



March 3rd, 2025

Town of Rolesville Planning  
c/o Michael Elabarger  
PO Box 250,  
Rolesville, NC 27571

Subject: **Kalas Falls Phase 5- CID-25-01  
CD Submittal #2– V1 Comment Response Letter**

Dear Mr. Elabarger,

Please find below the review comments received via method received dated 02/10/2025:

**Planning & Zoning – Planning Staff & WithersRavenel**

1. Comment: Provide a Written Response to ALL comments – responses should reference if/how/on what sheet was comment addressed.

***Response: A written response will be provided to all comments.***

2. Comment: Add revision dates to all submittal materials.

***Response: Revision dates have been added to all submittal materials.***

3. Comment: Cloud/bubble all changes.

***Response: All changes/revisions have been clouded.***

4. Comment: Add “CID-25-01” to the Cover sheet and on every plan set sheet.

***Response: “CID-25-01” has been added to the cover sheet and title block.***

5. Comment: It would be appreciated if the word “infrastructure” could be inserted between Construction and Drawings everywhere that “Construction Drawings” is stated, as that is terminology the Town of Rolesville utilizes, and is the type of application this submittal is. While the project is vested to the UDO, terminology was not well standardized in the UDO, whereas the LDO has express terminology in Appendix A of all the various types of Development Applications. Thank you.

***Response: The word “Infrastructure” has been inserted between Construction and Drawings in the plan set.***

6. Comment: Cover Sheet – removed the ‘fillable’ Town approval stamp – a customized complete stamp will be provided from/for the Town to be placed on the Cover sheet upon resolving all TRC Comments.

***Response: The Town approval stamp has been removed.***

7. Comment: Lighting Plan (Missing) – include a sight lighting plan including all requirements of 14.8.2.

***Response: Correspondence is underway with Duke to establish a work order number and begin developing a site lighting plan that will be included with the next submittal.***

8. Comment: Parking Screening – Please screen parking areas (VUA) in accordance with 14.7.5.

***Response: A 3’ evergreen hedge was added to parking areas to screen from off-site.***

9. Comment: Open Space Detail – Please provide detail of the proposed Amenity Site including hardscape, pedestrian access, lighting landscaping etc. as it is to be constructed at the same time as the greenway in this phase of development.

***Response: As discussed in 2/13 TRC meeting, a volleyball court (delineated) and its connectivity will be added to the plan set (CS401). Grading will be revised in this area to include these items (CG400).***

10. Comment: Parking Entrance Width – All parking lot entrances are less than the 24ft in width (See UDO 10.1.6) required for 2 way travel lanes, please address.

***Response: Parking lot entrances have been updated to be 24ft in width and been dimensioned in the CS400 sheet series.***

### **Engineering – Jacque Thompson**

#### **Cover:**

1. Comment: Please add “CID-25-01” and the original submittal date to the cover sheet (preferably in the middle of the sheet in a visible location).

***Response: The original submittal date for CID-25-01 has been added to the cover sheet.***

2. Comment: A lighting plan is required per LDO Section 6.6.F. Please add this to the next submittal set.

***Response: Correspondence is underway with Duke to establish a work order number and begin developing a site lighting plan that will be included with the next submittal.***

Sheet CS100:

3. Comment: There is a vertical line showing in the rear yard of the Typical Townhome Lot Layout detail. Please confirm what this line is for.

***Response: The line served no purpose and was removed from the Typical Townhome Lot layout.***

Sheet CS403:

4. Comment: Proposed temporary barricades should be labeled on the signing and striping plan as well since they are more permanent due to a future connection.

***Response: The temporary barricades have now been labeled on the signing and striping plan.***

5. Comment: Please confirm if the dashed lines shown on either side of the truncated connection road are easement lines. If so, please label them.

***Response: These are temporary construction easement lines for future connectivity and to allow for grade tie backs for any development on adjacent parcel. These lines have now been labeled accordingly on sheet CS403.***

6. Comment: Please provide the specific detail number (and sheet number) for the Proposed Temporary Barricade within the call out.

***Response: An NCDOT detail has been utilized for the temporary barricades, seen on sheet CS502, and a call out has been added citing the detail on sheet CS403.***

Sheet CS110:

7. Comment: Confirm what signage will be provided at the crosswalk on Armfield Creek Place given the close proximity to the intersection.

***Response: Signage has been added for this crosswalk on sheet CS110.***

8. Comment: Please include stop signs and speed limit signs on the Signage and Striping Plan.

***Response: Stop signs and speed limit signs have been added to CS110.***

9. Comment: Shouldn't sheet CS110 follow CS100 in the CID set? If so, please relocate it and change the sheet index on the cover sheet.

