



621 Hillsborough Street
Suite 500
Raleigh, NC 27603
919.361.5000

February 3, 2025

Town of Rolesville
Planning Department
502 Southtown Circle
Rolesville, North Carolina 27571

RE: Pearce Farm – Phases 1-3
Case Number: CID 24-08
Response to 1st CD Review Comments
AGN23001

The following are the response comments for the above-mentioned project. Our response comments are in **bold**.

Summary

Planning & Zoning

1. Provide a Written Response to ALL comments.
McAdams Response: This letter serves as the written response to all comments received.
2. Add revision dates to all submittal materials.
McAdams Response: Revision dates have been added to revised drawings and calculation reports.
3. “Cloud” or “Bubble” all revisions made – these will be removed upon signature set.
McAdams Response: We have added clouds where changes were made to the plans.
4. *FYI – a letter of explanation expressing that this is the first of at least 2 CID plan sets for the overall project, that this is only for Phases 1/2/3, etc. would have assisted TRC members in seeing the Applicants methodology in designing the infrastructure. Lack thereof may result in more discussion than otherwise necessary.*
McAdams Response: Comment noted.
5. *FYI – The Applicant (McAdams) was provided (Email, 10/01/2024) the Town’s “new” Checklist specifically for CID plans, but the Applicant chose to NOT submit.*
McAdams Response: McAdams used the checklist as a guide to try and capture all of the required elements. However, listing sheet numbers is not practical as most elements are represented on multiple sheets.
6. PSP-23-04 was approved for the entire project which comprises 5 Phases. This CID plan set only covers Phases 1, 2, and 3 therefore, all the information, all the calculations, from the number of acres involved down to the Open space, must be presented JUST/ONLY for Phases 1, 2, and 3. The Cover Sheet appears to be reflecting the “whole” subdivision, and is not subset or broken down by/for just Phases 1,2,3. The breadth of mark-up revisions is beyond

what Town Staff should have to do based on the Applicants' choice to break this project into parts (assuming Phases 4 and 5 will come together in a forthcoming CID package). Review all the information on the Cover Sheet and re-work it to reflect what is in Phases 1, 2, and 3, and by that action, you will be preparing 4 and 5 for the next CID plan set. Staff can discuss this at the TRC meeting, but if the point is not clear, a follow-up meeting can be arranged.

McAdams Response: Calculations and tables have been updated to only reflect those pertaining to phases 1-3.

7. On all Adjacent properties to the subdivision, add jurisdiction, zoning district, existing land use.
McAdams Response: This additional information has been added to all adjacent property labels on all sheets.
8. Revise zoning district boundaries and building setback table in accordance with MA-21-10.
McAdams Response: Lot development standards table reflects both what is required by the LDO and what is proposed based on the approved zoning case MA-21-10. As per previous request from Michael, we have also provided a clarifying note that the rezoning was submitted December 2021 and the area zoned for RM-CZ is subject to the LDO standards prior to the April 4th, 2023, LDO text amendment.
9. Alleys on plan should be labeled with the sqft as well as a lot number (are they simply part of Open Space lots, or are they deemed Private Right-of-way, a whole other/different class of land from development lots, open space lots, and public right-of-way to be dedicated.).
McAdams Response:
10. Site sheets – Revise/include a key for the numbered call-out that include signage & ADA ramps.
McAdams Response: The legend and other information have been added to the Site and Pavement Marking Plan sheets.
11. LIGHTING PLAN -- Required lighting plan prepared by Duke Energy per LDO 6.6.F. not provided. Please include with subsequent submittals as part of the overall package.
McAdams Response: Lighting plans have been included in overall package.
12. Street Names – Attain Street names from Wake County GIS/911.
McAdams Response: Street names have been approved by Wake County. See table on sheet C2.00.
13. Phase Ref's – Add phase reference(s) to sheet 3/100, C0.02; 19/100, C2.12; 47/100, C4.12
McAdams Response: Phase references have been added.

Comments Carried Over from PSP 23-04:

- A. ADDRESSES -- The applicant has indicated that comments from PSP-23-04 concerning E911 addressing assignments for lots and retaining walls would be reviewed and discussed during Construction Drawings. An addressing exhibit was not found as part of this submittal. Please advise on the status of conversations with Wake County.

McAdams Response: Wake County has approved the street names for the development. Please see the overall site plan on sheet C2.00 for a table showing approved names for each public street. We will also engage Wake County on lots and other address assignments.

