

Date: November 1, 2023

To: Michael Elabarger
Town of Rolesville Planning

From: Marty D. Bizzell, PE, CPESC

Re: Cobblestone Village, 2nd Submittal
SP 21-01 REV
Town of Rolesville, NC

As Engineers of Record, Bass, Nixon and Kennedy, Inc. offers the following responses to the comments for the above referenced project:

General Comment:

No Storm package was provided therefore we are not able to complete the engineering review. Please provide the revised storm package as the plans represent with updated storm design and DA maps.

BNK Response: Updated storm package and updged DA maps are included in this submittal.

Engineering Comments; Brian Laux

Cover Sheet:

1. Storm calculations (10 yr on storm system and 25 yr for any culverts) and drainage area maps (pre/post/inlet) will be required prior to approval.

BNK Response: Updated storm package and updated DA maps are included in this submittal.

Sheet C1.1:

2. The drive access for the tower is constructed in parking space. Access driveway will not be allowed here as currently installed. Update to the driveway access per easement location per the original design and clearing of proposed driveway as required.

BNK Response: Cell tower access easement aligns with the drive aisle of the parking lot and will provide access to the cell tower. Plat has been prepared and is in review for the easement dedication. All cell tower cables have been relocated within this proposed easement.

3. Overall Site Data Table: Update the impervious area per revised layout and design.
BNK Response: Impervious area has been updated in the Site Data Table.
4. Overall Site Data Table: The parking has been updated per revised plan. It does not match the count we calculated, verify.
BNK Response: Parking has been updated in the Site Data Table.
5. Overall Site Data Table: Flex building type should be included in the Total Retail/Commercial square footage.
BNK Response: Flex building SF has been added to the total retail/commercial square footage.
6. Overall Site Data Table: Event space has been updated per proposed plan. We only see 16,000SF +/- Show /label the additional event space for reference or show additional space calculated.
BNK Response: Site Data Table has been updated accordingly.
7. Buildings 2, 3, and 6 show square footage for retail. Provide residential and retail area in data table and on-site plan. Provide square footage for residential. x, xxx SF (Residential, 2nd/3rd floors).
BNK Response: A residential gross square footage has been added for the apartments.
8. Verify building 8 square footage. Label only shown in Overall Site Data table.
BNK Response: Building 8 square footage has been shown.
9. What is lease boundary (lot) for, proposed lease line?
BNK Response: Lease line previously shown for the town community building, but has since been removed. Lease line has also been removed from plan.
10. Verify whether the covered deck area of building 4 was included in square footage. Please verify if a concrete patio will be placed below deck.
BNK Response: Concrete patio will be below deck. Covered and patio included in building square footage.

Sheet C2.1

I have highlighted the proposed utility str to count required items for each building and note HYD to FDC locations. Orange FH are public and Red FH should be signed for public when connected to Fire line (CoR) testing could trigger alarm on private HYD).
BNK Response: Acknowledged.

All Grease trap size to have approval with FOG with CoR.
BNK Response: Acknowledged.

11. Private hydrants, FH require signage per CoR?
BNK Response: CORPUD has not requested. As-builts have been accepted and approved by CORPUD.
12. Building 6 only shows (1) FDC that is not parking side. While Building 2 shows (2) FDC that are parking side for easy access, please verify with WAKE FIRE DEPARTMENT this is okay.
BNK Response: Wake Fire Department has not commented on this.
13. Note 2 states backflow preventers are located within buildings. Please check, or update Note 2 as several backflow preventers are seen outside of building 6 or 5.
BNK Response: BFP's are located due to length of service and CORPUD requirement that maximum location from main. CORPUD has approved.
14. Sanitary service runs under Building 5 (rev), roof top deck?
BNK Response: Sewer service has been relocated.
15. Adjust 3" domestic water line's tee to be off 12" water main instead of fire line, CoR approval.
BNK Response: CORPUD has approved as shown. As-builts submitted and approved by CORPUD.
16. Please verify the cover and meter box is traffic rated or MOVE outside of parking area.
BNK Response: Meter Box will not be located within traffic areas. Plan has been updated.
17. Please include details of the raised plaza. Grades change(s). Entry/access location(s). Is there adequate cover? Is there ADA access?
BNK Response: Additional fine grading information has been provided on the grading plan.
18. Conflict between storm pipe and force main. Please adjust as horizontal separation is needed.
BNK Response: Horizontal separation has been shown.

