



BASS, NIXON & KENNEDY, INC., CONSULTING ENGINEERS
6310 CHAPEL HILL ROAD, SUITE 250, RALEIGH, NC 27607
919/851-4422 FAX 919/851-8968 www.bnkinc.com

To: Meredith Gruber, Town of Rolesville Planning Director
From: Marty D. Bizzell, PE, CPESC
Date: April 19, 2022
Revised April 21, 2022
Re: Cobblestone Village 7th Review
SP21-01

As Engineers of Record Bass, Nixon and Kennedy offer the following responses to your Review Comments for the above referenced project:

Planning Comments-Liza Monroe, Karen Mallo, AICP

Cover Sheet

1. The quantity summary on the Cover Sheet indicates there are 2.32 acres of open space provided. This is different from the site data table. The plans should be revised to show the open spaces calculations. Further, all open spaces on the plans should be labeled or hashed/marked as such to determine compliance with UDO Section 14.13.1.

BNK Response: Open Space has been corrected.

Existing Conditions

2. Several existing items are not clarified as being removed, replaced, or remaining. Please refer to the plan and make the necessary revisions.

BNK Response: Revised accordingly.

3. Label the match-lines between the two details provided along the eastern property line.

BNK Response: Match-lines shown.

4. Silt tree protection fencing is noted as being provided on the landscape plan to the rear of the site. If there is to be landscaping preserved here, the location of that landscaping shall be shown on the existing conditions sheet.

BNK Response: No landscaping to be preserved.

Site Plan Sheet C1.1

5. The applicant should verify the width of the parking spaces. A few appear to be less than the required 9’.

BNK Response: Parking space widths are 9’.

6. The number of parking spaces shown on the plan (468) does not match the number of required parking spaces of the conditions of approval (480). The applicant should revise accordingly.

BNK Response: 468 represents the parking required with the proposed community center square footage. The current site plan showing 468 parking spaces was approved by the Town Board of Commissioner’s October 5, 2021 meeting.

7. There are a few discrepancies in the square footage of the buildings from the area shown on the plans within the building footprint and the Site Data Table. Plans should be revised. **NOTE:** The parking calculations are based on the square footage of non-residential buildings provided. Therefore, we ask that the applicant verify and update the site data table to reflect the correct parking spaces required.

BNK Response: Parking updated. Reflects shared parking analysis.

8. There are several blank “shapes” that are not identified on the plans. Please label these areas with their anticipated surfaces, materials, and purposes.

BNK Responses: These are storm drainage structure numbers.

9. The site plan shows an “event space.” Parking must be provided to accommodate the area as a “place of assembly.” See the parking requirements in Section 10.1.10. of the UDO. It is understood that an off-site parking area is to be provided to accommodate those additional spaces. Notes indicating the provision of off-site spaces to meeting requirements shall be added to the plans.

BNK Response: Approved site plan does not reflect additional parking requirement for the event space.

10. The site plan shows seating around the event space. This additional seating should be incorporated into the square footage of the event space.

a. Provide a detail what the seating will look like including seating installation and footings.

BNK Response: Site plan approved with information currently shown. Respectively request that owner be allowed to provide seating

11. The Privette Insurance office does not appear to have improved parking. If parking is to be provided on-lot, please indicate where this will be provided. If their parking is shared, then the square footage of the office buildings should be included when calculating the required off-street parking spaces, per Section 10.1.10 of the UDO. Insurance offices are categorized as “Office & Institutional, Other.”

BNK Response: Privette Insurance property is not part of this site plan.

12. How is the Privette Insurance property being handled? If it is to remain as its own private lot, setbacks and buffer yards should apply. At a minimum, we would recommend additional buffering between the office building lot and Building 2 of the proposed development.

BNK Response: Privette Insurance property is not part of this site plan. Site plan approved by Board of Commissioners as shown.

13. In accordance with UDO 10.1.7.7. where a parking stall abuts a walkway, there shall be a space of 3.5 feet between the wheel bumper or curb and the edge of the walkway. Parking bumpers shall be provided in parking stalls, or the walkways should be moved from edge of curb.

