

PSP-24-05 – Harris Creek Farm – V1 Submittal review cycle

START DATE: <b>AUGUST 2024</b>	DUE DATE: <u>__09-09-24__</u>	TRC/STAFF Comments issued on: <u>__09/04/2024__</u>
--------------------------------	-------------------------------	---

Review Group / Staff	Comments	Cleared Comments
Planning & Zoning – Planning Staff & WithersRavenel	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide a Written Response to ALL comments.</li> <li>2. Add revision dates to all submittal materials.</li> <li>3. Cloud or bubble all changes.</li> <li>4. Add “PSP-24-05” to the Cover sheet and on every plan set sheet.</li> <li>5. See PDF of mark-up comments, many/most of which relate to the following written comments.</li> <li>6. Cover Sheet:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Remove the title block line of ‘Map amendment (conditional rezoning)’ – replace w appropriate ‘Preliminary Subdivision Plat’.</li> <li>b. Revise header of ‘Voluntary Rezoning Conditions’ to MA 22-08 Rezoning Conditions”.</li> <li>c. Please move the list of 39 “General Notes” – which are industry standard types of generic notes, and not something specific to this land/entitlement project per se’ – to a subsequent sheet. Suggest making the 2<sup>nd</sup> sheet of the plan set a spot for ‘General notes’. Also note, this is Preliminary Subdivision – this is NOT a constructable plan set. If these notes are intended for the construction contractors they are more appropriate on the next-step Construction Infrastructure Drawing (CID) plan set, in which case, they could be removed altogether.</li> <li>d. Site specific notes 6 &amp; 7 concerning well and septic are believed to be inaccurate and should be removed.</li> <li>e. <u>Site Data Table/PIN number</u> – This lists just one PIN, 1757277811; in IMAPS, this appears and is noted as 71.52 acres by Wake county; MA 22-08, the Rezoning, was for 94.99 acres comprising 19 separate PIN identified properties. Please explain the acreage discrepancy.</li> <li>f. <u>Site Data Table/Total Site Area</u> – MA 22-08 was for 94.99 acres; this states 96.33 acres; please explain the discrepancy.</li> <li>g. <u>Site Date Table/Existing Zoning</u> – MA 22-09 rezoned the land to an RM-CZ District; this says “R-30” which is a Wake County zoning district; revise.</li> <li>h. <u>Site Data Table/Proposed Zoning</u> – remove this row/entry it is inappropriate for a PSP. It is also incorrect stating “RH-CZ” which is Not the zoning of this land.</li> <li>i. <u>Site Data Table/Plat Book / Page reference</u> – BM2007/pg01224 seems to only include a portion of the land that is part of this subdivision, being the present day PIN of 1757471559, 14.9 acres owned by KENNETH INVESTMENT LLC. Revise to reference ALL the Book of Maps or Deeds that cover all the</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	

	<p>acreage of this subdivision (see previous comment, where there is a discrepancy between the 94.99 acres that was rezoned and the 71.52 acres that is in a PIN the Applicant states is the subject property.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>j. <u>Parking Calculations table</u> – <b>remove</b> the Row for ‘Dwelling, Single family, Attached’ as this subdivision is ONLY Single family Detached units.</li> <li>k. <u>FYI – Impervious Coverage per Lot</u> – if 4,900 SF per residential lot is the final number, this will be required to be commemorated on the Final Subdivision Plat, and then govern Building Permit review for impervious coverage.</li> <li>l. <u>Right-of-Ways</u> – Move the “Dedicated Road R/W” row from under ‘Residential Density Calculations’ to the “Street Data” portion. ADD the additional right-of-way for Jonesville Road being dedicated.</li> <li>m. <u>Lot Design Standards</u> – everything thing in this section should include the LDO Section reference from which they derive. See overall comment about referencing “Cluster” across the board in this PSP.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <u>Min Lot size</u> - There is, nor never was, an RM District minimum lot size standard of 6,000 SF – from where does this derive?? This should be the regulatory Minimum standard, be it the LDO or a voluntary Condition more-restrictive than the LDO.</li> <li>ii. <u>Min Lot Width</u> – There is, nor never was, an RM District lot width of 42’ – where does this derive from?? This should be the regulatory Minimum standard, be it the LDO or a voluntary Condition more-restrictive than the LDO.</li> <li>iii. <u>Min Building Setbacks</u> – Add the appropriate Corner/Side setback applicable to corner lots; there is none provided.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>7. <u>"(Cluster Option)"</u> should be added next to the proposed based on the applicant's proposed minimum lot width. Any references to lot dimensional requirements, open space, and landscaping within this preliminary plat should include the word "Cluster Subdivision" and note compliance with LDO 3.1.B.</p> <p>8. <u>Sheet 2 (Existing Conditions):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. We assume the light brown bubble symbology reflects existing tree line but nothing has been included in the legend. Please update.</li> <li>b. Remove reference to Durham County within the Existing Condition Notes. Additionally, this is believed to be an inaccurate statement as condition of approval #14 commits to the dedication of a 100-sf historical monument related to the Jonesville area. Please advise.</li> <li>c. Please update with the individual or entity that performed the delineation and the date during which it was conducted.</li> </ul> <p>9. <u>Sheet 3 (Overall)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Per Table 6.2.1.3 in the LDO, greenways are considered passive open space features and should be removed from this calculation. Certain segments of the greenway that are activated through the construction of outdoor exercise equipment and similar uses may count towards provided active open space.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

