

SDP-24-05 – 414 S Main – 1st Submittal review cycle

START DATE: JUNE 06-05-24	DUE DATE: <u> 07-08-24 </u>	TRC/STAFF Comments issued on: <u> 07/07/2024 </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. Cloud or bubble all changes to Staff knows where/what a Revision is, greatly improving Re-review and helps avoid “repeating” comments due to lack of clarity as to if/where revisions were made. 4. <u>FYI Demolition Permit</u> – This will be required to remove the existing building and clear the site in advance of the project embodied in this SDP; Staff encourages this be applied for and be ready for issuance so as to not artificially stall project movement once this SDP is approved and a Pre-Construction Meeting is held and site construction can commence. Note, Demolition can absolutely occur in advance of SDP approval. 5. <u>Traffic Generation/Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA)</u> – In an email dated 06/26/2024 @ 1:27 PM, the LDO Land Development Administrator, Meredith Gruber, waived the requirement of a Traffic Impact Analysis for the project expressed in SDP-24-05, but did state that a Traffic Generation letter is necessary to at least match the NCDOT requirement of that as (their/NCDOT) first step in assessing traffic impact of (a/this) project. Submit a Traffic Generation Letter ASAP – this can be stand-alone and not part of a resubmittal of this SDP application. Email that to the Planning Director, NCDOT contact (Jacob Nicholson), and Assistant Planning Director/TRC Coordinator. 6. <u>Alternative Parking Plan (APP) request</u> – Given this is absolutely paramount to this project/plan as submitted, this should be the #1 priority of Applicant, to process the APP to the Town Board of Commissioners ASAP. Note Staff’s experience with APP is that they proceed via an Evidentiary Quasi-Judicial Hearing by the Town Board. Contact Planning Director to begin prioritizing this; a 2nd Submittal should NOT be submitted until this is Approved as it affects the entire sites design. 7. <u>Proposed Principal Zoning Uses</u> – By the Sheet C-4 Information it appears Applicant is seeking to establish three (3) separate Principal Zoning Uses (on the single lot/single-building development). Please confirm that is the intent (as opposed to 1 Principal use and multiple Accessory to the Principal uses). If the former, expand the “Proposed Use” portion of [Site Data Table] to clearly express that 3 Zoning uses are proposed. If the latter, and the main/primary/principal Use is going to be “Recreation, Indoor”, then a retail (store) component and an eating establishment that are both Accessory to the Indoor Recreation use should be expressed. A determining factor as to what is/not considered an Accessory Use is whether or not it would be open or in operation when the Principal Use is Not. 8. <u>Main Street Sidewalk</u> – LDO Section 6.8.4.4., Nonresidential Pedestrian Considerations: Sidewalks shall be at least six (6) feet in width and shall be provided in the following locations: 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Along any street-facing side(s) of any lot that abuts a public street;</u> b. Along the full length of the building(s) along any façade(s) featuring a customer entrance, and c. Along any façade(s) abutting public parking areas. d. Sidewalks are required on both sides of any street. <p>Sheet C-3 (Existing Conditions and Demolition Plan) has call-out that existing sidewalk is 5' (wide). Sheet C-4, Site Plan (all proposed improvements) continues to reference "Ex 5' Sidewalk (Typ)" – Revise plans to indicate that Sidewalk will be 6'. Revise C-3 to clarify the existing 5' will be demolished. IF Applicant intends to somehow add 1' to existing 5' sidewalk, rather than demo/replace, discussion with Town Engineer, Town Inspector, and possibly NCDOT (as sidewalk is in the DOT Right-of-way) should occur asap to square this away.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9. <u>Lighting Plan (submitted as a separate file) –</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. imbed/incorporate the submitted as a stand-alone document within the plan set; update Cover Sheet Sheet Index to reflect this. b. Confirm that the building will <u>not</u> include <u>any</u> wall mounted lighting as the Lighting Plan shows NONE to be provided; it only details site pole lighting. 10. See uploaded PDF of Plan set MARK-UP COMMENTS that go along with most of the below Comments. 11. <u>Cover Sheet</u> – Remove the Duplicate "ST" on site address in center of sheet. 12. <u>Cover Sheet</u> - Add "SDP-24-05" to this and on every plan set sheet (suggest side banner bar). 13. <u>Cover Sheet</u> – Per LDO Section 6.8.1.E. provide Building architectural elevations/renderings that fully demonstrate compliance with graphical measurements and calculations and notes, not just drawings that leave Staff to guess at measurements and calculations of the requirements. See Checklist 'Architectural Drawings' section, to which applicant wrote in 'not included w/ this submittal'. Not including this bare minimum element makes this submittal Incomplete and it should not have been reviewed by the TRC; omitting required elements extends the Review cycles unnecessarily. Submitting an inherently un-approvable, Approval-process application, is inappropriate. 14. <u>Cover Sheet/Property Ownership</u> – This is devoid of stating who is property owner (Developer and Engineer of Record are clear); see Checklist, Cover Sheet #10; Ownership declaration should include the recorded Deed reference (Bk/Pg); see further comment about providing a full Site Data Table on Cover Sheet which calls for Property owner to be clearly stated. 15. <u>Cover Sheet/Eventual Signatures</u> – as a constructable plan set, the Cover Sheet will attain signatures of the Town, Wake County Watershed Management, and City of Raleigh Utilities. Town will provide an "approval stamp" to be imbedded on Cover Sheet; Wake County and City of Raleigh have signature block templates Applicant should attain from those entities directly, and place them on Cover Sheet to ensure spacing, organization, etc. is settled asap (avoiding last minute tweaks to accommodate). 	
--	--	--

