

**PSP-24-02 / Broadmoor (fka Woodlief)**  
**Major Preliminary Subdivision Plat**  
**1<sup>st</sup> Submittal**  
**Planning/Zoning Comments**

**Project Background:**

The following is the review of the Major Preliminary Subdivision Plat, dated May 1, 2024, for “Broadmoor”. The site is addressed as 1321 Rolesville Road per the Cover Sheet, and is split-zoned Residential Medium (RM-CZ) and Residential High (RH-CZ) through rezoning case, REZ-23-02, approved by the Town Board of Commissioners on March 5, 2024. The property was annexed into the Town limits per annexation petition ANX-23-01 also approved by the Town Board of Commissioners on March 5, 2024.

The Applicant proposes to subdivide 105.9 acres into 157 single-family detached Lots utilizing the LDO Section 3.1.B. “Cluster Development” option within the RM-CZ zoned portion of the property, and 98 single-family attached lot in the RH-CZ zoned portion of the property.

This application has been reviewed under the Town of Rolesville Land Development Ordinance (LDO).

**Overall**

1. Include a sheet containing the approved Concept plan from REZ-23-02.
2. Change all Zoning District references throughout the plan set to be “CZ”.
3. REZ-23-02 has several conditions of approval that relate to timing of applicability (# of building permits, which is Issuance of permits, not Certificate of Occupancies) - #8 for amenity center, #9 for pollinator garden, #10 for community amenities #12 for Rolesville Road improvements off-site of the subdivision. Confirm that Phasing plan is created to facilitate meeting these obligations without issue.
4. Cluster - The Town’s LDO was last updated on April 4, 2023 to include new dimensional standards for the LDO Section 3.1.B. Cluster Development option, including lot size and setbacks, which can be utilized within an RL or RM Zoning District. The Rezoning application for this project was first submitted March 2, 2023, pre-dating the change to LDO Section 3.1.B, thus granting it vested rights to the LDO at the time of that Application submittal. Staff does not observe any clear expression that the subdivision is utilizing/exercising Section 3.1.B. for the RM District and Single-Family Detached lots, outside of some proposed lots being less than 100’ wide and 20,000 SF in total size. [Link to red-line Text Amendment - https://www.rolesvillenc.gov/sites/default/files/uploads/planning/ta\\_23-02\\_-\\_ldo\\_3.1.1.b\\_3.1.2.b\\_-cluster.pdf](https://www.rolesvillenc.gov/sites/default/files/uploads/planning/ta_23-02_-_ldo_3.1.1.b_3.1.2.b_-cluster.pdf)
5. Street Names and Lot Addresses – Please contact Wake County GIS/911 to begin process of selecting new Street names and have every lot being created provided an Address; not that come construction, features like Retaining Walls often require an address, defer to Town Engineer and/or Wake County Building Code reviewers on that.
6. Landscape Plan information – Sheets 42-51, L1.00 – L2.00 – can be removed and included with the CID plan set, as this level of specificity – construction and installation – is appropriate at that time of development. PSP should be showing major spaces like Street and Perimeter Bufferyards.
7. Greenways – All references to Greenways should be references to “Proposed Greenway Easement”, with the dimension; the LDO 6.2.1.J.2.a. requires 50’ but has opportunities to reduce that to 30’ upon Town agreement. Revise all sheets where there are call-outs to “Public Greenway #1” and the like. At the CID level, this is when the plans will include dimensioned actual greenway and all the specs and construction details relative to constructing the greenway within the Easement.

8. Please explain the reason or intent for Phase 1A being apparently only Rolesville & Fowler Road frontages; is this intended to be ROW dedication only, frontage improvements, etc.?
9. References like “Rolesville Road Improvements Design by Others” – who is Others? More appropriate would be ‘per future CID plans’ – this PSP should simply be showing planned right-of-way donation/dedication up FSP recordation in future. Revise across the plan set accordingly.
10. The property’s east side bounds property’s within Wake County’s jurisdiction zoned R-30. While all the land areas are clearly being shown as being undeveloped/preserved, there is no Perimeter Bufferyard shown against PIN 1768602816 and 1768518609 – please explain why/how.
11. Lighting Plan/Light Poles – Staff counts 71 on Sheet SL1.00; at FSP, Applicant must pay \$650 per pole (that is \$46,150 total). Staff will review locations in full detail at CID review to see if fewer and more efficient layouts can be accomplished, lowering developer investment, and Town perpetual power payments. Has Applicant yet spoken with DUKE Energy (either them or Wake Electric services the area) yet about the plan for this subdivision. Staff suggests applicant coordinate with power company earlier in CID creation rather than completely after the fact as has been the norm in Rolesville to date by current Staff’s experience.
12. Townhome Parking – the single grouping of off-lot parking to accomplish the requirement of the SFA (Townhome) parking requirement is anything but central and facilitating to the majority of TH dwelling units. All townhomes are garage front-loaded, which is permitted, but creates a more un-pleasant living environment in townhome communities. Most TH Lots are 22’, which with a 10’ driveway leaves 12’ of curb in front of that lot; 12’ is too short to allow a vehicle to curb park. The combination of 22’ lot widths, front-loading driveway/garage, and small un-parkable curb areas creates streetscapes that invite quality of life issues relative to the streetscape.
  - a. Is Applicant creating a Deed restriction that prohibits on-street parking on one side of the townhome area streets?
13. Off-site roadway improvements – PSP should be clearly showing the necessary Right-of-way dedication amounts per the Rolesville CTP and the approved TIA. Remove details on the roadway improvements from this PSP, and include them in CID; both Rolesville Road and Fowler Road are NCDOT facilities, and thus the required frontage and TIA improvements to those roadways must have planned reviewed and approved by NCDOT separately. This topic will be paramount during the CID review, but not now.
14. The 50’ PSNC Gas Main Easement – IF a recording reference exists, add it throughout plan set when referencing this Easement.
15. OPEN SPACE – LDO 6.2.1.D.1:
  - a. The RM District base standard is 12% of gross land.
  - b. The RH District base standard is 15% of gross land.
  - c. The 3.1.B. Cluster Option standard for the RM District is 40% gross land.
  - d. Sheet C2.01 makes no mention of “Cluster”.
  - e. Staff suggests a meeting to discuss the matter of demonstrating Open Space compliance of minimum requirements vs. proposed amounts. Staff can reference recent LDO subject PSP plans as example/guidance.