- B. Sheet L5.15 – The applicant is asking for existing vegetation, when within a required Type 2 perimeter buffer, to not require replanting or fence installation. Note 1, under the perimeter buffer typical, should be revised to state “Upon installation of the required perimeter buffers, the project team will promptly coordinate with the Town of Rolesville LDA to inspect areas that have proposed to utilize existing vegetation to supplement the requirement of a fence that is associated with a Type 2 buffer. Upon inspection, the LDA reserves the right to require additional plantings and/or fencing in areas not meeting the intent of a Type 2 perimeter buffer.”

McAdams Response: Note 1 regarding existing vegetation credit has been revised.

Parks & Recreation

Eddie Henderson

14. Revise landscape plan to remove *Ulmus parvifolia*, which is considered by the State to be an invasive species – https://nc ipc.weebly.com/uploads/6/8/4/6/6846349/invasive_plant_list_ranked_-_2023-11-16.pdf
15. Review and CONFIRM in Writing that all Greenways are in compliance with the Town’s Standard Engineering Manual - <https://www.rolesvillenc.gov/sites/default/files/uploads/torstandard-engineering-manual-2023.pdf> .

McAdams Response: *Ulmus parvifolia* has been removed from planting plans.

McAdams Response: Proposed Greenways are in compliance with the Town’s Standard Engineering Manual.

Engineering

Jacque Thompson

16. See four (4) PDF’s
- 1) Memo dated 01-02-2025 with 42 Comments;
 - 2) Mark-ups on the CID plans Part 1, with 59 comments/entries;
 - 3.) Mark-ups on the CID plans Part 2, Sheets C.6000 and C0.001, with what appears to be 3 Comments/entries;
 - 4.) Mark-ups on the Storm Drainage package, with what appears to be 6 Comments/entries.

McAdams Response: Thank you. See comments and responses in the “Memo” section below.

CORPUD

Tim Beasley

17. See PDF of mark-up comments – there appear to be 35 comments/entries on Part 1 (21 sheets).

McAdams Response: See CORPUD markup responses below.

Wake Co Watershed Management

Alex Geddie

Kevin Zelaya

18. No Comments were received – Applicant should Contact Wake County directly, and/or submit to the County the necessary and appropriate SEC/ SWF permit applications for this project.
McAdams Response: We have submitted plans and calculations to Wake County and will address the comments when they are received.

NCDOT

Jacob Nicholson

19. Full review of the (CID) plans will occur as part of the NCDOT Driveway permit/Encroachment Agreement review process.
McAdams Response: Comment noted.

Wake County Fire / EMS

Brittany Hocutt

There are no comments.

Memo

Jacqueline Thompson

COVER SHEET

20. Either include Preservation Plan in next submittal or remove from Sheet Index.
McAdams Response: Preservation plan has been removed from submittal and sheet index.
21. Please submit a Lighting Plan per LDO Section 6.6.F.
McAdams Response: Lighting plans have been included in latest package.

SHEET C0.01

22. For the public greenway typical section, please revise the aggregate base course shoulders to 2 feet, per Town of Rolesville standards.
McAdams Response: We extended the aggregate base course for the entire 2' shoulder section.
23. For the public greenway typical section, please revise the maximum grades on either side from 2:1 MAX to 3:1 MAX, per Town of Rolesville standards.
McAdams Response: The maximum grade has been revised to 3:1.

SHEET C2.01

24. Please confirm that the easement crossing lot 29 does not impact the buildable area. If it does, please revise the easement location.
McAdams Response: The impact to the buildable area will not be a problem for the building products being considered for this area.

25. Please confirm who will be responsible for the retaining wall. If the wall is considered public property, an easement may be required for maintenance where it crosses into lots 39 through 42.

McAdams Response: We have added an access/maintenance easement to the retaining wall where it encroaches private lots. The retaining walls will be maintained by the HOA.

26. Please clarify the reason the easement along lots 49 through 55 shifted south. Does this impact buildable area for these lots?

McAdams Response: The easement was shifted to lessen the height of the retaining wall above it. The impact to the buildable area will not be a problem for the building products being considered for this area.

27. The legends and notes shown within the final PSP submittals have been deleted from the site and pavement marking sheets in the CID set. Please add these back to the appropriate sheets in the next submittal.