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 16. <u>Cover Sheet</u> – Change main title to ‘Site Development Plan’, that is the Town’s terminology. Yes it is a constructable (or construct-from) plan set. 17. <u>Cover Sheet</u> – Clarify/confirm the perpetual name of this property/project is “Pine Glo”. All involved know that that was the proprietary name of a manufacturing company that owned and operated out of this property in the past. 18. <u>Cover Sheet</u> – Per Checklist, Cover Sheet #8 – provide a Site Data Table per the description. Staff knows Sheet C-4, Site Plan, has an inclusive “Summary Information” table which is fine to include/keep. 19. <u>Sheet C.4, Site Plan</u> - In the SUMMARY INFORMATION Table, the Zoning District is expressed as “GI” meaning General Industrial; Per rezoning MA 22-04, approved on June 7, 2022, the property was rezoned to a General Commercial Conditional Zoning (GC-CZ) District – make all revisions to correct this significant error. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Please note that, per LDO Section 5.1.A., EATING ESTABLISHMENT requires a Special Use Permit in the GI district and RETAIL SALES AND SERVICES, NEIGHBORHOOD is not permitted in the GI district. These uses are permitted by-right under the GC district. Submitting this SDP with a Prohibited use according to the noted GI District is grounds for finding the submittal Incomplete and un-reviewable. Staff presumes this is a non-intentional error. b. Revise Permitted Maximum Building Height to the 35' of the GC District (deleting the sprinkler language). c. Revise the Proposed Building Height to be in compliance (35' or less); the Architectural Elevation drawings, which were NOT submitted, will demonstrate the proposed height of the Building (from finished grade). 20. <u>Sheet C.4, Site Plan - LDO 3.2.1, GC District Front Building Setback</u> – the standard is 20’; this states there is a “30’ Front Setback and Streetscape Buffer” – Detach Building Setback dimension and Streetscape Bufferyard dimension, and call-out/graphically show each independently (across all sheets that express either standard). Yes, this particular property, on a street requiring a 30’ Streetscape Bufferyard, cannot actually construct a building to its (GC District) minimum 20’ front setback dimension. 21. <u>Sheet C.4, Site Plan</u> - Per LDO Section 6.4.3.K, an Alternative Parking Plan must first be approved by the Board of Commissioners. This requires a parking study to be submitted which is prepared by PE or CLU in North Carolina. Please see this section for further submittal details. 22. <u>Sheet C.4, Site Plan</u> - Required Open Space appears slightly incorrect: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. 4.19 AC (Total Area) = 182.516.4 sq. ft. b. 182.516.4 sq. ft. * 5% = 9,126 sq. ft. 23. <u>Sheet C.4, Site Plan - LDO Section 6.8.4.2., Pedestrian Amenities</u> -- Please include note indicating that at least four (4) pedestrian amenities are provided; This note should expressly described exactly what is to be provided/built/installed. 	
--	--	--

