



June 22, 2022

Planning and Zoning – Karen Mallo / Liza Monroe
Engineering – Jacqueline Thompson
Wake County Watershed Management – Janet Boyer
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 / Ms. Monroe -

- 1. (REPEAT) Comment:** 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. **NEW:** Please allow us to clarify and expound on this comment. Per LDO Section 6.2.4.2.A.12, a tree and/or vegetative survey shall be provided as a part of the landscape plan. Additionally, a preservation plan, as noted in LDO Section 6.2.4.5.C, should provide at a minimum: critical root zones areas as well as the size, location, and species of all trees. The applicant has shown two (2) trees that are to be removed and require replacement, but the results of the tree survey was not provided for the rest of the site which is well forested according to a recent iMaps aerial. On the landscape plan sheet, the applicant mentions another 20" dbh to be preserved, yet this tree is not mentioned anywhere else in the plan set

Response: Understood. Added sheet CO.4 Alta survey includes the locations of the 3 existing trees the surveyor found to be of required size for mitigation. The remaining trees on site are too small in caliper to meet any mitigation requirements. CO.5 Tree Preservation Plan has been added to the set.

- 2. (REPEAT) 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 **NEW:** Please provide documentation from Planning staff for the case file determining that this comment is no longer valid

Response: Email received from Meredith Gruber on May 15, 2022. Email included in this resubmittal for reference.

3. **(RPEAT) Comment:** 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) **NEW:** We will defer to the Town of Rolesville Planning Staff for how they aim to keep record of tree removal at this time while the tree removal permit is being finalized

Response: Understood. Town is still in the works on this.

4. **(REPEAT) Comment:** 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.

NEW: Although provided, these details were submitted as separate exhibit sheets. Please include these in the overall plan set submittal going forward

- b. Provide screening for the transformer shown to the right of the entrance **NEW:** Staff still does not see that the transformer has been appropriately screened. There is ground cover and one Gingko shown near the transformer. However, if using landscaping for screening, LDO Section 6.2.4.6.B notes that landscaping of the service area or equipment shall be done with a row of understory trees, shrubs, or berms which shall mature to the height necessary to fully screen the area or equipment

Response:

a. **Please see added architectural sheets at the end of the civil set.**

b. **Shrub Hedge has been added to landscape plan surrounding transformer.**

5. **(REPEAT) Comment:** Label all site distance triangles. **NEW:** Please allow us to clarify. As this original comment was related to potential monument signs and the LDO's requirement that they not obstruct any cross-visibility area or traffic control device, we are requesting the applicant label internal sight distance triangles within the development. We have noted the triangle shown on Louisburg Road and are requesting that same detail within the site.

Response: We have provided triangles at the drive entrances now. No obstructions are within the triangles. Please see sheet C2.1 and L2.1 for location.

6. **(REPEAT) Comment:** Include the right-of-way width for all streets shown on the site plan sheet. **NEW:** The ROW widths are not clearly labeled on the site plan sheet C2.1

Response: There is only one ROW and there is a private access easement for the site. The access easement is measured at 30' in multiple places on sheet C2.1 and the ROW varies for Louisburg Road.

7. **(REPEAT) 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) The small open space area shall be a minimum of 500 square feet. **NEW:** The applicant noted that there are several eligible open space areas on the plan. As a reminder, small open spaces can be plazas, pocket parks, amenity areas, green areas, squares, or active use areas. We are requesting an area be specifically called out as a small open space area, at least 500 square feet, to demonstrate compliance with LDO Section 6.1.2.D

Response: A green area of 500 sf has been identified on the landscape plan.

8. Comment: The proposed parking areas exceed the maximum spaces permitted. Per LDO Section 6.4.3.B, the applicant may submit an Alternative Parking Plan (APP) for review and consideration by the Land Development Administrator and approval from the Board of Commissioners. The APP shall include a parking study prepared by a registered Professional Engineer or Certified Land Use Planner in the state of North Carolina. WithersRavenel will defer to the Town of Rolesville staff about next steps regarding the APP as they would be reviewing the application and submitting it to the Board agenda calendar.

Response: The Alternative Parking Plan has been included with this resubmittal.

9. Comment: The applicant has provided a parking letter prepared by a Professional Engineer. However, this letter does not appear to include the information required in a parking study: the size, type, and proposed use(s) of the development; anticipated peak parking; anticipated normal parking amounts; and a narrative and data as to why the parking requirements of the LDO do not accurately reflect the needs of the proposed development.

Response: The Alternative Parking Plan has been included with this resubmittal

10. Comment: Per LDO Section 6.4.5.C, a minimum of one (1) loading space is required per 50,000 square feet of office/medical space. The applicant has not labeled the loading space on the site plan. If the applicant does not need a loading space, this could be a portion of the Alternative Parking Plan in which this requirement is mentioned and reasoning for omission provided.