Sheet C3.1:

19. Repeat-The existing topo has shifted on this sheet only.
BNK Response: Sheet has been corrected.
20. Add structure labels to the updated storm. Add these to the storm charts also.
BNK Response: Storm structure labels are shown.

21. We are not able to complete the review without the Storm calculations (10 & 12 year) and drainage area maps (post/inlet) will be required prior to approval. The storm calculation package does not include curb inlet area maps.

BNK Response: An updated stormwater package with updated DA maps is included with this submittal.

22. Is there ADA access to building 3 seating area?

BNK Response: Yes, additional grading information has been provided for Building 3.

23. Please show 441 contours around building 4.

BNK Response: Additional fine grading information has been provided for Building 3 and this area.

24. Building 3 FFE rose from 441.5 to 443 (8%-9% from FFE to BC at Main Street).

BNK Response: Correct, raised in order to meet existing grade at Privette Building access drive. An accessible route is shown to the street.

25. How is the area marked draining to structure 27? No grades shown, and structure behind curb?

BNK Response:

26. How will impervious run off from roof and downspouts be collected?

BNK Response: Runoff will be captured and pipe to storm drainage system via roofdrains.

- Building 8 in swale along and offsite to tower parcel?

BNK Response: No, swale to convey off-site drainage only.

- Building 3 along Main Street, removed drainage from previous plan.

BNK Response: Drainage not necessary due to raised FFE and connection with Main St.

FYI

Berm or swale runs through the sidewalk near building 6. Contour not labeled. This may affect drainage to the adjacent area drain.

BNK Response: Acknowledged.

Sheet C3.4:

27. Update the SEC plans per the revised storm.

BNK Response: SEC plans have been updated.

Sheet C3.8:

28. Please include storm drainage pipe tables.

BNK Response: Storm drainage pipe tables have been included with this submittal.

29. Add revised storm design to chart as needed. Please identify what storm is new.

BNK Response: No new storm drainage has been added.

30. Has the as-builts of the existing storm been completed?

BNK Response: Yes.

Sheet L1.1

31. Adjust tree placement away from the stairs.

BNK Response: Tree has been adjusted accordingly.

32. Tree placed on top of water service line, adjust tree placement.

BNK Response: Tree placement has been adjusted.

33. Tree placed on top of sewer line, adjust tree placement.

BNK Response: Tree placement has been adjusted.

34. Adjust tree placement out of curb.

BNK Response: Tree placement has been adjusted.

35. Sod labels should be updated or deleted. Sod placed in raised plaza? Will concrete or sod be installed below the covered deck area? Sod in concrete?

BNK Response: Sod labels have been removed in these areas.

Site Lighting

36. The lighting plans have not been updated to reflect the revised building and parking updates.

BNK Response: Duke is currently updated lighting plan, although minimal changes are anticipated.

37. Provide a rough markup on DA inlet map of area needing attention. The notes in orange are from past review comments and hopefully are on the map already.

BNK Response: Updated DA maps are included with this submittal.