SDP-24-05 – 414 S Main – 1st Submittal review cycle

	<p>24. <u>Sheet C-10, Landscape Plan -- PIN 1758799572/Bufferyard Requirement --</u> LDO Section 6.2.2.1 depicts Types 2 & 3 buffers against conventional Residential Zoning Districts. PIN 1758799572 to the north/east (Coffee Lodge) is zoned the R&PUD District (which is no longer utilized in the LDO and hence, is not a considered adjacent District in Table 6.2.2.2). The UDO’s R&PUD District was inherently a ‘residential’ District but did permit non-residential development; this property is developed as a drive-through Coffey shop, which would be more appropriately zoned along S. Main Street as a General Commercial zoning District. With that background, the Land Development Administrator shall consider viewing PIN 1758799572 as being zoned General Commercial for purposes of Bufferyard requirements; if so determined, there would be zero perimeter bufferyard required adjacent PIN 1758799572. TBD.</p> <p>25. <u>Sheet C-10, Landscape Plan --</u> Per LDO Section 6.2.2.1.D., light fixtures, parking spaces, and any structures other than plants, fences/walls, or berms, are permitted in a Required Perimeter buffer. Revise to remove any features other than those permitted.</p> <p>26. <u>Sheet C-10, Landscape Plan –</u> Per LDO Section 6.2.4.4.F., a Parking Divider Median shall be located here with a minimum width of 7' measured from the inside of the curb, containing one large or medium canopy tree or two small under-story trees per each 30' linear feet. Additionally, pedestrian-scale lighting shall be provided within divider medians. Further review will be necessary once these features are added.</p> <p>27. <u>Sheet C-10, Landscape Plan –</u> Per Section 6.2.4.5.B note that the preservation standards outlined shall apply and a Preservation Plan in accordance with Section 6.2.4.5.C shall be prepared. Further review will be necessary once this required element is provided.</p>	
<p>Parks & Recreation - Eddie Henderson</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Town is planning to construct an event center with a gymnasium at The Farm Park in 2025. Parks Staff would like to discuss the two projects (both indoor recreation space) in light of one another. 2. Based on the proposed land use, Staff recommends a pedestrian connection to the adjacent Townhome subdivision on Short Ridge Way. See PDF of possible means of pedestrian connections. 3. Revise Landscape Plans to REMOVE <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> which is considered by the State to be an invasive - https://nc-ipc.weebly.com/uploads/6/8/4/6/6846349/invasive_plant_list_-_ranked_-_2023-11-16.pdf 4. Revise Landscape Plans to show more of a diversity of native trees and shrubs in the landscape plan; current Plan shows one (1) species/type. <u>Per Rolesville LDO 6.2.4.7c: “All developments shall provide a diverse plant palette...”</u> See the following links for alternative native bush species: https://ncwildflower.org/recommended-native-species/ https://content.ces.ncsu.edu/extension-gardener-handbook/12-native-plants 	
<p>Engineering - Brian Laux / Jacque Thompson</p>	<p>See two PDF’s –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Written Memo comments dated July 1, 2024 – there are 26 numbered Comments. 	

SDP-24-05 – 414 S Main – 1st Submittal review cycle

	2.) Mark-ups on the SDP plan set – there is an indeterminate # of Staff entries/comments due to AutoCad entries appearing in the “Comments” tab of Adobe.	
Wake County Watershed Management - Janet Boyer	No comments were received from Wake County on this submittal; Wake county will be involved in V2 submittal review. Applicant is encouraged to contact Wake County for input and/or apply for the required and associated SEC and SWF permits that the project will require.	TBD
COR Public Utilities - Tim Beasley	See PDF of mark-up comments on the SDP plan set – there appear to be 4 comments.	
Wake County Fire / EMS - Brittany Hocutt Lingle	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. REAR ACCESS TO BUILDING TOWARDS DUMPSTER NEEDS FIRE TRUCK TURNAROUND. LENGTH >150 FT 2. NO ACCESS TO WITH 150FT OF SIDE NEXT TO STORAGE MAX. 3. PROVIDE TRUCK DIAGRAM FOR ACCESS/TURNING- CURBING APPEARS VERY SHARP FOR TURNING. 4. BASED UPON WATER SUPPLY ENTRANCE TO BUILDING- ADDITIONAL FIRE HYDRANT WILL BE NEEDED FOR FDC (STORZ CONNECTION). 5. *LANDSCAPING PLANTS MAY NEED TO BE MOVED BASED UPON LOCATION OF FDC/PIV/HOTBOX. 6. WHAT ARE THE MEASUREMENTS OF FIRE ACCESS WIDTH? WHAT IS THE HEIGHT OF THE BUILDING? BUILDINGS OVER 30FT REQUIRE AERIAL ACCESS TO BE 26 FT WIDE. 	
NCDOT – Jacob Nicholson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A Driveway Permit will be required as this proposed development is a change in use (former Industrial use to a proposed Indoor Recreation use). Submit this asap to NCDOT. 2. The Driveway Permit does <u>not</u> have to be signed by the Town as a pre-requisite to submit to/initiate NCDOT’s review. This policy varies Division to Division, and I believe our District Office used to require the municipality signature prior to beginning review, but we no longer require that in an effort to have more concurrent reviews. From my experience, most municipalities don’t sign until they are comfortable with the site plan/CDs. 3. A (ITE) Trip Generation Memo will be needed to determine if a TIA is required or not. Looking at the plans on the town’s TRC website, the proposed land use is a highly variable use in terms of trip intensity. 	