BNK Response: Site plan approved by Board of Commissioners as shown with 19’ long parking spaces. Wheel stops would be required to meet this requirement. Respectively request that parking be approved as shown. *Per discussion with Town Staff and ref: LDO Section 6.4.4.A6 parking spaces as shown will be allowed.*

14. Crosswalks should be provided throughout the parking areas. Locations should be added to the plans and details provided to the details sheet.

BNK Response: Crosswalks are shown and additional crosswalks have been shown accordingly.

Utility Plan Sheet C2.1

15. Four of the spaces on the plans are noted as electric vehicle charging spaces. On the utility plan and the site plan, label the location of the charging equipment.

BNK Response: Charging stations shown.

16. On the existing condition sheet, a fire hydrant along Main Street is noted as “to be replaced.” The location of all fire hydrants should be specified on the utility plan and site plan.

BNK Response: All proposed fire hydrant locations are shown on the Utility Plan.

17. Label tree protection fencing location.

BNK Response: No tree protection fencing is proposed.

Grading Plan Sheet C3.1

18. Top and bottom of all retaining walls should be labeled. Provide a retaining wall detail.

BNK Response: Elevations have been shown.

19. Provide a legend to clarify what the numbers in the hexagons on the plan are indicating.

BNK Response: These symbols represent storm drainage structure numbers that correspond to the storm drainage pipe chart.

Landscape Plan Sheet L1.1

20. The applicant should demonstrate compliance with the vehicular use area tree requirements that all parking spaces shall be within 60’ of the base of a tree, throughout the entire parking area. It appears that several spaces do not meet the requirement. They are indicated on the plans with yellow highlighter.

BNK Response: Trees have been added where needed, pending verification from staff as to whether the entire space needs to be within the 60’ radius or

a portion of it.

21. The building lines and pavement should be lightened, and the proposed trees and shrubs should have the heavier lines to make the plan easier to read.

BNK Response: Transparency has been added to the plan to lighten the background line work.

22. In the western buffer, the symbol for ICG is overlaid with the symbol for the VML, making the ICG difficult to read/identify. The plans should be revised so that just the "+" is shown in the center of the symbol, rather than both the "+" and the ".".

BNK Response: This is a repeat comment that I still don't understand. The notes were moved prior to the last submittal so there was no overlap, and the "+" and "." In the center of the symbols are different because they represent two different plant types.

23. The applicant should indicate the required site triangles on the landscape plans and remove any proposed landscaping or buffers that would interfere with site distance.

BNK Response: Sight distance triangles have been labeled on Both Main Street and Young Street.

24. Ground covers should be noted in all blank beds and open areas-grass, mulch, vegetative ground cover, etc.

BNK Response: General Note #15 states "Unless otherwise noted on the Plan, all disturbed areas are to be seeded with warm season grass, including parking lot perimeters and parking lot islands". This note was added prior to the previous submittal.

25. The location and preservation of any existing vegetation should be noted on the plans as well as the location of any tree protection fencing.

BNK Response: The site has been totally cleared and there is no existing vegetation. Tree project fence and tree protection fencing are provided to protect offsite vegetation.

26. The plant list should be revised to note what requirement each plant is filling (i.e. Buffer tree, dumpster screening).

BNK Response: Done.

Lighting Plan Sheet L1.01)

27. The lighting plan shows the basic fixture and base installation detail. However, there is no information regarding mounting height, exterior building lighting, cut-offs, or shielding. The plans should be revised to show this information.

BNK Response: Mounting height is shown on lighting plan.

28. The plans should be revised to show and/or notes added to the plan to indicate the type and location and/or if building mounted lighting is proposed.

BNK Response: Duke Energy will need to revise lighting plan.

29. It appears from the proposed location of the lighting fixtures, that the proposed canopy tree(s) may be in conflict.

BNK Response: Will coordinate with Duke Energy will need to review lighting plan.

30. The lighting plan should be revised to demonstrate compliance with Section 14.8.9., Spillover Light, which requires footcandle spillover not to exceed 0.3 at property lines adjacent to residential and 1.0 at property lines adjacent to commercial uses and right-of-way. It appears that the plans exceed these levels.