***Response: The sheet index has been reordered accordingly.***

Sheet CT200:

10. Comment: Note the minimum separation requirements between utility pipes in all appropriate locations. This comment applies to all profiles within the CID plan set.

***Response: Minimum separations have been added to all profile sheets.***

Sheet CT201:

11. Comment: Please confirm if there will be a temporary easement at the end of Graymont Oaks Drive to allow for the installation of the storm sewer tie-in.

***Response: A temporary construction easement will be required at the end of Graymont Oaks to make infrastructure connections. See sheet CS401 and/or CT201.***

Sheet CU100:

12. Comment: Please show the temporary easement at the end of Graymont Oaks Drive where it ties into the adjacent property. It is shown on the site plan but does not appear to extend far enough to include the proposed sanitary sewer pipe installation.

***Response: The temporary construction easement now extends far enough to include all infrastructure connections/tie-ins.***

Sheet CU401:

13. Comment: Confirm drainage structure 378A-CB is far enough away from the pedestrian ramp curb cut to allow for the curb transition. It currently appears this catch basin sits right in the transition area according to the Site Plan.

***Response: Structure of concern has been adjusted for constructability.***

14. Comment: Is there a pedestrian ramp/curb cut where the sidewalk ties into the parking lot for access from the parking lot? If so, confirm the curb transition for the catch basin can occur.

***Response: Yes. Structure of concern has been adjusted for constructability.***

Sheet CU402:

15. Comment: The Town would like to see catch basins outside of driveways when possible. Please adjust where possible.

***Response: The structure of concern has been moved outside the driveway.***

16. Comment: Confirm catch basin locations with the curb transitions to ensure constructability.

***Response: Structure of concern has been adjusted for constructability.***

Sheet CE100:

17. Fix the overlap of text and hatch within the Erosion Control Legend. This appears on multiple sheets. Please fix all instances.

***Response: The legend overlap has been resolved on all sheets.***

Sheet CE400:

18. Comment: Please label the silt fence outlet located at the end of the TSB #1 rip rap dissipator.

***Response: The silt fence outlet has been labeled.***

19. Comment: Please include the detail number (and sheet number) in the callout for all riprap dissipaters.

***Response: A note has been added at the bottom of all E&SC plans to cite the appropriate sheet for rip rap calculations.***

20. Comment: Please add the Construction Entrance to the Erosion Control Legend.

***Response: The construction entrance has been added to the legend for all E&SC sheets.***

21. Comment: Label size and slope of all temporary drainage piping or refer to the sheet where it is detailed.

***Response: A note has been added at the bottom of all E&SC plans to cite the appropriate sheet for E&SC pip schedules. See sheet CE500.***

22. Comment: Delete the leader line that is pointing to nothing (near the staging and laydown area).

***Response: The loose leader has been removed.***

23. Comment: We recommend indicating the sheet number/detail number for each measure. The labels can be in the callouts and/or on the legend to make it easy to reference those details. This is not a requirement.

***Response: All applicable details are now referenced in the legend.***

Sheet CE401:

24. Comment: Label size and slope of all temporary drainage piping or refer to sheet where it is detailed.

***Response: A note has been added at the bottom of all E&SC plans to cite the appropriate sheet for E&SC pipe schedules. See sheet CE500.***

Sheet CE413:

25. Comment: Show existing and proposed (Phase 5) storm drainage piping on this sheet (within the offsite areas).

***Response: All storm drainage pipes have been added to sheet CE413.***

26. Comment: Please add to this note a reference to CE500 Stage 2 Erosion Control construction sequence where this is described in more detail.

***Response: Note has been revised accordingly.***

Sheet CE130:

27. Comment: Update the NPDES documentation notes table and temporary seeding schedule for this project.

***Response: NPDES documentation notes and temporary seeding schedule have been updated.***

Sheet CE500:

28. Comment: It would seem that by plugging the downstream storm structure (to prevent stormwater from flowing to the Phase 3 SCM) and not plugging the upstream catch basins, the storm pipes could stay full and/or sediment will settle out within the piping over time which could require cleaning out once the system is ready to be brought on line. If the Kalas Falls Stage 3 basin is still set up as a Sed Basin, could it function as an erosion control measure for Phase 5?

