


SDP-24-05 – 414 S Main – V3 Submittal review cycle

START DATE: NOVEMBER 2024	DUE DATE: <u>12-09-24</u>	TRC/STAFF Comments issued on: <u>12/09/2024</u>
----------------------------------	---------------------------	-------------------------------------------------

Review Group / Staff	Comments	Cleared Comments
Planning & Zoning – Planning Staff & WithersRavenel	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Continue to Provide a Written Response to ALL comments.</i> 2. <i>Continue to Add revision dates to all submittal materials.</i> 3. <i>Continue to 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.</i> 4. <u>FYI Demolition Permit was issued on 10/31/2024.</u> 5. <u>FYI – Building Height</u> – TA-24-02, to revise Building Heights in all LDO Non-residential Zoning Districts, is now anticipated to be presented to the Town Board of Commissioners at the January 7, 2025 Business meeting; IF adopted by the Board, all references to Permitted Building Height will need to be revised to mesh with the LDO as amended by TA-24-02. 6. <u>FYI - Alternative Parking Plan (APP) request</u> – this request is anticipated to be presented to the Town Board of Commissioners at the January 7, 2025 Business meeting; The remainder of the review of this SDP hinges on the parking decision by Town Board. 7. <u>REPEAT Comment from Elevations mark-ups</u> – No response was provided for the following comment and does not appear to have been addressed in the updated elevations: <i>Per LDO Section 6.8.D.3.c, the maximum continuous blank wall area for any building shall be a maximum of 50-sf without a break by windows, doors, architectural features greater than one foot in depth or substantial material change. Please alter this portion of what appears to be more than 50-sf of blank wall to comply with these requirements.</i> The architect should provide a written response as to why this comment appears to have been ignored. 8. <u>REPEAT Comment from Elevations mark-ups</u> – No response was provided for the following comment and does not appear to have been addressed in the updated elevations: <i>Please provide a legend with building materials. Note, building materials shall comply with LDO Section 6.8.2.D.4.a. Building colors shall comply with LDO Section 6.8.2.D.5. Without a legend illustrating building materials or colors, compliance with non-residential building standards in accordance with the LDO cannot be determined. Please provide with updated elevations.</i> Refer to the markups provided as part of the V2 review. 9. <u>Partial Repeat - Sheet C-10, Landscape Plan</u> – A note should be added to sheets C-6, 8, 9, 10, & 11 stating that all Tree Protection Fencing shall comply with the requirements of LDO 6.2.4.5 which requires all TPF to remain in place until a CO is issued and that no more than 25% of the CRZ may be disturbed. 	
Engineering - Jacque Thompson	See two PDF’s – <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Written Memo comments dated December 4, 2024. 2.) Mark-ups on the SDP plan Sheet C-6 only. 	

SDP-24-05 – 414 S Main – V3 Submittal review cycle

COR PUD - Tim Beasley	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I understand that the plan maybe the use the ex. WMs if needed but these will require Raleigh approved BFPs (RPZ) in heated enclosures within 50' of piping from the water meters. Please go ahead and show the BFPs (size, make and model # "or Raleigh approved equal) and call out the sizes of the ex. WMs. 2. Please show a valve at the property line for the proposed fire line. <p>Please email me for the Raleigh development fees. These fees should be paid to Raleigh prior to signatures.</p>	
Wake Co Watershed Mgmnt - Janet Boyer	See attached PDF – Wake County DISAPPROVAL Letter dated 2024-11-25 for SEC-126025-2024/SWF-125026-2024 for this property.	TBD
NCDOT – Jacob Nicholson	<p>No new comments were received; Applicant should contact DOT representative to determine their status. For reference, the V2 Comments are kept below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - V2 #1 - REPEAT -- 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. - V2 #2 - Full review of the plans will occur as a part of the NCDOT Driveway Permit review process. 	TBD
Parks & Recreation - Eddie Henderson	No further comments.	
Wake Co. Fire / EMS - Brittany Hocutt Lingle	No further comments on the current layout. If the layout changes, Fire needs to review again.	