



5410 Trinity Road
Suite 102
Raleigh, NC 27607

P 919.866.4951
F 919.859.5663
www.timmons.com

Date: 2022-07-01
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.

Planning Department

Mike Elabarger

1. Provide a written response to ALL comments with next submittal.
 - a. **Response: We have included a response to comments with this submittal.**
2. Provide dates/revision dates on all submittal materials. The Conceptual Master Plan document is dated May 2, 2022; the Conditions document does not have any date - it should reflect at least the latest version date.
 - a. **Response: We have updated the date on our plans to reflect the current submittal date.**
3. Please provide a detailed response as to whether or not there is a Phasing plan for this development; see next Comment.
 - a. **Response: We are in the middle of working through the phasing plan for this development. We are scheduling a meeting with Meredith to discuss the phasing plan, revising the TIA to incorporate phasing and to discuss the possible future impacts if the phasing plan were to change. At this point we are unsure if it will be included in the Map Amendment package or the Preliminary Plat.**
4. Regarding proposed Condition #3 (Recreational Amenities) – provide timing elements for the eventual implementation of these commitments. As written, and in conjunction with the lack of Phasing plan information, there is no way for future Staff to tie, associate, require Recreational Amenities with or by certain Final Plats, Building Permit issuance, Certificate of Occupancy issuance, etc.
 - a. **Response: Please see Jonesville Draft Conditions from Beth Trahos.**

5. Regarding proposed Condition #4 (Transportation Improvements) – provide timing elements for the eventual implementation of these commitments. As written, and in conjunction with the lack of Phasing plan information, there is no way for future Staff to tie, associate, require Transportation Improvements with or by certain Final Plats, Building Permit issuance, Certificate of Occupancy issuance, etc. Please clarify if the TIA includes timing elements, and incorporate into Condition #4 if so.
 - a. **Response: These timing elements of the road improvements are still undetermined (see comment response #3 above). The TIA will be updated to include timing elements when it is revised to include the driveway for the retail site of the NC zoning.**

Parks & Recreation JG Ferguson / Eddie Henderson
See two (2) PDF's – Bike Network map and mark-up of Concept Plan.

1. GREENWAY - Staff has reviewed the comments about the location of the Greenway (GW) and agree that the current location shown on the most recent version of the concept plan is best both in terms of environmental impacts and for connectivity to the rest of the TOR GW network. However, since GW is no longer going along the north side of the creek, Staff recommend the addition of a side path (green line on mark-up) along the east side of Jonesville Road to connect the single-family homes on the north side of the development to the GW and better connect the entire development to the GW system overall.
 - a. **Response: Agreed, we like the current location of the Greenway and think it is a good blend of functional and respectful of the environment. We have added the 10 foot side path as we discussed and along Jonesville Road.**
2. BIKE LANE - Please add a bike lane along Mitchell Mill Road, Jonesville Road and the proposed road connecting Jonesville Road and Gro-Peg Lane, which will all be a part of the new TOR Bicycle and Greenway Network that will be approved by Town Board in the upcoming months. (These are marked in blue solid and dashed lines on the mark-up, reflecting those on the Bike network map). See link for more information:
<https://www.rolesvillenc.gov/parks-recreation/parks-and-facilities/bicycle-pedestrian-plan-and-open-space-greenway-plan-updates>
 - a. **Response: We have added the requested bike lane along Mitchell Mill, Jonesville Road and the subdivision road connecting to Gro-Peg Lane.**

COR Utilities (W/WW)

Tim Beasley

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.
 - a. **Response: We understand that a public water main extension would be required to serve this project. Our client is in discussion with the developer of The Hills at Harris Creek (MA 22-01) which is located east of our site on Mitchell Mill Road. They are planning on extending a new 16" DIP water main from the Kalas Falls project on Rolesville Road to their site. We will extend that 16" DIP main along our project boundaries on both Mitchell Mill Road and Jonesville Road. I assume this can be addressed at Site Plan Review on the plans.**
 - b. **Response: We will run a water model once the Kalas Falls project extends their section of water main to determine if there will be enough pressure in the new water main. We understand we may need to loop the water main if the pressures in the new main are low.**
 - c. **Response: We know there have been sewer upgrades along Harris Creek to the existing sewer main. Do you know if those upgraded mains have 30 foot or 40 foot easements??**

Engineering – CJS/B&M

Brian Laux / Jacque Thompson

1. (via email) No further comments.

