

09/03/2024

To: Town of Rolesville Planning Department  
502 Southtown Circle  
Rolesville, NC 27571

**SUBJECT: Hills at Harris Creek 1<sup>st</sup> Submittal PSP-24-03 TRC Summary Comment Response**

In response to review comments provided on 07/06/2024, we are providing the following comment responses:

**Planning & Zoning – Planning Staff and WithersRavenal**

1. Provide a Written Response to ALL comments.  
**SREG Response: Written responses to all comments are provided within this submittal**
2. Add revision dates to all submittal materials.  
**SREG Response: Revision dates have been added to all elements of this submittal**
3. Add “PSP-24-03” to the Cover sheet and on every plan set sheet.  
**SREG Response: PSP-24-03 has been added to the revision block on Sheet C1.0**
4. Complete and submit the Property Owner Consent Form  
**SREG Response: The Property Owner Consent Form has been completed and is included in this submittal**
5. Staff provided this Applicant team the Draft versions of a New Application and Preliminary Subdivision Checklist – these were not completed and part of the Submittal package – Why/please explain.  
**SREG Response: A New Application and Preliminary Subdivision Checklist was still in-progress at the time of the last submittal. They are now complete and included in this submittal. Please see the checklist on Sheet C1.1. We would like to review all of the files and forms that are in possession of the Town and if there are any outstanding documents still needed since this is a soft opening of the form and checklist. This form was not used in the Rezoning process, which was approved in May 2024. Thank you.**
6. OVERALL COMMENT – Strongrock Engineers has worked through 3+ Review Cycles of a PSP plan for the ‘Reserve at Mitchell Mill’ project – this Plan set should therefore already be representing all the “lessons learned” from that extensive Review. Applicant should go back to that PSP and carry over all those items TRC asked for there, as these are very similar projects. Doing so will hopefully reduce comments and shorten the overall review.  
**SREG Response: This is noted, we will work to include all applicable comments and lessons learned from the Reserve at Mitchell Mill project. Thank you.**
7. Rezoning Conditions - Add/Include the REZ-24-02 conditioned/approved Concept Sketch Plan to go along w the Conditions of Approval that are included on/as Sheet C-1.1. Both (Concept Plan and

Conditions) are Conditions of the Rezoning approval and the basis for review of this PSP and all future development applications.

**SREG Response: The REZ-24-02 Concept Sketch Plan has been added to the plans, see Sheet C1.2**

8. Phasing Plan – this PSP plan set does not include any Phasing Plan/information, thus Staff assumes this project will be built in One (1) Phase. Confirm the intent is for this to be one phase, all ~115 acres at once.

**SREG Response: This project is intended to be completed in one phase.**

9. Cover Sheet – Add/create a Table to CLEARLY couch the Propose new public right-of-ways, by named street, with details of the ROW width / pavement edge-to-edge / Linear feet. This is critical for Powell Bill purposes. Once provided it will be repeated on CID and eventually FSP's per phase.

**SREG Response: A street data table has been added to the plans, see Sheet C1.0**

10. Street Names & Addresses – 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).

**SREG Response: We have submitted 2 rounds of Road Name Applications with Wake County. Approval is expected soon and the plans will be updated accordingly. We have also submitted to Wake County for addresses, and they will appear on the plans as soon as they are finalized.**

11. Mitchell Mill Right-of-way [ROW] dedication area – Sheet C-5.1 is oddly representing a “25’ Dedication” with a double-arrowed line outside the Legend’d line of ‘Existing Property Line’. While this is correct, at Prelim this is PROPOSED ROW dedication, and until Recorded, the Property line is where it is – Revise to “gray’ out or some other way graphically delineate the Proposed ROW dedication. Then, the first 25’ depth of the property measured from the Proposed ROW line is the Thoroughfare Bufferyard.

**SREG Response: The ROW dedication and existing ROW have been updated, see Sheets C5.1 and C5.2**

12. Sheet C-5.0/C-5.1 – See other comments that relate to this; the “Bike Lane” called out is shown to be immediately at the back of the “25’ Dedication” AKA the new edge of the Mitchell Mill ROW; no pedestrian path should be immediately adjacent an edge of ROW; if this is converted to a Sidepath see the Standards Engineering Manual - <https://www.rolesvillenc.gov/sites/default/files/uploads/tor-standard-engineering-manual-2023.pdf> - Section 2.b.iii. for Sidepaths; Sidepaths shall be located at a MINIMUM of 5’ from back of curb. Note, the Town Board does not/cannot approve deviations from the Greenway or Bicycle Plans, so this project does not have an entitlement to delete the Bicycle Lane within the ROW and replace it in-kind on private property (ie the Street Bufferyard area).

**SREG Response: The bike lane has been updated to be a 10’ sidepath as advised, see Sheets C5.1 and C5.2**

13. Sheets 43-50 (C-8.0 – C-8.6, C-9.0 or C-2.2 – All of this specific Detail about numbers of trees and so forth, this is all pre-mature for a PSP – that is CID specificity. PSP should be providing the “Preservation Plan” as that plays into Open Space calculations, but new plantings to be installed are construction

related. Rework or Remove the construction details, but the “Spaces” of Buffers and Open spaces etc. must be figured here at PSP stage.