***Response: We are in the process of discussing/progressing construction sequencing with Wake County, and it will be updated/current with next submittal.***

29. Comment: The Pipe Summary (ESC) table headings appear to be flip flopped. It looks like the structures under "Downstream Structure" are actually upstream and vice versa. The storm drainage table on sheet CD110 is the same. Please revise both tables accordingly.

***Response: Pipe tables have been edited to properly communicate storm drainage data.***

30. Comment: Confirm if the first blank cell in the Pipe Summary (ESC) table should be structure 30B.

***Response: Pipe tables have been revised to properly communicate storm drainage data.***

31. Comment: Confirm if the third cell in the Pipe Summary (ESC) table should be structure 376 (this appears to be the case based on plan sheet CE-400).

***Response: Pipe tables have been revised to properly communicate storm drainage data.***

32. Comment: Cross check this Structure Summary (ESC) table with the plans, there are several discrepancies with what is shown on the erosion control plans.

**Response: Structure tables have been revised to match plan sheets.**

33. Comment: Delete the redundant word in Stage 1 E&SC Construction Sequence note 6.

**Response: The redundant word has been deleted.**

Sheet CG400:

34. Comment: Please confirm if the temporary easement needs to be adjusted at the north end of the site adjacent to Graymont Oaks Drive to include the extent of the limits of disturbance.

**Response: The temporary construction easement has been revised to include grading in this area. Please see sheets CS401 and CG400.**

35. Comment: Please provide spot elevations on all parking lots to confirm positive drainage and ADA compliance. This comment applies to all proposed parking lots on the site.

**Response: Insets have been added to include spot elevations for ADA parking areas.**

Sheet CG402:

36. Comment: Please confirm that the proposed grading on either side of Graymont Oaks Drive at the culvert crossing does not exceed 3:1 slopes.

**Response: As discussed in 2/13 TRC meeting, safety railings are installed along areas that exceed 3:1 slope. Additional E&SC measures will be implemented in the higher slope areas which will be reflected in design following Wake County submittal.**

Sheet CD200:

37. Comment: In the 385-DI to 385A-CB Profile, is the inlet a FES or a DI? The profile says 385B-DI which is not labeled, so assuming this is a DI but profile does not look like a DI. Please label for clarification.

**Response: The inlet is a FES and labels and profiles have been updated to better communicate design intent. See sheet CD200.**

Stormwater Drainage Report:

We noticed several instances throughout the report where stormwater HGLs do not stay within the pipe. All HGLs must stay within the pipe for 10-year events. There are several locations this is not the case currently. Please review and revise accordingly.

**Response: All HGL's are now within the pipes for the 10-year event. See the revised SIA report.**

Comment: Appendix B: It looks like there may be more drainage area that will be draining to 32A-FES. We have delineated what appears to be the additional area that will drain to that FES. Please review the drainage area and revise if needed. If revised, check drainage pipe sizing with added flow.

***Response: The catchments and modeling have been revised for an increased drainage area to 32A-FES.***

### **COR Public Utilities – Tim Beasley**

#### CU100:

1. Comment: 1' is not enough space for the WMs, COs and FHs behind the sidewalk. Please show a 3' City of Raleigh Utility Easement strip easement along each lot frontage.

***Response: A 3' City of Raleigh utility strip easement has been added to the plan set along any lot frontage.***

2. Comment: Once design is complete, please email me for the water and sewer permit numbers and the development fees associated with this project.

***Response: Noted. Thank you.***

#### Sheet CU401:

3. Comment: FH must be behind the sidewalk.

***Response: All hydrants are now located behind the sidewalks.***

#### Sheet CU402:

4. Comment: FH must be behind the sidewalk

***Response: All hydrants are now located behind the sidewalks.***

5. Comment: Is this invert going to be sufficient for a gravity sewer connection to the adjacent upstream adjacent parcel/basin.

***Response: The invert has been adjusted to provide as much depth as possible for any future connections.***

#### Sheet CU403:

6. Comment: FH must be behind the sidewalk.

***Response: All hydrants are now located behind the sidewalks.***

### **Parks & Recreation – Eddie Henderson**

Comments will be provided at a later date.



**Wake Co Watershed Management – Kevin Zelaya**

Town staff – *no comments were provided. Applicant should contact Wake Co. directly and/or submit required SEC/SWF Permits.*

**NCDOT – Jacob Nicholson**

The submittal has no impacts to NCDOT R/W, so no NCDOT permitting or input is needed.

**Wake County Fire/EMS – Stephen Wolf/Brittany Lingle**

There are no comments on this project at this time.

Sincerely,

 03/03/2025

Roman Cook  
Project Engineer  
American Engineering Associates – Southeast, PA