BNK Response: Duke Energy will need to revise lighting plan. Footcandles graphics are shown on lighting plan.

31. The plans shall demonstrate compliance with Section 14.8.10, which requires that lamps for non-cutoff fixtures shall not exceed 100W. However, the plans propose lamps in excess of 150W and it appears cutoffs are not provided.

BNK Response: Duke Energy will look at providing cutoffs.

Engineering Comments-Brian Laux

We have not seen a storm package since 1st submittal February 2021 for review of the storm pipe and drainage calcs on site. This is a comment that we have had most if not all reviews. The town engineer needs to review and approve the storm design. Wake County reviews and SCM and SEC. Any questions please let us know.

BNK Response: Storm drainage report has been included with this submittal.

Title Sheet

1. The quantity summary lists 0 LF of public sidewalk, however, there appears to be sidewalk located along Main Street/401 and W. Young Street in the ROW. Please update the value in the summary. This is a repeat comment.

a. The quantity summary lists no public sewer, however, there appears to be sanitary sewer proposed crossing Main Street connection into existing manhole. Please update the value in the summary.

BNK Response: Sidewalk quantity has been reflected to include the portion of sidewalk to be installed by developer.

Sheet C0.1

2. Please address the previously asked questions regarding the asphalt drive (to be removed) on the western corner of the site. Is there an existing easement located here to be abandoned?

BNK Response: All existing asphalt on the property has been removed.

Sheet C1.1:

3. Please ensure all easements are labeled.

BNK Response: Easements are labeled.

4. When labeling the relocated greenway, please include the path width.

BNK Response: Path width shown.

5. An access and maintenance easement to public ROW should be included and labeled for the SCM in the western corner of the site. Repeat comment.

BNK Response: Development/property is under one ownership.

6. Please clarify how the walk by building 7 will be extended to the greenway trail, including the material used for this path extension. Also state the width of the greenway that the walk will be extended to. Repeat comment.

BNK Response: Greenway trail extension/connection shown.

7. The 10' perimeter buffer line is not showing on the plans. Please turn on/show this line.

BNK Response: 10' perimeter buffer is shown where required.

8. Please provide an exhibit showing that a fire truck and future SCM maintenance truck with trailer can maneuver in, out, and around the parking lot located northwest of building 7. Repeat comment.

BNK Response: Wake County Fire has approved the site plan.

9. Will an access drive, material be provided for access to the cell phone tower? Will there be connection to an existing drive for the tower? Repeat comment.

BNK Response: Access easement shown to property line. No off-site connection proposed at this time.

10. The easement for the cell phone tower should connect to the existing easement, as shown in the markups. Repeat comment.

BNK Response: Access easement to cell tower property is shown.

11. Please clarify the intent of the end of the walk to the east of Flagstone Crossing Road and update the plans accordingly. Will there be a ramp crosswalk to the parking area or is it planned to connect to the other sidewalk? Repeat comment.

BNK Response: Crosswalks have been revised accordingly.

12. Please provide a walkway for the ramp along parking spaces north of Bluestone Crossing Road. Repeat comment.

BNK Response: Walkway provided in a different location.

13. Sidewalk widths vary throughout the site. Please dimension all widths that are not constant and indicate typical widths. Note a minimum width of 6ft along parking areas. Repeat comment.
BNK Response: Minimum 6' sidewalk is shown in parking areas.
14. Please ensure drive isle and mountable curb dimensions are shown. This is a repeat comment.
BNK Response: Drive aisle and mountable curb shown per NCDOT approval.
15. Is the proposed curb by NCDOT to be built or demolished? Is any coordination on construction needed? Repeat Comment
BNK Response: Developer is coordinating with Stantec.
16. Will there be any demo from the proposed improvement with proposed parking? If so, please make sure it is indicated. Repeat comment.
BNK Response: It is not proposed that any new improvements will be demo'd. Developer is coordinating with project consultant, Stantec, to avoid this.
17. The tree grates along Main Street/401 will not work with the sidewalk. The retaining wall also limits the space and doesn't provide necessary room for pedestrians. Please update the design to address the issues. Repeat comment.
BNK Response: Pedestrian friendly tree grates are proposed.
18. Please clarify what is proposed vs. existing in the area northeast of building 3. Will the asphalt drive remain, or is it getting resurfaced/repurposed? Repeat comment.
BNK Response: Asphalt drive on Privette property to remain.
19. The 14' access easement dimensioned to the northeast of building 3 is not shown. Please ensure this easement line is shown, including how it is terminated. Repeat comment.
BNK Response: 14' access easement will be provided.
20. Please provide more information on how the drive to the northeast of building 3 is being designed. Will there be ADA ramps where the sidewalk meets the drive? What