**SREG Response: The CD level of detail has been removed from this PSP set, see Sheets C8.0-C8.6 and C9.0**

14. The 50th Sheet – On Cover Sheet/Sheet Index, this is termed C-9.0, but the actual sheet is named “

**SREG Response: The sheet name and sheet number have been updated to show the correct information**

15. See PDF of Written Memo comments produced by WithersRavenel – there are 10 numbered comments.

**SREG Response: Responses to these comments from WithersRavenel are included as a separate file within this PSP submittal. Thank you**

16. See PDF of mark-up comments produced by WithersRavenel.

**SREG Response: Responses to these comments from WithersRavenel are included as a separate file within this PSP submittal. Thank you**

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

1. Toward the tail-end of the TRC/Town Board review of REZ-24-02, a 50’ Public Greenway Easement was agreed to be shown following the entire creek at the north side of the property; see Condition #10 of the approved Rezoning (Sheet C-1.1). Revise to show this (Proposed) public greenway easement.

**SREG Response: The 50’ greenway easement is now shown, see Sheet C5.0**

2. Revise All shown Greenway Easements to read “Proposed Public Greenway Easement”. Once project reaches Final Subdivision Plat, “Proposed” will be removed as recordation = officially created.

**SREG Response: All greenway easement labels have been updated, see Sheets C5.0 – C5.6**

3. Confirm the physical Space for the Bicycle Lane is present within the Mitchell Mill Road right-of-way. See below excerpts from the Town's Bike Plan, mimic these cross section and diagram examples.

**SREG Response: The bike lane has been updated to be a 10’ sidepath as advised, see Sheets C5.1 and C5.2**

4. Sheet C-5.0/C-5.1 - Staff observes a “Bike Lane” (no dimension) running parallel to Mitchell Mill Road within the [Mitchell Mill] Streetyard Buffer area. The REZ-24-02 Concept Plan showed commitment to a BLUE LINE called out as “10 ft Bike Lane”. Bicycle Lanes are to be in public right-of-ways per the 2022 Bicycle Plan. IF Applicant continues to show a Pedestrian pathway within the 25’ Street Bufferyard area, rename it as a “Sidepath”. Please note that the 2022 Greenway Plan does NOT call for a Sidepath on the North Side of Mitchell Mill (this would have been identified during Rezoning review) and thus a Sidepath on private property is Voluntary.

**SREG Response: The bike lane has been updated to be a 10’ sidepath as advised, see Sheets C5.1 and C5.2**

### **Engineering – Brian Laux / Jacque Thompson**

1. See PDF of Written Memo comments produced by Bolton&Menk – there are 34 numbered comments (plus some for future CID plans).

**SREG Response: Responses to these comments from Bolton&Menk are included as a separate file within this PSP submittal. Thank you**

2. See PDF of mark-up comments produced by Bolton&Menk – there are 110 entries/comments.

**SREG Response: Responses to these comments from Bolton&Menk are included as a separate file within this PSP submittal. Thank you**

#### **Wake County Watershed Management – Janet Boyer**

1. 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.

**SREG Response: This is noted, thank you.**

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

1. See PDF of mark-up comments on 8 Sheets of the Prelim Plat. Being C-6.0 through C-6.7

**SREG Response: Responses to these comments from CORPUD are included as a separate file within this PSP submittal. Thank you**

#### **Wake County Fire / EMS – Brittany Hocutt**

1. ROADWAYS SHALL BE MINIMUM 20 FT WIDE REGARDLESS OF PUBLIC OR PRIVATE THAT ARE THE PRIMARY ROADWAY SERVING HOUSING UNIT.

**SREG Response: All roadways and cross sections are now appropriately labelled and provide a minimum of 20' width**

2. ROADWAYS SHALL BE MINIMUM WEIGHT RATING OF 80K POUNDS FOR FIRETRUCKS- PROVIDE ROADWAY CROSS SECTION.

**SREG Response: Roadway cross sections are now provided on Sheet C5.8. The weight rating design will be addressed in future CD submittals.**

3. CUL-DE-SACS SHALL BE 96 FT- PROVIDE MEASUREMENTS ON PLAN.

**SREG Response: All cul-de-sacs have been updated to 96' and are labelled as R46'**

4. ENTRANCE CURBING SHALL BE MOUNTABLE FOR FIRETRUCK TURNING- ENTRANCE LANE MEASURING APPROX 10 FT.

**SREG Response: All cubing on site has been updated to Rolesville Standard Valley Curb, see Site Plan Sheets**

5. TURNS SHALL BE 28' R MINIMUM- PLEASE PROVIDE TRUCK DRIVING/TURNING DIAGRAM (TRUCK LENGTH 50 FT).

**SREG Response: A firetruck turning exhibit is now provided as Sheets C9.0-C9.3**

**NCDOT – Jacob Nicholson**

1. 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.

**SREG Response: This is noted, thank you.**