

PSP-24-07 – MERRITT – V1 Submittal review cycle

START DATE: DECEMBER 2024	DUE DATE: <u>01-06-25</u>	TRC/STAFF Comments issued on: <u>01/06/2025</u>
---------------------------	---------------------------	---

Review Group / Staff	Comments	Cleared Comments
Planning & Zoning – Planning Staff & WithersRavenel	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide a Written Response to ALL comments. 2. Add revision dates to all submittal materials. 3. Add “PSP-24-07” to the Cover sheet and on every plan set sheet in a regular/recurring location. 4. Application and Submission Requirements - A Tree Survey (Section 6.2.4.2.A) and Tree Preservation Plan (Section 6.2.4.5.C) are required as a portion of Landscape Plan submitted with this application. 5. Application and Submission Requirements - Copies of all environmental permits for disturbances and encroachments shall be submitted to the Town. 6. Application and Submission Requirements - The applicant suggests the project will be developed in two phases. Please provide a phasing plan showing the lot numbers associated with each in a subsequent submittal. Said phasing plan should be included within the preliminary plat plan set. 7. Cover Sheet and Site Details - Add the current project number to the cover sheet and all other sheets that include a project number placeholder. Also add any historical case numbers to the sheet, including TA 24-01 & REZ 24-01. These references can be added under a separate table titled “Associated Approvals” or included where the zoning conditions from REZ 24-01 are shown in the upper left-hand corner of the cover sheet. 8. Cover Sheet and Site Details - Condition #1 referring to conformity with the concept plan should be updated as there is no “Exhibit A” within the plan set (appears these were copied and pasted from the conditions of approval from the 11/07 BOC hearing). Simply refer to the associated concept plan with REZ-24-01, approved on 11/07. The same applies to condition #8. 9. Cover Sheet and Site Details - Fix the pagination issue with condition #15. 10. Cover Sheet and Site Details - approval cert - Should reference the LDO not UDO. 11. Cover Sheet and Site Details - Please add the following information to the Site Data Table and/or correct the information as shown on the mark-ups: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The overall Site Data Table should show both required and proposed building setbacks to confirm compliance throughout the project for both attached and residential lots. Refer to the approved text amendment when showing this information. The side building setback should state 10’ Aggregate. b. The proposed impervious surface area total of 12.84 ac. seems to be inaccurate. Please update as appropriate. 	

	<p>c. Remove one of the project narratives from the cover sheet.</p> <p>d. Open space calculations (required and provided) should be included in the site data table. Note, the RH district requires a total of 15% open space (based on total project acreage). Vehicle use areas, streets, driveways, and sidewalks required per this LDO may not be used toward open space calculations unless explicitly stated in LDO 6.2.</p> <p>e. Parking requirements, parking calculations, and spaces provided to demonstrate compliance</p> <p>12. Cover Sheet and Site Details - All information with associated requirements in the Site Data Table (i.e., lot area) should show both required and proposed figures to ensure compliance with the LDO.</p> <p>13. Cover Sheet and Site Details - Provide Open Space Calculations within the Site Data Table and include a demonstration of compliance with the requirements for LDO Section 3.1.B.1. The Open Space Plan should also be provided with this information and an additional level of detail.</p> <p>14. Existing Conditions Sheet - Show all existing vegetation (with general description/location).</p> <p>15. Site Plan Overall (CS-100) - Clarify/ explain if/how the hammerhead stub ultimately be extended to establish a connection to the “Commercial/Retail” outparcel that fronts Rolesville Road?</p> <p>16. Site Plan Overall (CS-100) - Show all existing vegetation (with general description and location).</p> <p>17. Site Plan Overall (CS-100) - Clarify/ explain why have only a select few of the roadways been named? The applicant needs to initiate road naming and E911 address assignment conversations with Wake County. All road names and addresses should be shown on subsequent submittals.</p> <p>18. Site Plan Overall (CS-100) – Clarify/ explain why does the Greenway/sanitary easement vary in width from 30-40’. It appears that the portion in the southwest corner which is 30’ in width can be shifted north to accommodate additional width. Note, per LDO Section 6.2.1.J.2., Greenway easement width should be 50’ (reducible to 30’ with proven and accepted site constraints).</p> <p>Additional Comments and Requirements</p> <p>19. <u>Regarding LDO Section 6.6</u> - while a complete and fully constructable Lighting Plan is required as part of the CID plan set to follow this PSP, please provide a general Street Light pole layout exhibit to allow Town Staff to participate in the choice of location and number of street light poles, Street lighting is an on-going quality of life aspect involving the Town (not the developer) in perpetuity and historically, the Town has had zero input into the above ground lighting provisions within subdivisions.</p>	
<p>Parks & Recreation - Eddie Henderson</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain the plan for interconnectivity to amenities and commercial areas, such as off-street connections (sidepaths) to the future park? 2. Please revise to say future Town park instead of an active open space area. 	

PSP-24-07 – MERRITT – V1 Submittal review cycle

Engineering - Jacque Thompson	See the two (2) PDF's of Comments – 1) Memo dated 01-02-2025, with 67 comments, plus 6 (A.-F.) for future CID plans; 2.) Mark-up comments, there appear to be 192 comments/entries.	
Wake County Watershed Management – Kevin Zelaya	Town Staff: No comments provided; Janet Boyer has retired; note new staff names. Typically there are no comments from Wake Co. at PSP, but they do get involved at CID, which they must sign. Contact Wake Co directly to start discussion as needed.	
COR Public Utilities - Tim Beasley	See PDF of markup comments – there appear to be 77 comments/entries on 7 select sheets.	
Wake C Fire / EMS - Brittany Hocutt	Cul-de-sac near lots 476 and 455 shall be 96 ft.	
NCDOT – Jacob Nicholson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on previous discussions with the development team, the westernmost driveways on the Fowler extension should be removed. 2. A TIA was <u>never</u> submitted to NCDOT for review. 3. The roadway plans for the Fowler extension will need to be reviewed by NCDOT separately from the driveway permit/encroachment agreement process. This may result in changes to the proposed alignment and therefore R/W dedication. 	

