

503 S. Main Response to Comments Review #3

1. FYI – MA 22-07 must be Approved by Town Board for final approval/signature of this Site Plan application; the application is on the March 7, 2023 Town Board of Commissioners agenda.
Response: Waiting on the Town for recombination approval. Revised stormwater permit for the StorageMax submitted to Wake County.
2. FYI – FP 22-20, Recombination Plat, must be Recorded and the new legal description and BM/PG reference included on/in this Site Plan.
Response: Waiting on the Town for recombination approval. Revised stormwater permit for the StorageMax submitted to Wake County.
3. FYI – All Building Height and roof features comments/questions resolved with V3 architectural drawings, Sheets A-1.01, A-3.01, A-3.02, A-4.01.
Response: Comment noted.
4. NEW - Addresses – Contact Wake County GIS/911 (Saunders, Dianne dianne.saunders@wakegov.com) to vet/attain/express Addresses for the proposed (9 non-residential tenant spaces on 1st Floor, then 11 upper-story multifamily dwelling units). Clarify the overall property will remain 503 S. Main St.
Response: Contacted Wake County GIS and waiting for their response.
5. Written Response - Provide a written response to comments document that addresses ALL/EVERY comment. Making a mark-up of mark-up comments is fine if best way to respond.
Response: Comment noted.
6. Dates - Add appropriate revision dates to Site Plan / any other submitted/re-submitted documents. Cover Sheet has NO dates at all (neither for V1 or V2), but all other sheets do in the Right- side banner; please add ALL Dates to Cover Sheet.
Response: Dates added.
7. See the PDF of Mark-up Comments prepared by WithersRavenel – please make all Corrections or provide Written Response (Answers if a Question).
Response: Comments addressed
8. Sheet C1 – see Mark-ups – follow comments and answer questions regarding intended COM disturbance relative to existing Trees.
Response: Note added to concern COM disturbance.
9. LDO Section 6.2.1.D.3. -- Open space areas shall have an open space “type” proposed. On the Cover Sheet, please include the labels of each of the proposed Active areas. Further on the Site Plan, please add the label, “Plaza” to the Active Area 1. See Mark-ups.
Response: Cover sheet and site plan labeled.
10. LDO Section 6.2.1.G., Open Space Design Standards -- Open shall also meet the design requirements of specifically seating, receptacles, and active and passive features. Revise appropriate sheet(s)/drawings to demonstrate compliance with these requirements.
Response: Elements added.
11. LDO Section 6.8.4.B.5. -- “Street crossings shall be required whenever a walkway intersects a vehicular area; and/or a pedestrian walkway intersects a vehicular area within a

development...” . Revise Sheet C3 to add crosswalks across vehicular use area as marked on plans.

Response: Crossings added.

13. Sheet D1 - Fencing - (1.) Fence Detail Type 1 is blurry/illegible - Clarify the type of fencing, color, and material (eg, black aluminum slatted) for Type #1. (2.) Clarify the material for 'Fence Detail Type 2' as it is unstated.

Response: Fencing detail revised.

14. LDO Section 6.4.4.A.6. - Wheel Stops – Revise to show Wheel Stops COMPLETELY WITHIN the parking space. See Mark-up for five (5) parking spaces that should add Stops to prohibit encroachment into Landscaping.

Response: Wheel stops adjusted.

15. Type of Curbs – Clarify/call-out type of curbs being used internally, it is unclear if stand-up, rolled, or flat curbing

Response: There is only one type of standard curb. The area shaded is flat and called out as key note 20 on the site plan.

16. LDO Section 6.4.4.C.1.c. - Parking Space Widths – See mark-up, revise all spaces to measure 9' wide minimum.

Response: End parking spaces are dimensioned on the site plan.

17. LDO Section 6.6.J., Parking Area Lighting Standards – Regarding Sheet SL1 :

(a.) J.1. speaks to staggering heights, higher in the middle, shorter at the perimeter; all 5 light poles note at being 26' tall – please revise to meet this standard; the pole by Wall Creek Drive and the 2 poles by Pete Smith should be shorter than the 2 poles adjacent stormwater pond – see J.2 for related height maximums.

(b.) Sheet SL1 makes these poles look like they are IN parking spaces – revise drawing to not show this.

Response: Comment responses as follows:

LDO Section 6.6.J., Parking Area Lighting Standards – Regarding Sheet SL1 :

(a.) J.1. speaks to staggering heights, higher in the middle, shorter at the perimeter; all 5 light poles note

at being 26' tall – please revise to meet this standard; the pole by Wall Creek Drive and the 2 poles by Pete Smith should be shorter than the 2 poles adjacent stormwater pond – see J.2 for related height maximums.

Pole heights revised as required.

(b.) Sheet SL1 makes these poles look like they are IN parking spaces – revise drawing to not show this.

The fixtures are denoted by a small square representing the pole and a larger square representing the actual fixture. None of the smaller squares are located in parking spaces. The larger squares are actually suspended over the parking spaces.

18. LDO Section 6.8.2.D.1 , Facade – contains the “Standards” for Façade Building Architecture; Revise Sheets

A- 1.01, A-3.01, and A-3.02 to include the necessary measurements or call-outs to demonstrate compliance with each of the five (a. through e.) items. On the Sheets, add dimensions and a brief note/statement explaining compliance. For instance, for 6.8.2.D.1.a., call out the vertical 1’ architectural detail/articulation as is shown in LDO Figure 6.8.1. by illustration “A”.

Response: Elevations revised with notes indicating LDO items.