Review Group/Staff Comments

1. Given the state of the actual physical development occurring on the site, it is unclear to Staff what is still possible to be changed, and what is actually BUILT. Can applicant explain exactly what is NOT yet built?
BNK Response: All infrastructure has been constructed. Buildings 4, 5 and 8 have not been constructed. All other buildings are in various phases of construction.
2. Cover Sheet-Sheet index has 24 entries-there are 28 sheets in this plan set. REVISE Cover Sheet index to note/reference each and every sheet in the plan set.
BNK Response: Index and plan set has been updated.
3. Event and Overall Parking-Please explain the full intent to provide Overall and Special Event parking spaces relative to the original plan with two (2) off-site parking areas (Main Street Park and parking lot across Young Street). Staff notes from the V1 Revision to this V2 Revisions, the calculated REQUIRED parking after the 15% reduction dropped from 461 to 457-clarify this especially relative to the current state of Construction occurring on the site.
BNK Response: Reduction is due to reduction in the size of Building 4 from Community Center Building to smaller building.
4. GREENWAY near Building 7 and SCM-Provide an update on the status/intent to rebuild this pursuant to the relocation in order to allow for the SCM construction, etc. Building 7 appears completed on the exterior, hence appears “site” improvements around it may be nearing completion and thus time to finish Greenway.
BNK Response: Greenway paving to begin shortly as discussed at TRC meeting.
5. REPEAT-Provide a Written Response to ALL the comments. Do not just write “comment addressed”- explain first where/on what sheet(s), and then how, by making what change or revision, the comment is being addressed. The “explanation” document with this Submittal is NOT sufficient to facilitate a swift Staff Review; Staff is left reviewing each and every detail on every sheet because Applicant has given very little clarity as to what might have been changed.
BNK Response: Written responses are provided with this submittal.
6. REPEAT- (this was NOT performed on the Resubmittal) – Revisions on Plan Set- Cloud/bubble both the original intended Revisions/Changes to this approved Plan Set, PLUS all the changes/revisions to address these comments. The lack of a clear and concise expression of what it is that was being Revised in the original (Revision plan set) made the Staff Review immensely more difficult than it had to be.
BNK Response: Written responses are provided with this submittal and clouding has been provided as requested.

7. REPEAT- Sheet C1.1 Overall Site Data- Amount of Non-Residential space/square footage-it is unclear how many dwelling units are in Buildings 2, 3, and 6. From the Overall Site Data table. Please revise to make this explicitly clear, matching the text in the building footprints in the drawing.

BNK Response: Additional information has been provided as requested.

8. REPEAT- There was NO response to this—Clock Tower—On Sheet C1.1, in both the original/approved Plan set and the Revision plan set is unclear where this intended clock tower was to go-explain where it “was” and ensure that it is no longer referenced in this Revised Plan set.

BNK Response: Clock Tower is not longer part of this project.

9. REPEAT-“Proposed Lease line-Sheet C1.1., both the original/approved Plan set, the 1st Revision, and now this 2nd Revision, plan set shows a “proposed lease line” in the area of the Veterans Memorial—it this still in play/required? Please explain, revise plans as necessary, thank you.

BNK Response: Proposed lease line as been removed as it is not longed applicable to this project.

10. REPEAT Lighting Plan (V2 Revision, Sheet 19/28)-This shows the ORIGINALLY approved layout and thus not reflective of the project layout and therefore the Lights/poles in those areas. Have DUKE revise Lighting Plan based on proposed layout and re-submit. Area around Building 8 clearly is not what this sheet shows; Building 4 is a completely different shape/orientation from original community center, and unclear if Lighting should be changed to accommodate?

BNK Response: Duke Energy is currently revising site lighting plan although minimal changes are anticipated. A copy of the revised lighting plan will be provided once received.

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

See 2 PDFs-a Memo dated 9-13-23 and a set of mark-ups.

BNK Response: Acknowledged.

Wake County Watershed Management-Janet Boyer

1. V2-Wake County permits SEC-055248-2021/SWF-055250-2021 have not been modified. Permits must be revised. Upload to Wake County permit portal for review.

BNK Response: Updated SEC and SWF will be uploaded to the Wake County portal.

2. REV V1-Modify Wake County permits SEC-055248-2021/SWF-055250-2021 as necessary to reflect changes.

BNK Response: Updated SEC and SWF will be uploaded to the Wake County portal.

COR Public Utilities-Tim Beasley

1. REV V2- no record of comments submitted.

BNK Response: Acknowledged.

2. REV V1-Please provide a callout for the location of the BFPs for buildings 2, 3, and 4 for both domestic and fire lines and demonstrate that they are within 50' of piping from the WM.

BNK Response: BFP locations have not been changed since previous approved construction drawings and are within 50' of piping from the WM.

Wake County Fire/EMS-Brittany Hocutt

REV V1

1. Provide a truck turning diagram to ensure fire truck can access the parking area(s) primarily where Building 8 original was sited.

BNK Response: Truck turning diagram in included with this submittal.

2. No issues with FDC/Hydrant.

BNK Response: Acknowledged.