Response: Please see revised Alternative Parking Plan

11. Comment: Please include bicycle rack detail on the detail sheet.

Response: Please see revised detail sheet C5.6.

12. Comment: Several of the exhibit sheets submitted shall be included in the plan set and not a separate sheet. Please combine sheets A11.1, EX A, and EX B with the overall plan set.

Response: Please see revised plan set with exhibits included.

13. Comment: Lighting plan. The applicant provided a lighting plan (L5.1), however it does not provide all the information required per LDO Section 6.6. Plans shall be prepared by a licensed engineer and signed and sealed. It should include the following information:

- a. All proposed and existing buildings on the site
- b. Pedestrian and vehicular areas
- c. Other above-ground improvements
- d. The horizontal location of all proposed and existing outdoor lighting fixtures, including pole and wall-mounted fixtures
- e. Mounting heights of each fixture
- f. Overall height of each pole above grade
- g. Fixture details
- h. Location of externally illuminated signs and associated fixtures
- i. The location of all architectural and landscape lighting fixtures.

Response: Please see revised lighting plan and associated specs as an attachment.

14. Comment: Lighting plans shall be specified and calculated in maintained footcandles (FC), unless specified otherwise in Section 6.6. Measurements of light levels shall be taken at finished grade with an accurate and calibrated light meter.

Response: Please see revised lighting plan and associated specs as an attachment.

- 15. Comment:** The plan must include a footcandle plan that provides typical footcandle contours and a point photometric grid that indicates footcandle levels measured at grade across the site. Maximum, average and minimum site foot-candles, uniformity ratio (average and minimum), and depreciation factors also are required. The plan must show initial horizontal illuminance values in foot-candles for the area to be illuminated.

Response: Please see revised lighting plan and associated specs as an attachment.

- 16. Comment:** These values must be calculated at grade and include contributions from all onsite fixtures.

Response: Please see revised lighting plan and associated specs as an attachment.

- 17. Comment:** The plan must plot foot-candles of illumination at ground level to the nearest tenth of a foot-candle, and at horizontal grid intervals of no more than ten feet.

Response: Please see revised lighting plan and associated specs as an attachment.

- 18. Comment:** The plan shall show illumination level at the lot line (or perimeter of a development, if applicable) to ensure maximum illumination levels are not exceeded.

Response: Please see revised lighting plan and associated specs as an attachment.

- 19. Comment:** The manufacturer's cut sheets (specifications) for each proposed fixture must be submitted.

Response: Please see revised lighting plan and associated specs as an attachment.

- 20. Comment:** A lighting fixture schedule that presents the fixture type, including the manufacturer's product identification catalog number, and the fixture mounting height.

Response: Please see revised lighting plan and associated specs as an attachment.

- 21. Comment:** Provide architectural drawings showing the buildings facades including heights, materials, and proposed colors.

Response: Please see revised plan set with architectural elevation sheets included in the back of the set.

Ms. Thompson -

- 22. Comment:** Sheet C0.3 – Please clarify or label if the existing sanitary sewer easement is to be abandoned since the sanitary sewer is being relocated.

Response: Please see revised demo sheet C0.6 (renumbered because of other comments) with the added note.

- 23. Comment:** Sheet 1-1 – Please clarify if L3 should be a curve so the limits are along the access easement or if this is intended to be a line.

Response: The line is meant to stay a line, the curve was not intended to be included as it should be part of maintaining the existing intersection in the future.

24. Comment: Sheet C1.1 – Please confirm if the rectangular symbol shown in the ditch along Eagle Scholars Drive is intended to be a check dam. Please add a label to the symbol to the east if applicable.

Response: *Confirmed per the note already on the sheet. The contractor is to replace the rock dam, if required using the details in plans.*

25. Comment: Sheet C1.1 – Please correct the leader location or delete the Concrete Washout note.

Response: *Please see revised sheet C1.1 with the note removed.*

26. (REPEAT) Comment: Sheet C1.2 – The symbol for the scour protection at end section is missing.

Response: *Please see revised sheet C1.2 for the scour protection.*

27. Comment: Sheet C2.1 – Please update the leader location for the Proposed 20' Storm Easement south of Eagle Scholars Drive.

Response: *Please see revised sheet C2.1 with the updated easement note.*

28. Comment: The references for the NCDOT ramp details should be updated to the correct sheet numbers.

Response: *Please see revised sheet C2.1. There are updates to the ramps/walks due to existing grade tie in conditions.*

29. (REPEAT) Comment: Sheet C2.1 – Please revise the note for “Curb Turnout” to “Curb Cut” to match the detail label.