is the curb type at this location? Repeat comment.

BNK Response: This area is under the LAPP project limits and access ramps should be provided.

21. Is there any building setback from the existing property line south of building 2? If so, please ensure this setback is being met and the line shown in the plans. Repeat comment.

BNK Response: Building 2 is subject to a “build-to” requirement under Town Center Zoning.

22. Please indicate if any work will be done on the Privette Insurance site. Will there be any existing asphalt or gravel removal? If so, what will replace it? Will there be any walk connection to the plaza area? Repeat comment.

BNK Response: No work is proposed other than to relocate an existing water meter as approved by the City of Raleigh Public Utilities Department.

Will there be light duty paving in the parking lot, or will it all be heavy duty paving? Not legend, labels, or section to show this.

BNK Response: All parking and drive aisles will be paved at 2.5” asphalt and 8” stone.

Fire department approval for driveway width and the layout along Building #7. Building code requires 26ft wide for fire apparatus access when Buildings are more than 30 feet in height (note in blue)

BNK Response: Site plan has been approved by Wake County Fire Marshall.

The Town also had a few questions on Community are layout and signage (note in blue)

BNK Response: Acknowledged.

Sheet C2.1

23. Please ensure that all FDCs have a hydrant within 100ft of them. CoR and Fire department approval needed for current design.

BNK Response: Acknowledged. CORPUD and Wake County Fire Marshal

have approved site plan.

24. There is a force main crossing a wall by building 1. Please clarify if this will be going through or under the wall. Repeat comment.

BNK Response: Under.

25. Towards the top right of the sheet there is a note that is partially cut off and not pointing to anything. Please remove or fix the comment so it can be easily read and understood.

BNK Response: Addressed.

26. Please ensure all buildings have FDCs. And follow the Fire department and CoR minimum standards.

BNK Response: FDC's approved by CORPUD and Wake County Fire Marshal.

27. Please show the location of the grease trap for the community center.

BNK Response: Grease trap information needed from Town Architect.

28. The sanitary sewer by Basalt Place and Main Street/401 is not clearly labeled. Please indicate where the private sewer starts. If there are section of public sanitary sewer not within ROW, please ensure a sanitary easement is provided. Repeat comment.

BNK Response: Sewer to be private as per City of Raleigh Public Utilities.

The Town also had a few questions on Community area layout and signage (note in blue)

BNK Response: Acknowledged.

Sheet C3.1:

29. Please provide top of wall and bottom of wall elevations for all walls. Repeat comment.

BNK Response: Shown.

30. Please provide a maintenance strip (10ft) for equipment to access and maintain the SCM in the western corner of the site.
BNK Response: All property under same ownership.
31. The grading of the parking lot by the SCM should be more clearly identified. Consider providing spot grades to represent drainage flow or provide more detail with the contours. Repeat comment
BNK Response: Drainage in this area is to be all sheet drainage.
32. There is a leader without text, and some cut off text to the southwest of Bluestone Crossing Road. Please remove leader or ensure text can be seen.
BNK Response: Addressed.
33. All conflicts should have separation clearly identified. If there is no profile containing the conflict, please ensure the conflict separation is clearly noted. Repeat comment
BNK Response: No conflicts anticipated. Force main will avoid storm drainage and water main/service conflicts.
34. Please clarify how the access drive by building 7 is going to grade/slope. Based on current contours it appears additional curb inlets will be needed. Repeat comment.
BNK Response: Two curb cuts have been shown to ensure positive drainage.
35. Contour labels should be provided on the proposed contours by building 1. Repeat comment.
BNK Response: Contour labels provided.
36. Please clarify if building 1 will have a stem wall or a separate retaining wall. Adjust plans as needed. Repeat comment.
BNK Response: Stem wall shown.
37. There appears to be a low point with no storm structure in the parking lot north of building 1. Please adjust grading or add structure to prevent pooling. Repeat comment.
BNK Response: Stormwater will sheet flow off parking lot.

