map on sheets C1.1. and C1.2.*
- 82. Comment:** Provide encroachment letter from NCDOT.
Response: *The project is currently under review with NCDOT. Approvals will be provided upon receipt.*
- 83. Comment:** Provide deed, letter of consent from land owner if the applicant is not the same as the land owner.
Response: *Deed and letter of consent from land owner included in this resubmittal.*
- 84. Comment:** Provide site Specific construction sequences on C1.2 and C2.2.
Response: *Please see construction schedule on sheet C1.2 and notes on sheet C0.2.*
- 85. Comment:** Provide Wake County Approval block.
Response: *Please see sheet C1.3.*
- 86. Comment:** How is construction run off diverted to the basin? Provide conveyances (ditch) Ditches and calculation.
Response: *Please see revised location of ditch. This runoff amount is so small that the traditional detail as required by Wake County will be plenty for the conveyance. No calculations needed.*
- 87. Comment:** Provide stage seeding and sediment control along project perimeter as part of the initial installation in the erosion control sequence. Provide note that area downstream of basins will be stabilized immediately upon construction.
Response: *This particular note is already covered via required notes on sheet C1.2. Please see revised sheet C1.2.*
- 88. Comment:** Provide details on skimmer, dewatering time and orifice calculation. Provide calculation for all basins and SCM conversion sequence on the plan. Provide note in the construction sequence to notify NCDEQ-DEMLR a minimum of 10 days prior to initiating this sequence, per NCG01 permit.
Response: *Please see revised sheet C1.1 and details for calculations on the skimmer basin and required notes.*
- 89. Comment:** Submit FRO form, application.
Response: *FRO and application included in this resubmittal.*
- 90. Comment:** Provide ground stabilization table.
Response: *Please see table in the details on sheet C1.4.*

91. Comment: Please note that the New NCG01 permit requirements will need to be followed when submitting for erosion control plan approval and the NCG01 permit will need to be applied for through the new Portal. The Certificate of Coverage will need to be acquired prior to Wake County setting up the pre-construction meeting and issuing the Grading Permit.

Response: Understood

Mr. Beasley –

92. Comment: Please include the Raleigh standard utility notes on this sheet (CORPUD Handbook Appendix D).

Response: Please see revised sheet C3.1 for this information.

93. Comment: If this is to be public FH, it will need to remain no more than 10' from the R/W. If it needs to be future into the site, this would need to be private FH with a backflow preventer (RPDA).

Response: It is a private hydrant. Please see C3.1 for location of backflow preventer.

94. Comment: The tap size and domestic water meter sizes should match. If 1.5" domestic the tap size should be 1.5". The waterline can be increased to a 2" behind the water meter.

Response: Please see revised sheet C3.1 for these updates.

95. Comment: Please reach out to sarah.gornick@raleigh.nc.gov to determine if an amalgam separator will be required for the dental work for this office.

Response: Sarah confirmed the amalgam separator is required and it is shown on the plans. We will get the appropriate paperwork filled out and submitted to Sarah.

96. Comment: You will also need a traffic rated cleanout at the new sewer easement line.

Response: Please see revised sheet C3.1 with a callout stating such.

97. Comment: A 6" sewer service must connect directly to a manhole.

Response: Please see revised connection and manhole location on sheet C3.1.

98. Comment: This offsite construction work would require offsite easement to be reviewed by Raleigh and recorded by deed prior to CD approval.

Response: Understood, the purchase contract includes the temporary easement for the grading purposes adjacent to the site and for utility access purposes. The purchase agreement contract will be provided upon amendment completion.

99. Comment: The easement size for the relocated sanitary sewer should be 30'.

Response: This was discussed and decided to remain 20' as currently existing.

100. Comment: The easement size for the relocated sanitary sewer should be 30'.

Response: This was discussed and decided to remain 20' as currently existing.

101. Comment: Storm sewer pipe cannot run parallel within the CORSSE.

Response: Please see revised storm sewer location and easement. A crossing is required.

102. Comment: 24?

Response: *Please see revised sheet C4.2.*

103. Comment: With the relocation of the sewer, you'll need to provide continuous sewer service for Bojangles. This will likely require a bypass pump.

Response: *Please see note added to sheet C3.1 concerning this. Pumping should not be required if done correctly.*

Mr. Nolfo -

104. Comment: Ensure driveway permits and encroachments are applied for when connecting to US 401 (S. Main St)

Response: *The sidewalk and utility encroachments have been submitted. A driveway permit is not needed here.*

Ms. Hocutt –

105. Comment: Fire services has no issues with this submittal at this time. At which time there is the addition of sprinklers and/or fire alarm, we require FSTR permits and an official review.

Response: *Understood*

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me via email (dylan@tarr-group.com) or phone (6-829-0331).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Dylan Tarr".

Dylan Tarr, PE