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

30. Comment: Sheet C2.1 - The corner of Eagle Scholars Drive and S Main Street needs to be re-evaluated for a constructability review to ensure it can meet ADA compliance.

- a. There is an existing pedestrian ramp at the intersection of S Main Street and Eagle Scholars Drive. Based on the proposed connection location, there does not appear to be room to allow two pedestrian ramps to be constructed without providing area where drainage may pool. The existing ramp appears to be similar to a Type 2B.
- b. The proposed pedestrian ramps at the entrance off S Main Street do not meet ADA compliance. They are identified as Type 1 but based on the radii, this does not appear to be able to work. This comment also applies to the pedestrian ramps at the entrance off Eagle Scholars Drive.

Response: *All ADA ramps have been removed at drive cut entrances and now a more gradual recess in sidewalk to become flush with the drive apron and then returning to existing grade. Along this transition a 6" curb will remain along the road. There is a detail showing how the transition should work as a general instance.*

31. Comment: Sheet C2.1 - Consider installing a pedestrian ramp where the sidewalk tees into the parking drive on the northwest side of the building.

Response: *Considered. ADA access is not needed here, nor will it work with pavement grades. (Sidewalk grade in compliance)*

32. Comment: Sheet C2.1 – The Town is strongly encouraging 24" curb and gutter be used along S Main Street since you will be tying into existing 24" curb and gutter on both sides, and this is the

style of curb being used on the other side of S Main Street and along Eagle Scholars Drive. This will provide a quality design for S Main St as a whole, as well as for future maintenance with gutter vs. no gutter and transitioning back and forth. You can use the post curb within the site.

- a. It appears that 24" curb and gutter is already drawn in the plans; the linework for curb along S Main St and Eagle Scholars Dr is different than what is shown internally to the site.

Response: We have provided a 24" curb along the private street now. Details are now provided on sheet C5.3.

33. Comment: Sheet C2.1 – Please confirm if the radius at S Main Street and Louisburg Rd is being removed and replaced. There appear to be two existing curb cuts in the existing curb that will not be used for Louisburg Rd improvements or for the Dental Office site improvements, therefore it would be beneficial to remove and replace this curb to allow the pedestrian ramp to be placed where needed.

- a. Since the Louisburg Rd improvements are not installing pedestrian ramps or sidewalk on the south side of Louisburg Rd or on the southwest corner of the intersection of Louisburg Rd and S Main Street, the pedestrian ramp being installed as part of the Dental Office site improvements should be designed and installed as a directional ramp to cross to the north only and connect to the existing ramp; the proposed crosswalk should not lead the pedestrians to the middle of the existing pedestrian ramps since there is no curb cut between the ramps.

Response: Please see revised sheet C2.1 with the updated ADA ramp callout. It is probable that the updates along Louisburg Road will be completed at the time of construction. Regardless of existing conditions a ramp will be provided.

34. Comment: Sheet C2.1 – Please confirm what the duplicate dashed linework on the south side of the building is.

Response: First line is setback second line is access easement. Both are labeled.

35. Comment: Sheet C3.1 – Please adjust the text/leader on the top side of the page so all notes are legible.

Response: Please see revised sheet C3.1.

36. Comment: Sheet C3.1 – The leader on the southside of the building calls out a 1.5" water line but the waterline appears to show 2" with the line type. Please clarify and ensure the correct size is being communicated in both ways.

Response: The water line is now a generic style rather than showing a specific size. Callouts still specify size. Please see revised sheet C3.1.

37. Comment: Sheet C3.1 – The tapping sleeve not on the right side of the page has a typo in it and is referencing the wrong detail. Please correct accordingly.

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

38. Comment: Sheet C4.1 - The existing CB on Eagle Scholars Drive at the north side of the new entrance will need to be adjusted to allow a pedestrian ramp to be constructed and meet ADA compliance (a grate is not allowed in ramp). Please confirm what improvements need to be made.

Response: The grate will be transitioned to a flat casting. Please see revised sheet C4.1.

39. Comment: Sheet C4.1 - The curb removal is called out and shown on the demo plan for the new entrance off Eagle Scholars Drive, but it appears the linework shown on C4.1 still shows curb. Adjust as necessary.

Response: *Linework will be staying as the proposed curb and gutter will replace it. Please see revised sheet C2.1 and details on sheets C5.1 and C5.3.*

40. Comment: Sheet C4.1 - Please show and label the storm sewer easement. Your previous comment response references an easement, but there is currently nothing shown. This easement should be shown on Sheet C2.1 as well.