38. At building 8, contours show drainage going from the walk towards the building. Please show how this water will be collected. Repeat comment.

BNK Response: Contours have been revised.

39. There is a note towards the top right of the sheet indicating a 10' perimeter buffer, however there is no leader, nor a buffer shown. Please remove or correct the positioning as needed.

BNK Response: Label issue has been addressed.

40. Please ensure the FFE is listed on all buildings.

BNK Response: Building 2 and 6 are one large mixed use building. Same FFE's.

41. There appears to be a low point with no storm structure in the parking lot west of building 3. Please adjust grading or add structure to prevent pooling. Repeat comment.

BNK Response: *Grading has been adjusted to provide positive drainage to curb inlet at intersection.*

42. There appears to be a low point with no storm structure in the parking by the intersection of Rolesville Center Road and Main Street/401. Please adjust grading or add structure to prevent pooling. Repeat comment.

BNK Response: Positive drainage will be provided in curb line as there is no storm drainage to connect to in street.

43. Please show any road drainage improvements by NCDOT along Main Street and E. Young Street. Repeat comment.

BNK Response: Drainage improvements are shown per Stantec drawings.

44. Please indicate the slope direction of the patio in front of building 3. Repeat comment.

BNK Response: Developer to coordinate with Main Street project to determine if patio can slope to Main Street.

45. NCDOT plans look different than what is shown here. Please reference their plans and have approval from NCDOT. Repeat comment.

BNK Response: Current plan information is shown.

Sheet C3.2:

46. Repeat comment: There is no berm for maintenance around the proposed SCM.

BNK Response: Property under one ownership.

47. Riser pipe outlet does not seem long enough for what is in the details (10' MAINTENANCE/WALL FOOTING/CUTOFF TRENCH (5' MIN/FES?). Repeat comment.

BNK Response: SCM approved by Wake County.

48. Provide minimum cover on pipe. Repeat comment.

BNK Response: SCM approved by Wake County.

Sheet C3.3:

49. Limits of disturbance does not include the Greenway for the town that is relocated.

BNK Response: Greenway construction is underway/complete.

Sheet C3.8:

50. Standard note: All construction activity must be in accordance with accepted policies of the Town of Rolesville and NCDOT. Rolesville currently does not allow HDPE within the pavement area. Repeat comment.

BNK Response: Construction plans were approved by Board with HDPE shown on plans. *Per discussion with CJS – Engineering Consultant for the Town; HDPE pipe will be allowed due to the storm drainage being private on not on the public R/W. NCDOT stone bedding details have been provided in the plan set.*

51. Provide the storm drainage and calculations required for approval. Repeat comment.

BNK Response: Storm drainage report provided with this submittal.

Sheet C4.1 & C4.2:

52. Stations in plan view are hard to follow/read to see alignment that goes with the profile. Looks like you might be able to turn off unrelated stationing alignments.

BNK Response: Stations are shown for appropriate alignments.

53. Show any Public sanitary sewer easement on main as required by CoR.

BNK Response: Sewer main is private per CORPUD.

54. Verify rim to FG?

BNK Response: Revised accordingly.

Sheet L1.1:

55. Tree conflict with ADA ramps at driveway. Repeat comment.

BNK Response: Addressed.

Sheet C5.1 & C5.2:

56. Need NCDOT details along ROW. Repeat comment.

BNK Response: NCDOT details have been shown.

Sheet C5.5 & C4.2:

57. Is the detail for block wall designed for SCM, typical around site, Main Street wall?
Repeat comment.

BNK Response: Yes; at this time.