McAdams Response: The legend and other information have been added to the Site and Pavement Marking Plan sheets.

SHEET C2.02

28. In the callout “PROPOSED PROPOSED 10’ LANDSCAPE BUFFER EASEMENT (TYP.)”, the word “proposed” is duplicated. Please remove the duplicate word in all callouts (multiple callouts on multiple sheets).

McAdams Response: The labels have been corrected.

29. This is a continuation of comment #7 above. Please clarify the reason the easement along lots 53 to 65 shifted south. Does this impact buildable area for these lots?

McAdams Response: The easement was shifted to lessen the height of the retaining wall above it. The impact to the buildable area will not be a problem for the building products being considered for this area.

SHEET C2.04

30. Please confirm the required permitting is being obtained for the retaining wall encroachment within the stream buffer area.

McAdams Response: The stream buffer impact due to the road crossing is included in the environmental impacts.

SHEET C2.05

31. Label greenway material (asphalt) on all greenway callouts, all sheets.

McAdams Response: We have added “ASPHALT” to all public greenway labels. We also added “SOFT SURFACE” to all private greenway labels.

32. The greenway crosses the stream just downstream of the pond. The dam is being breached but the grading shown on the grading plans looks like the greenway will be built on fill material. Please confirm intent. Will this create a new dam for the pond? A boardwalk may be required. Refer to the Town of Rolesville Standards Manual for design requirements.

McAdams Response: We have added a boardwalk to this location and removed the grading.

SHEET C2.06

33. The greenway has shifted further into the pond “zones” since the approved PSP set. Please confirm the appropriate permitting is being obtained.

McAdams Response: The greenway has not shifted, but the buffer was adjusted since the PSP was approved. Since the pond dam is being breached, the buffer will shift away from the proposed greenway at that time.

SHEET C2.09

34. Utility easement linework is shown on either side of Street “K”. Please label these on plan sheets.

McAdams Response: Utility easements have been labeled on the revised plans.

SHEET C3.01

35. The Town of Rolesville minimum storm drainage pipe size is 15” diameter. Please revise any pipes under 15” accordingly.

McAdams Response: Pipes under 15” diameter have been revised.

36. Please add more proposed grading labels throughout the grading sheets. It is hard to follow the grading without many labels in some areas.

McAdams Response: We have added additional finished grade contour elevation labels as well as existing grade labels.

SHEET C3.04

37. and 19. The Town of Rolesville minimum storm drainage pipe size is 15” diameter. Please revise any pipes under 15” accordingly.

McAdams Response: Pipes under 15” diameter have been revised.

38. Review all grading plans for steep cut and fill areas near roadways or walkways as well as retaining walls. Guardrails or handrails may be required.

McAdams Response: See note #5 under the Retaining Wall Notes on sheet C0.01 which indicates “All retaining walls over 30” high shall have a safety fence (design by others)”.

39. Label the culvert shown under Street “A” with size, slope, etc.

McAdams Response: The culvert has been labeled on the revised plans.

40. Add a callout reference to the SCM Details at each stormwater control measure.

McAdams Response: We have added sheet references for each SCM.

SHEET C3.05

41. Review the retaining wall grade differential along Alley "23". A guardrail may be necessary.

McAdams Response: We have added guardrail along Alley “23”.

42. Confirm the drainage plan/intent for the existing pond. Per the plans, the dam will be breached and the pond drained but it appears it will then be filled again for the construction of the greenway crossing. A boardwalk may be necessary.

McAdams Response: The dam will be breached, and the stream will be allowed to re-establish. We have removed fill for the greenway crossing and added a boardwalk.

SHEET C3.06

43. General comment that applies to all sheets – review plans and provide text masks where needed. Many labels are hard to read.

McAdams Response: We have cleaned up labels in general but have not added masking.

SHEET C3.08

44. Review the retaining wall near the private greenway path. A handrail may be necessary.

McAdams Response: Per note #5 of the “Retaining Wall Notes” on sheet C0.01, “All retaining walls over 30” high shall have a safety fence...”. Also, sideslope for trail is max. 3:1, so handrail shouldn’t be necessary.

45. Wetland disturbance is shown where the greenway crosses near SCM “G”. Confirm this disturbance will be permitted.

McAdams Response: The wetland impact is included in the permit applications.

SHEET C3.09

46. Label the rip rap at the culvert outlet crossing Street “A”.

McAdams Response: The riprap dissipator has been labeled on the revised plan.