#### **Cover Sheet**

16. Application number – complete all references to PSP-24-02.
17. Address - The address noted is 1321 Rolesville Rd; IMAPS has that address as just being for PIN 1768511519, which also includes property on the north side of Fowler Rd (NOT part of this project). Please provide correct addresses for the property involved in this plat; suggest PIN 1768511519 be split to detach the property in this project from the property on north side of Fowler.
18. Parcel Data – All 6 properties lack referencing the Zoning District as “CZ”; REZ-23-02 was for conditional zoning forms of RM and RH.
19. Site Data Table:

- a. 'Existing Zoning' - Change to be "CZ", and add 'per REZ-23-02' as no two CZ Districts are the same (all are unique).
- b. Add the REZ-23-02 Conditions of Approval – *alternately, see Overall comment, could add Conditions on a Sheet with the Concept Plan, and Cover sheet could reference that (See Sheet X for Conditions of Approval).*
- c. 'Existing Land use' – this says Single-family residential Detached and Single-family residential Attached – is this meant to be the 'Proposed land use' ? The land is by large if not actually, vacant and undeveloped – Revise to be accurate; Staff views land as "vacant" even if there should be a single house or building planned for demolition.
- d. Revise to "Proposed TOTAL number of DWELLING units"
- e. Revise to "Proposed number of SINGLE-FAMILY ATTACHED DWELLING UNIT (Townhomes) LOTS".
- f. Revise to "Proposed number of Single Family DETACHED DWELLING UNIT ~~Homes~~ LOTS".
- g. Regarding Proposed lot sizes:
  1. Must clearly differentiate between SFD and SFA lots, as SFD has its Standards in RM District LDO 3.1.2. and SFA has its Standards in RH District LDO 3.1.3.
  2. For the SFD in the RM District, it must be made expressly clear that this subdivision is using the LDO 3.1.B Cluster Development Option.
- h. With 2 Zoning Districts and 2 Different Proposed Uses, Staff suggests creating a table to provide the following for each Zoning use; *while some this information does not relate directly to the division of land, it makes it an easy lift to the CID plans, and the FSP's – get it right once, carry it forward:*
  - i. Maximum Building Height
  - ii. Minimum Building Setbacks (*this is where the SFD in RM would make clear utilizing 3.1.B. Cluster*)
  - iii. Minimum Lot Width (*this is where the SFD in RM would make clear utilizing 3.1.B. Cluster*)
  - iv. Minimum Lot Area (*this is where the SFD in RM would make clear utilizing 3.1.B. Cluster*)
  - v. Proposed Density within each Zoning District
  - vi. Parking Provided (Townhome Use only)

20. Infrastructure Data Table:

- a. The "Units" line – break this down to differentiate SFD and SFA lots, by Phase.
- b. Proposed Impervious Surface – these specific numbers indicate Applicant has done significant drainage study; add Impervious Coverage per Lot, per Use (SFD/SFA, Amenity Lot, others with planned Impervious), suggest a table to capture this.

**Sheet C1.05 & C1.06 & C1.07 -**

21. PIN 1768602816 is 'blank' in its Zoning description – add it (W.C. R-30).

**Sheet C3.09**

22. RH Zoning District LDO Section 3.1.3. for (Single-family) Attached states "Minimum 30' between Structures." This sheet in the lower left says "Minimum distance between Townhome Buildings [only permitted in the RH District] shall be 15 feet." Please explain how this project is permitted to violate this LDO requirement, or revise to State 30' separation shall be provided, and revise drawings to demonstrate that.

**Sheet C4.00**

23. References to Rolesville Crossing should not be "proposed"; that project has approved Preliminary Subdivision and Construction Drawing plans and thus is not proposed but rather approved per those Town numbered plans; revise to reference the approved Town Application plans.