

From: [Gruber, Meredith a](#)
To: [Monroe, Liza](#); [Jamie Linenberg](#); [Elabarger, Michael S](#); [Danielle Ellis](#)
Cc: [Mallo, Karen](#)
Subject: RE: [External] RE: SP 22-01 / Discuss LDO Sec. 6.2.2.1.C
Date: Sunday, May 15, 2022 10:47:46 AM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)

Hello Liza and Jamie,

It is fine to remove the comment in the email below about the perimeter buffer. Karen was kind enough to provide the text below that Rolesville Planning staff are in agreement with.

There has been much discussion on the provision of perimeter buffers on common lot lines of lots within the same development. Although Table 6.2.2.2 Required Perimeter Buffers by District is very specific that a buffer is required, even on parcels within the same district, there is extremely compelling language in the Ordinance to indicate this is NOT the intent of this Section.

Section 6.2.2.1. Perimeter Buffers, Subsection A. Purpose and Intent clearly states, “...These standards intend to minimize potential nuisances, such as noise, pollution, lights, and buildings or parking areas through physical and visual separation **between land uses in separate zoning districts.**”

Section 6.2.2.1. Perimeter Buffers, Subsection G. Required Perimeter Buffer by District, Subsection 1., reads, “While Table 6.2.2.2 is intended to provide for buffers based on zoning district, **the Land Development Administrator may take into consideration existing and proposed uses to achieve the intent of this section.**”

As the ordinance gives the Land Development Administrator the ability to “take into consideration....the intent of this section”, which clearly reads, “between land uses in separate districts”, it is reasonable to eliminate the need for buffers to be provided on adjacent parcels within the same development, sharing a common access drive, and with a similar commercial land use. While this interpretation does not eliminate the need for perimeter buffers elsewhere on the site nor those required on streets, it does negate the need for perimeter buffers on interior lot lines of adjacent lots within the same zoning district.

Thanks,
Meredith

Meredith A. Gruber, PLA, AICP
Planning Director
Town of Rolesville
P.O. Box 250
502 Southtown Circle
Rolesville, NC 27571
www.rolesvillenc.gov
919.554.6517



From: Monroe, Liza <lmonroe@withersravenel.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2022 1:52 PM
To: Jamie Linenberg <jamie@tarr-group.com>; Elabarger, Michael S <michael.elabarger@rolesville.nc.gov>; Danielle Ellis <dellis@wmgdevelopment.com>; Gruber, Meredith a <meredith.gruber@rolesville.nc.gov>
Cc: Mallo, Karen <kmallo@withersravenel.com>
Subject: [External] RE: SP 22-01 / Discuss LDO Sec. 6.2.2.1.C

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify. Send all suspicious email as an attachment to [Report Spam](#).

Hello Jamie,

Hope this finds you well. We were essentially wanting to close out our comment and are looking for a written confirmation or interpretation from Rolesville staff about the comment no longer being valid to place in the case file. From what we understand, Michael is out of the office today and will return tomorrow and Meredith is currently out of the office.

Thank you,

Liza Monroe

Planner II WithersRavenel



137 S Wilmington Street, Suite 200 | Raleigh, NC 27601

Office: 919.469.3340 |

lmonroe@withersravenel.com



[CONFIDENTIALITY AND NONDISCLOSURE](#)

From: Jamie Linenberg <jamie@tarr-group.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2022 12:05 PM
To: Elabarger, Michael S <michael.elabarger@rolesville.nc.gov>; Danielle Ellis <dellis@wmgdevelopment.com>; Gruber, Meredith a <meredith.gruber@rolesville.nc.gov>
Cc: Mallo, Karen <kmallo@withersravenel.com>; Monroe, Liza <lmonroe@withersravenel.com>
Subject: RE: SP 22-01 / Discuss LDO Sec. 6.2.2.1.C

Good morning Town Staff,

On our latest set of comments the reviewers requested we provide the case file determining the buffer comment is no longer a valid comment.

Original Comment: 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.

NEW Comment: Please provide documentation from Planning staff for the case file determining that this comment is no longer valid

I thought after our meeting on March 17 this comment was closed and everyone agreed that this comment doesn't apply to our project based on interpretation of the Code. Is there some sort of documentation the Town can provide acknowledging this so we can get this comment closed out during this next review?

Thank you!
Jamie



Jamie Linenberg
Project Manager
Tarr Group, LLC
O: (317) 678-7517
M: (765) 491-5066

IMPORTANT: The contents of this email and any attachments are confidential. They are intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you have received this email by mistake, please notify the sender immediately and do not disclose the contents to anyone or make copies thereof.

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Elabarger, Michael S <michael.elabarger@rolesville.nc.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2022 7:47 AM

To: Elabarger, Michael S; Danielle Ellis; Jamie Linenberg; Gruber, Meredith a

Cc: Mallo, Karen; Monroe, Liza

Subject: SP 22-01 / Discuss LDO Sec. 6.2.2.1.C

When: Thursday, March 17, 2022 9:30 AM-10:00 AM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).

Where: Microsoft Teams Meeting

This is to discuss the conflicting application of buffer yard standards along interior lot lines of adjacent lots within a non-residential subdivision scenario, and specifically to this project which seeks to run a shared access easement/drive on a shared lot line between non-res lots. The two applications involved are SP 22-01 and FP 22-02, for a Dental office development.

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app
[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Join with a video conferencing device

ncgov@m.webex.com

Video Conference ID: 116 641 675 8

[Alternate VTC instructions](#)

Or call in (audio only)

[+1 984-204-1487,426395928#](#) United States, Raleigh

Phone Conference ID: 426 395 928#

[Find a local number](#) | [Reset PIN](#)

[Learn More](#) | [Meeting options](#)

Email correspondence to and from this address may be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties by an authorized state official.