SHEET C5.00

47. Clearly define the mill and overlay limits at the intersection of Street “A” and Forestville Road.

McAdams Response: We have added a bold dashed line where the off-site road improvements meet on-site improvements.

48. Label and dimension right-of-ways and easements on all plan and profile sheets.

McAdams Response: We have added dimension labels to the plan and profile sheets.

49. Review all profile sheets and confirm that all pipe crossings are being shown. There were several that were in the plan view that were missing in profile view.

McAdams Response: We have added pipe crossings that were previously missing.

SHEET C5.03

50. Clearly define mill and overlay limits at the intersection of Street “A” and Burlington Mills Road.

McAdams Response: We have added a bold dashed line where the off-site road improvements meet on-site improvements.

SHEET C5.14

51. Clearly define mill and overlay limits at the intersection of Street “O” and Burlington Mills Road.

McAdams Response: We have added a bold dashed line where the off-site road improvements meet on-site improvements.

SHEET C5.25

52. Fix pipe style for pipe crossing under Alley "14". And show sewer crossing in the profile as well.

McAdams Response: The pipe crossing has been revised.

53. Show the waterline crossing under Alley "15".

McAdams Response: We have added pipe crossings that were previously missing.

SHEET C5.38

54. Confirm the minimum cover is being met for the 8" DIP SS pipe between SSMH-101 and SSMH-102.

McAdams Response: This area has been revised, and 12" cover for DIP is being met.

SHEET C5.41

55. Confirm the minimum cover is being met for the 8" DIP SS pipe between SSMH-102 and SSMH1103.

McAdams Response: We are working with Tim Beasley with Raleigh Water to meet Raleigh requirements for Sanitary Sewer Outfall "A".

SHEET C5.42

56. Confirm the minimum cover is being met for the 8" SDR 35 PVC SS pipe between SSMH-107 and SSMH-108.

McAdams Response: The SDR 35 at this location has been revised to DIP.

SHEET C5.46

57. Clearly define mill and overlay limits at the intersection of Street "O" and Burlington Mills Road and at the intersection of Street "A" and Burlington Mills Road.

McAdams Response: We have added a bold dashed line where the off-site road improvements meet on-site improvements.

SHEET C6.001

58. Revise the sheet number. It is incorrectly shown as "C0.001".

McAdams Response: The sheet number has been corrected.

SHEET C6.102

59. Show and label silt fence outlets along the temporary silt fence at all low points throughout erosion control sheets.

McAdams Response: The area pointed to in the markups doesn't include silt fence and is located at a high point. We have noted on the plans that silt fence outlets are required at all low points.

SHEET L5.01

60. Confirm that tree placement shown does not conflict with any driveways – this comment applies to all landscape sheets.

McAdams Response: Street trees have been adjusted to avoid conflicts with proposed driveway locations.

Storm Drainage Report

Per the Town of Rolesville, storm drain piping should be a minimum of 15" diameter pipe. Storm drain piping smaller than 15" diameter has been flagged in the Storm Sewer Tabulation tables. Please review and adjust pipe sizes. The flagged pipes are as follows:

- I System 100
 - Pipe 37 → 12"
 - Pipe 54 → 12"
 - Pipe 55 → 12"
- I System 200
 - Pipe 69 → 12"
 - Pipe 70 → 12"
 - Pipe 77 → 8"

McAdams Response: The noted pipes have been revised in the updated Storm Drainage report and plans.

CORPUD

COVER SHEET

1. Please email me for updated Public Improvements Quantities Table (please include on the cover), Attn: Contractors Block (cover), standard utility notes and Water/Sewer permit blocks. The water/sewer permit blocks should be included on the cover, utility and plan/profile sheets.

McAdams Response: The above listed notes, table and permit blocks were received and incorporated with the revised plans.

2. Does the sewer study only include flow from phases 1-3 for Pearce Farm or does it include the entire development? If it's only including phases 1-3, design for replacement should be included with these CDs. If not, please update the sewer study to include a sheet for just phases 1-3 flows from Pearce Farm to determine when the downstream pipe needs to be replaced.

McAdams Response: The original study submitted on 12/10/2024 was for the entire development. The updated study that addressed your comments and I sent on 01/08/2025 included a breakout for just the 275 lots in CD Package 1. As the results for that iteration demonstrate, no pipes require improvement to accommodate CD Package 1.

