

PSP-24-03 – Hills at Harris Creek – V2 Submittal review cycle

START DATE: <b>SEPTEMBER 2024</b>	DUE DATE: <u>10-07-24</u>	TRC/STAFF Comments issued on: <u>10/04/2024</u>
-----------------------------------	---------------------------	---

Review Group / Staff	Comments	Cleared Comments
Planning & Zoning – Planning Staff and WithersRavenel	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Continue to</i> Provide a Written Response to ALL comments.</li> <li>2. <i>Continue to</i> Add revision dates to all submittal materials.</li> <li>3. <b>REPEAT</b> - Complete and submit the Property Owner Consent Form [V2 did not include this, though Response said it was]</li> <li>4. <b>Partial REPEAT</b> - <u>Cover Sheet</u> – Update the now provided Table regarding New Public Right-of-ways being Proposed in this PSP; see next note on this topic too.</li> <li>5. <b>REPEAT</b> - <u>Street Names &amp; Addresses</u> – Engage Wake County GIS/911 on attaining Street Names and Addresses for EVERY LOT. This PSP will not be approved without these unless Wake County refuses to provide them at this time (desiring to wait until CID or Final Plats).</li> <li>6. <b>Partial REPEAT</b> – <u>Shts C5.1, C5.2</u> – With required 25’ ROW dedication on Mitchell Mill now clearly shown (striped area), these sheets are showing a shaded “bike lane” / “10’ side path” (see Parks comment on that) – First, PSP is for creating and showing new properties, right-of-ways, and easements primarily, not constructable features like an actual paved Sidepath; easement for it Yes, actual built feature, No; that detail is for Construction Drawings. Defer to Parks as to whether or not a Sidepath should be Back-of Right-of-Way of a Planned 4-lane divided road like Mitchell Mill; Applicant failed to respond to this part of V1 Comment #12. Suggest this topic get pushed to Construction Drawing review, and PSP simply show/call-out the Required Streetyard Buffer dimensioned area for now. This topic can be discussed with Planning, Parks, and Engineering as needed. Thank you.</li> <li>7. <b>NEW</b> – <u>V1 Plan set was 50 sheets; V2 Plan set is 57 Sheets</u> – what 7 new sheets were added? Per Planning Comments, the expectation was that the Plan set would be reduced by removing some sheets that are more CD level of detail. Was the inclusion of 7 new sheets in response to a particular TRC Review Comment? Was the inclusion of 7 new sheets otherwise broached in the Response documents, to inform TRC Staff that there are 7 new sheets that require essentially a V1 Review?</li> <li>8. <b>NEW</b> – <u>Cover Sheet</u> – Per response regarding Phasing, add a clarifying note: “This subdivision shall be developed and recorded in a single phase; there is No Phasing Plan.” This will clearly answer this question for the future, and future CID and FSP submittals should include that note, again for clarity of intent. Thank you.</li> <li>9. <b>NEW</b> – <u>Lot 164</u> – what is the viability of developing this lot given its dimensions? As shown, it appears as an SFD Development lot.</li> <li>10. <u>See PDF of WithersRavenel Written Memo</u> – V1 Comments # 5.b, 5.c., 5.e., 8, and 11 are still outstanding.</li> </ol>	
Parks & Recreation - Eddie Henderson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please revise to show the 50’ greenway easement following the entire length of Harris Creek from the plan north and south property lines. It currently looks like it stops mid-way where it connects to the sewer easement. It should continue across the sewer easement and go on the backside of the SCM#8</li> <li>2. Revise greenway to not cross in front of lot 169 and cross the street directly from where it runs in between lots 169 and 168. The Town is trying to minimize the number of homes this greenway crosses in front of.</li> </ol>	

PSP-24-03 – Hills at Harris Creek – V2 Submittal review cycle

	<p>3. Please check all sheets to ensure consistency of the sidepath/bike lane terminology. Sheet C-5.0 for example still has a label for the sidepath that reads 'bike lane'.</p> <p>4. Please confirm if bike lane is a consistent 5' wide for all of this projects road frontage. It looks like it tapers off and the 5' bike lane is only present in the plan south entrance.</p>	
Engineering - Brian Laux / Jacque Thompson	<p>1. See PDF of Written Memo comments produced by Bolton&amp;Menk – there are 17 numbered comments (plus some for future CID plans).</p> <p>2. See PDF of mark-up comments produced by Bolton&amp;Menk – there are 27 entries/comments.</p>	
Wake County Watershed Management - Janet Boyer	<p><u>V2</u>: No comments were received.</p> <p><u>V1</u>: No comments were received, which is not atypical for Preliminary Subdivision, as Wake County usually only comments on constructable plans (which will be the next step, Construction Infrastructure Drawings. Applicant is free to contact Wake Co. to gain insights.</p>	N/A
COR Public Utilities - Tim Beasley	See PDF of mark-up comments on 2 Sheets of the Prelim Plat -- C-1.0 and C-6.0.	
Wake County Fire / EMS - Brittany Hocutt	*STREET G WILL NEED TURNAROUND NEAR LOT 104/105. ELIMINATION OF TURNAROUND UNACCEPTABLE AT 750'.	
NCDOT – Jacob Nicholson	<i>There are no comments on the Preliminary Subdivision plat; complete review of the off-site improvements to DOT roads to occur at Construction drawing time.</i>	