Wake Co. Fire / EMS

Brittany Hocutt

1. V1 - via email 3/23/22) No Comments.
2. V2 – No comments.

NCDOT

Matt Nolfo

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.
 - a. **Response: A TIA has been completed by Ramey Kemp but needs to be revised to account for a driveway to the retail space that was not included on the original TIA. We will also be looking at a Phase TIA as we have discussed with you separately on emails.**

2. FYI 1 - Be aware there are extensive offsite requirements for utility work and required under the TIA.
 - a. **Response: Yes, there will be extensive utility work and road improvements along Mitchell Mill Road and Jonesville Road. We have previously discussed with Sean Brennan that no bridge improvements would be required on Jonesville Road at the Harris Creek crossing.**
3. FYI 2 - Driveway permits and Encroachments will be needed for Mitchell Mill Road and Jonesville Road.
 - a. **Response: We will apply for Driveway and Encroachment permits as we move to Construction Drawings.**

Wake Co. Watershed Management

Jeevan Neupane

1. (via email 3/16/22) No Comments.

WithersRavenel Memorandum

A. Concept Plan/Advisory Comments

In accordance with Section 3.4.3.B., a Site Plan is required as part of the Zoning Map Amendment when rezoning to NC. As a split zoning, technically only the NC portions of the site are required to have a site plan. 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.

The applicant shall amend the application to include, at a minimum, a site 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 potential conditions are needed to reduce the impacts from the proposed rezoning and eventual development of this site.

Response: Refer to the Site Plan included with this submittal.

- a. Site Plan Sheet – Should include the following:
- i. Site Data Table including acreage, existing and proposed zoning, proposed units/housing types, maximum density allowed, proposed density per housing type, open space required, open space proposed, parking required, parking proposed, building height allowed, building height proposed, percentage of gross area for nonresidential uses, percentage of gross area for residential areas, etc.
 - ii. Proposed rights-of-way and parking
 - iii. Proposed easements
 - iv. Proposed utilities
 - v. Open space areas. There should be at least three (3) small open space types and two (2) medium open space types according to the LDO Section 6.2.1.D.2.
 - vi. Environmental features and associated buffers. The 30-foot-wide streetscape buffers should be dimensioned. Also, the mixed-used perimeter compatibility transition areas should be dimensioned per LDO 6.2.3.1B.
 - vii. Setbacks (per LDO 3.4.3 & LDO 6.8.5H for structures with street-facing garages)
 - viii. Lot widths and areas compliant with LDO 3.4.3
 - ix. Mailbox Units and associated parking
 - x. North arrow
 - xi. Scale

Response: All applicable requested information has been included in a Site Data Table on the Site Plan.

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

Response: Street walls are shown for parking areas with frontage on the public street.

- c. The concept plan only has a parking area 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 was not quantified within the concept plan site data table.

Response: Required parking and provided parking are listed in the Site Data Table.

- d. 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: Driveway parking is listed in the Site Data Table.

- e. The plan does not clearly indicate where guest parking areas will be located on the property, raising concerns that townhome guests will park at the commercial building and result in less parking for that use. It is suggested that a site design dispersing the guest parking be located near each block of townhomes to discourage parking in the commercial area or along public rights-of-way.
Response: Visitor parking areas are labeled on the Site Plan and listed in the Site Data Table.
- f. 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). The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the buffer width and type requirements.
Response: Buffer widths and types are labeled on the Site Plan.
- g. Advisory Comment: 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: Acknowledged.
- h. Advisory Comment: The applicant should note that building architectural elevations will be required to determine compliance with the requirements of Table 3.4.3. Elevations are expected to be provided during the site plan review process.
Response: Acknowledged; the elevations will be provided during site plan review.