3. Once design is complete, please email me for the assigned water/sewer permit #s and Raleigh development fees associated with this project.

McAdams Response: Comment Noted.

C5.00 PLAN AND PROFILE

4. At this depth, 5' dia MH.

McAdams Response: All plan and profile utility markups have been addressed on the revised plans.

C5.04 PLAN AND PROFILE

5. This MH should have an inside drop assembly, 5' dia with an extended base.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

6. This MH should have an inside drop assembly, 5' dia with an extended base.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

7. Please provide 2/10 drop between inverts.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

C5.05 PLAN AND PROFILE

8. At this depth, 5' dia MH.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

C5.06 PLAN AND PROFILE

9. At this depth, 5' dia MH.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

10. At this depth, 5' dia MH.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

C5.07 PLAN AND PROFILE

11. At this depth, 5' dia MH.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

C5.08 PLAN AND PROFILE

12. Please make text legible. If depth exceeds 12', 5' dia MH.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

C5.09 PLAN AND PROFILE

13. At this depth, 5' dia MH.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

C5.10 PLAN AND PROFILE

14. At this depth, 5' dia MH.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

15. This MH should have an inside drop assembly, 5' dia with an extended base.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

C5.11 PLAN AND PROFILE

16. Conflict?

McAdams Response: The 30" RCP has been deleted from the profile since it's on a different alignment. See sheet C5.06 for the W/L crossing the 30" RCP.

C5.12 PLAN AND PROFILE

17. This MH should have an inside drop assembly, 5' dia with an extended base.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

18. This MH should have an inside drop assembly, 5' dia with an extended base.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

C5.13 PLAN AND PROFILE

19. This MH should have an inside drop assembly, 5' dia with an extended base.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

20. At this depth, 5' dia MH.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

21. At this depth, 5' dia MH.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

C5.16 PLAN AND PROFILE

22. This MH should have an inside drop assembly, 5' dia with an extended base.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

23. At this depth, 5' dia MH.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

C5.17 PLAN AND PROFILE

24. At this depth, 5' dia MH.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

C5.19 PLAN AND PROFILE

25. This MH should have an inside drop assembly, 5' dia with an extended base.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

C5.38 PLAN AND PROFILE

26. Drop invert?

McAdams Response: The SS Manhole data has been corrected on the revised plan.

C5.40 PLAN AND PROFILE

27. Aerial crossing design min criteria:

1. Carrier pipe: use restrain joint DIP @ 1.0% min grade
2. Steel casing: use 8" larger diameter & 0.375" wall thickness. Drain, vent & extend 4.0 into creek bank
3. Cross 3.0 min above creek bottom &/or 1.0 min above Q25 elevation
4. MH rims must be raised 3.0 above Q100 or 12" above grade, seal-tight & vent stack to 3.0 above Q100
5. Specify max span per CORPUD detail

McAdams Response: See notes added on sheet C5.40 for SS Outfall Stream Crossing. Also, piers, casing pipe and flood elevations have been added to profile.

C5.41 PLAN AND PROFILE

28. At this depth, 5' dia MH.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

29. Should be SDR 26 PVC.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

30. Can be SDR 35 PVC.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

C5.42 PLAN AND PROFILE

31. SDR 26

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

C5.43 PLAN AND PROFILE

32. At this depth, 5' dia MH.

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

33. Try to lower this drop to max 30".

McAdams Response: Same as CORPUD response #4 above.

34. Can you achieve both 2/10 drop and min slope? FYI, after installation, if this doesn't meet state min design criteria, Raleigh may not accept this.

McAdams Response: We have revised the profiles to clean up the invert elevations and allow a min. 0.20' drop in the manholes. The vertical alignment is very tight and we need to keep pipe slopes down to 0.50% for much of the alignment. Assuming the State minimum referred to is 0.40%.

C5.46 PLAN AND PROFILE

35. Please make sure there is a main line valve every 1000' along this 12" waterline extension. Where valves are needed to meet this requirement, please place them within 50' of a FH.

McAdams Response: We have revised the plans to provide a valve at least every 1000 LF along the alignment and within 50 LF of a Fire Hydrant Assembly.

Consideration of this response is greatly appreciated. If you should have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at 919. 361. 5000.

Sincerely,

McAdams



Mike Sanchez, PE | Group Manager, Residential
sanchez@mcadamsco.com | 919. 361. 5000

MS/tp