19. LDO Section 6.8.2.D.2., Transparency – Revise Sheets A-3.01(Northwest Exterior facing Main Street) and A-3.02 (Southwest Exterior facing Wall Creek Drive) to demonstrate compliance with the (2.a.) minimum 30% of Ground Floor Transparency and (2.b.) minimum 20% of Upper Floor Transparency required.

Response: Elevations revised to indicate “Transparency” areas with a note indicating percentage of glazing.

20. LDO Section 6.8.2.D.4, Building Materials - Revise Sheets A-1.01, A-3.01, and A-3.02 to calculations (a Table) to demonstrate compliance; Staff notes that at the bottom of each elevation drawings are noted building materials; Applicability would be to the Northwest (Main St.), Southeast (Wall Creek Subdivision), and Southwest (Wall Creek Drive) elevations.

Response: Building materials key added and indicated in a rendering. We would like to discuss with Town Staff the 60% masonry requirement in LDO Section 6.8.4.a.i and how this calculation is to be performed.

21. LDO Section 6.8.2.D.4.a.i. – Revise Sheet A-3.01 to include “Synthetic Stucco” rather than “EIFS” as “Synthetic Stucco” is a Permitted material an “EIFS” is not a listed Permitted material.

Response: Revised EIFS material to Synthetic Stucco.

22. LDO Section 6.8.2.D.5., Color – Revise Sheets A-1.01, A-3.01, and A-3.02 to include a palette or proposed Colors that fit the description of this Section; there are NO calculations to provide.

Response: A color palette has been added to the elevations.

23. LDO Section 6.8.2.D.6. – Minimum Design Items - Revise Sheets A-1.01, A-3.01, and A-3.02 to include a Note, Text Box, or Table that a minimum (4) of the 11 items are being provided.

Response: LDO Section 6.8.6, Note added to indicate all relevant items.

24. LDO Section 6.8.2.D.7 – Roof Design - Revise Sheet A-3.01 to add dimension to NorthWest Elevation to show minimum 1’ physical articulation and that Parapets are maximum 36’ above roof line.

Response: No parapet will extend more than 36” above the roof line. There is an outdoor roof area for the residential tenants that extends beyond the 36”, but these are not parapets. This is actually a feature that visually breaks up the elevation. See D1/ A-3.02 for a 3D diagram.

25. Regarding the V2 Mark-up Comments provided, the following are REPEAT –

a. Comment #6 – Sheet C3 – Landscape Easement over existing wall and Bradford Pear trees – why is this not shown to be intended, though understood Easements are created via a Plat (Book of Maps) and not this Site Plan.

b. Comment #8 - Sheet LS3 – the “Plant List” information is still clearly stating the “Required” and the

“Provided” – it appears to only be listing a “Provided” (‘Count’) column. Staff cannot review for compliance without showing Required to compare to “Provided”. Contact Staff if this comment request is not clear.

Response from Landscape Architect: Attached is a revised details sheet. The plant usage and requirements on the planting plan and again on the plant list previously, but they apparently wanted it listed differently. As I had tried numerous times to get an answer (having left voice mail, messages via people in the office and e-mails) with no response last time, I finally made a stab at what I thought they were asking. My guess is that they want to glance at the sheet and have it all tallied for them; so that is the current change. For comment 6, you will need to show a landscape easement on your sheet C-3 for the existing wall and pears. That way it can be included on the plat to be recorded.

Engineering Comments

Sheet C1:

1. Please confirm existing storm system; according to NCDOT plans for Main Street, it appears there is a possible underground JS and 18” storm pipe that are not currently shown in these plans.

Response: The system shown on Main street was provided by the surveyor. Also, we do not intend to make any modifications to the existing system.

a. A 20” RCP and a 20” FES are shown in the southern corner of this site; however, it appears as if these should be 18”. Please verify.

Response: Plans modified.

2. Please correct the “Tree Protection Fence” leader near the corner of S Main Street and Wall Creek Drive.

Response: Drawing modified to reflect comment.

3. Please confirm if the existing drive entrance at the north corner of the property is to be removed. If so, please show and label.

Response: Existing Drive to be removed a NCDOT encroachment permit has been been submitted to the Town for signature.

a. This comment applies to Sheets C3 & C4.

Response: Comment noted.

4. The label for existing sidewalk to be replaced is duplicated on this sheet.

Sheet C2:

Response: Label adjusted.

5. The text for the structure label is being cut off. Please correct.

Sheet C3:

Response: Label adjusted

6. Please adjust the “tie into existing” label along Wall Creek Drive. It appears only curb is tying in where the leaders point; there is a separate note for sidewalk.

Response: Label adjusted

7. Please copy the note from Sheet C-1 onto this sheet for sidewalk improvements along S Main Street.

a. This comment also applies to Sheet C4.

Response: Note revised.

8. Need to show where proposed drainage easement will tie out. Provide exhibit with next submittal

Sheet C4:

Response: Adjusted as noted and a “draft” copy of the recombination plat noting the drainage easement included with the resubmittal.

9. Please ensure there is adequate cover over the drainage pipes.

Response: The pipes are RCP and have a min of 1 foot of cover and based on experience is adequate.

10. Please label the blue line that cuts through the bioretention basin.

Response: Line removed.

11. Confirm if the intent is to have color on these plans; adjust as necessary.

Sheet C6:

Response: Color removed

12. The north arrow in plan view is cut off; please correct.

Sheet EC1:

Response: Drawing adjusted

13. Please review the baffles and drainage patterns; consider adjusting the baffles so the drainage flows through them.

Response: Temp diversion ditches drain into the outer baffle.