Response: *There is an easement on sheet C4.2. I apologize as we had a typo in our last response saying sheet C4.1 where it should have been C4.2.*

41. Comment: Sheet C4.1 - Please confirm your sidewalks along S Main St and Eagle Scholars Drive meet ADA compliance and have less than 2% cross-slope, as well as meet requirements for longitudinal slopes at the pedestrian ramp locations.

Response: *Per phone conversation a unique solution was developed to make sure that the sidewalk would work as it crossed the drive entrances. Please see revised sheet C2.1 and associated details on sheet C5.6. Also, a stamped crosswalk is now proposed in both locations.*

42. Comment: Sheet C4.1 - Confirm the 384 contour and the spot elevations provided at the curb radii near parking off the entrance at S Main Street.

Response: *This contour was not correct, please see revise sheet C4.1.*

43. Comment: Sheet C4.1 - NCDOT and the Town of Rolesville require curb inlets to be installed to allow gutter spread requirements to be met. Please provide calculations showing your analysis of the drainage along S Main St. It appears the flow is proposed to flow into your site at the driveway location which is why we are encouraging a drainage structure prior to the driveway. While you currently do not have any proposed structures, please evaluate the gutter spread along S Main St to prove a structure would not be necessary.

a. The existing structure on Eagle Scholars Drive should be included in the calculations with the proposed improvements, not necessarily as existing.

Response: *Please see revised basin map and plan set for a recognized bypass area. This area will be discharged to the proposed 24" pipe meant to bypass offsite drainage to the downstream end.*

44. Comment: Basin Map – Wrap DA around closer to basin, berm please verify.

Response: *Please see revised Basin Map in the Drainage Report.*

45. Comment: Basin Map – Include all drainage to basin based on current contours.

Response: *Please see revised Drainage Basin Map.*

46. Comment: Basin Map – S Main St (private) should be collected in driveway CI (see design review).

Response: *Please see revised Drainage Basin Map showing this area.*

47. Comment: Basin Map – Include drainage area up to top of berm (not just the property limits).

Response: The area will be different now that the new ROW is In place and a new sidewalk. Everything within the ROW should drain to the ROW and anything that was within the property should drain to the proposed infrastructure.

Mr. Beasley –

48. Comment: The onsite CORSSE should be recorded by plat prior to release of building permits. Please show/callout this easement.

Response: Noted the easement will be provided per proposed Plat.

49. Comment: The offsite CORSSE deed must be reviewed by Raleigh and recorded prior to CD approval. This site plan appears to be functioning also as the infrastructure construction drawings. Please email me for Raleigh's deed template.

Response: Per conversation, the intent is to have the easement recorded with the proposed Plat, since it is still in review.

50. Comment: The existing CORSSE will also need to be disposed of/released by Raleigh through a deed. This should be approved by Raleigh and recorded prior to release of building CO.

Response: Noted.

51. Comment: This may be a graphical bug but the WMs should not be located in the sidewalk. If a portion of the vault will reside on private property, some City of Raleigh Waterline Easement may be necessary.

Response: Not necessarily a graphic bug, it is just the standard block used for water meters on our plans. Not actual size of the water meter, the real ones should easily fit between the sidewalk and the ROW line.

52. Comment: Does the FH need to be located here? If it can be closer to the R/W, it could be a public FH and not required a RPDA.

Response: It will for us to have access to it. The grade up to the road wouldn't be ideal for the firefighters if a fire were to occur.

53. Comment: Please obtain a signed Certificate of Compliance for backflow prevention devices, fill out an online application at <https://www.raleighnc.gov/services/content/PubUtilAdmin/Articles/CrossConnectionControlProgram.html> - Email cross.connection@raleighnc.gov or phone (919) 996-2747 for more information. The Raleigh approved/signed Certificate of Compliance must digitally affixed to the building plans prior to issuance of permits.

Response: Certificate of Compliance emailed to Tim on June 6, 2022, also included in this resubmittal.

54. Comment: Please email me the public sewer permit application.

Response: Public sewer permit application emailed to Tim on June 6, 2022, also included in this resubmittal.

55. Comment: Please provide plan profile sheets showing min separation for utility crossings for the public sewer extension/relocation.

Response: Please see new profile sheet C3.2 for utility crossings detail.

56. Comment: Please provide construction sequence for the relocated sanitary sewer line. It's not clear how you will avoid bypass pumping.

Response: Construction sequence is per standard for any line that needs to be relocated. Construct the proposed line before disconnecting the existing line. Contractor will then take a couple of hours to do the connection during non-peak hours and will be fine. There is only one connection to sewer up-stream and is likely that the connection interruption will be planned to be during the closed hours of the Bojangles. Notes reflecting this plan have been added to the plans on sheet C3.2.

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 that reads "Dylan Tarr". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Dylan Tarr, PE