PSP-24-05 – Harris Creek Farm – V1 Submittal review cycle

	<p>b. Please review Section 6.2.1.G of the LDO and provide updated calculations for passive open spaces. Note, a maximum 50% of the total required passive open space may be stormwater facilities. Additionally, only 20% of the total required passive open spaces may be environmentally sensitive or unique lands. The applicant will need to provide updated open spaces totals to confirm compliance with LDO 6.2.1.G.</p> <p>c. Please note that a limited number of parking spaces may count toward open space requirements. This comment may not apply during this preliminary subdivision review but will need to be considered if any proposed parking is a part of active open space totals. Being as the project requires 3.5 acres of active open space and is proposing 6.3ac, it is recommended that the applicant investigate any potential challenges with compliance. Please also see comment regarding greenways being considered passive open spaces and advise on how this may affect open space compliance.</p> <p>10. <u>Sheet 3 (Overall)</u></p> <p>a. Per LDO Table 6.2.1.3, Greenways are considered <b>passive open space features</b> and should be removed from this calculation. Certain segments of the Greenway that are activated through the construction of outdoor exercise equipment and similar uses <u>may be considered/counted</u> towards provided Active open space.</p> <p>b. Review LDO Section 6.2.1.G and provide updated calculations for Passive open spaces. Note, a maximum 50% of the total required Passive open space may be stormwater facilities (SCM). Additionally, only 20% of the total required Passive open spaces may be ‘environmentally sensitive’ or unique lands.</p> <p>c. <u>Per LDO 6.2.1.G.10</u> - only limited numbers of parking spaces may count toward open space requirements. At PSP, it may be premature to be able to vet and demonstrate compliance to this standard. With 3.5 acres of active open space Required, and 6.3 acres being Proposed, it is recommended that the Applicant investigate any potential challenges with compliance. See also comment regarding Greenways being considered Passive open spaces and determine how this may affect open space compliance.</p> <p>11. <u>Sheet 28</u> -- Remove City of Raleigh reference and replace with Town of Rolesville. Note, additional comments may be triggered once the required Preservation Plan is provided.</p>	
<p>Engineering - Brian Laux / Jacque Thompson</p>	<p>See two PDF’s – (1.) Memo dated 08-29-2024 with 67 comments, plus A-G for future CID plans; (2.) Mark-ups on the PSP plan set, with 2085 Comment entries (<i>but many/most are Autocad – Applicant should eliminate those to make Commenting easier/clearer</i>).</p>	
<p>Parks &amp; Recreation - Eddie Henderson</p>	<p>1. Revise Public Greenway Easement section - <i>the section that runs along the creek to the south</i> - to be labeled as “Public” [NOT private].</p> <p>2. Per LDO 6.2.1.J.2.(a). - Revise Public Greenway Easement to be 50’ wide from proposed 30’. This section does go on to state: “ <i>An alternative may be granted to reduce the minimum [50’ wide]</i>”</p>	

PSP-24-05 – Harris Creek Farm – V1 Submittal review cycle

	<p><i>Easement...to 30' if site constraints including topography and/or environmental features do not allow for a 50' Easement. Cost shall not be considered a constraint.</i> " If Applicant wishes to request less than 50', do so in writing.</p> <p>3. Confirm that Public Greenway will stub all the way to property lines (no gaps) in southeast &amp; southwest corners.</p> <p>4. The private greenway looks to be constrained where it goes up to Street C near SCM #2. Please clarify if this is a 10' wide sidewalk in this location.</p> <p>5. FYI – The shown 10' wide Sidepath along Jonesville Road is not required by the Town's Greenway Plan.</p> <p>6. In Landscape Plans, replace Lespedeza thunbergii with another plant as it is considered an invasive species -  <a href="https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/plantmaterials/gapmctn7775.pdf">https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/plantmaterials/gapmctn7775.pdf</a></p>	
COR Public Utilities - Tim Beasley	See PDF mark-up of comments on the Utility Plan Sheet.	
Wake County Fire / EMS - Brittany Hocutt	<p>1. Revise cul-de-sac to be 96 ft diameter;</p> <p>2. Revise so that no trees are within 3ft of fire hydrants;</p> <p>3. Revise/provide radii on turning (provide truck diagram for 50 ft truck for turning).</p>	
NCDOT – Jacob Nicholson	<p>1. The PSP should account for the roadway improvements required by the TIA.</p> <p>2. 4:1 pavement tapers will be required to tie into existing pavement for ultimate section widening.</p> <p>3. This subdivision is responsible for improvements at the Jonesville/Mitchell Mill intersection; the Reserve at Mitchell Mill subdivision also has TIA/traffic impact responsibility at this intersection. Monitoring for signal requirement/warrants will be an on-going effort.</p>	
Wake County Watershed Management - Janet Boyer	<i>No comments were received, which is not atypical for preliminary subdivision.</i>	N/A

