

09/03/2024

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

SUBJECT: Hills at Harris Creek 1st Submittal PSP-24-03 Engineering Comment Response

In response to review comments provided on 04/02/2024, we are providing the following comment responses:

Sheet C-1.0:

1) Add the following items to the site data table for the next submittal:

- Current and proposed use
- Current impervious
- Watershed, River Basin
- Parking data per use
- Residential density and unit data per housing type
- Total limits of disturbance on site and off site with sewer extension

2) Update the project number and submittal date moving forward to the appropriate PSP-24-03 and the date of the first submittal or revision date.

SREG RESPONSE: The project number and date has been updated as requested, see Sheet C1.0

3) Please add parcel owner and applicant contact information with the engineer's contact information on the cover.

SREG RESPONSE: Parcel owner and applicant information has been added, see Sheet C1.0

Sheet C-3.0:

4) Fix the overlapping text. See the markups.

a) This applies to multiple locations and multiple sheets throughout the plan set; the markups highlight some areas that we noticed.

SREG RESPONSE: Overlapping text has been addressed on all applicable sheets.

5) The chart for the property lines is grayed back and it is making it difficult to read. Please adjust the plot style for legibility.

a) This comment also applies to Sheet C-4.0 and Sheet C-6.0.

SREG RESPONSE: The property line chart has been updated, see Sheets C3.0, C4.0, and C6.0.

- 6) Please clarify what WH-11 represents.
a) This comment also applies to Sheet C-4.0.

SREG RESPONSE: WH-11 is a label style for the wetlands that appears in multiple locations on this sheet. This label has been updated for clarity.

- 7) Add and label existing contours to the existing conditions plan.

SREG RESPONSE: Existing contours have been added and labeled, see Sheet C3.0
Sheet C-4.0:

- 8) Call out the removal of the existing driveway in the southwest corner of the site.

SREG RESPONSE: Existing driveway has been labeled as to be removed, see Sheet C4.0

Sheet C-5.0:

- 9) Typical Sections are required for all streets; please reference the Town's Standards Manual to help define the section and ensure everything fits within the proposed ROW.

SREG RESPONSE: Typical street sections are now included on Sheet C5.8

- 10) The design for the eyelet off Street F differs from the concept plan and is something the Town would like to avoid. These eyelets don't meet true roadway standards or cul-de-sac standards and provide additional asphalt and maintenance.

SREG RESPONSE: The design of this road has been revised, see Sheet C5.3

- 11) The centerline radius for collector roads is 310' minimum and local roads are 230' minimum. Revise to meet these criteria.

SREG RESPONSE: All proposed roads have been updated to meet the town minimums for centerline radii measurements, see Sheet C5.0

- 12) A portion of the curve table has been cut off. C16-C20 are missing. Revise the viewport or table so the entire table is visible.

SREG RESPONSE: The curve table has been adjusted, see Sheet C5.0

- 13) It is recommended to review the pedestrian crossing locations to avoid providing too many. Crossings on collector roadways should be signed and stripped per MUTCD requirements.

SREG RESPONSE: Pedestrian crosswalks have been revised to remove the abundance of crossings

Sheet C-5.1:

- 14) Lot 54 will need to be revised or the power pole on the lot will need to be relocated.

SREG RESPONSE: A note has been added to the plans for the power pole to be relocated, see Sheet C5.1

- 15) Confirm if there is an existing easement for the overhead power line.

SREG RESPONSE: Our research has shown no overhead powerline easements exist in this location

- 16) The minimum rear setback for single family residential is 25' per UDO section 6.2.1.2. This is typical for all lots.

SREG RESPONSE: Rear setback distances have been revised, see all site plan sheets

17) Please confirm how the park east of Street A will be accessed.

SREG RESPONSE: Rear setback distances have been revised, see all site plan sheets
Sheet C-5.2:

18) Will the high voltage overhead power line towers near Street B need a fence around them being so close to pedestrian areas? Are there existing fences? Verify what is existing and what will be required.

SREG RESPONSE: A note has been added to this sheet regarding safety measures for the towers, see sheet C5.2

19) Add the existing house driveway and curb cut to the demolition sheet and remove the drive from the site plan sheets.

SREG RESPONSE: Existing driveway has been removed from this sheet and added to the demo sheet, see sheets C5.2 & C4.0

20) Please clarify the meaning of the "5 Minute Walk to Clubhouse" label north of Street C.

a) This comment also applies to Sheet C-5.3, northeast of the site. Sheet C-5.3:

SREG RESPONSE: This label has been removed from all sheets.

21) The adjacent property number 33 has the wrong property owner information. Verify all the adjacent property owners are labeled correctly.

SREG RESPONSE: All adjacent property owner labels have been checked and updated

Sheet C-6.1:

22) The drainage crossing lots 40 and 50 will require a drainage easement. Revise the plans to include this easement.

SREG RESPONSE: All drainage easements have been added, see all grading sheets

23) Add the right of way dimensions to the labels for each street in the utility plans.

a) This comment applies to all sheets with road labels.

SREG RESPONSE: ROW dimension labels have been added to all of the utility sheets

Sheet C-6.3:

24) Confirm that the offsite sewer extension will be a part of this plan. If so, an easement will be required, and the extension will need to be included in the limits of disturbance.

SREG RESPONSE: The offsite sewer outfall now includes an easement, see Sheet C6.3

25) The proposed sanitary sewer from structure SSMH #35 to SSMH #34 is currently being shown outside of the proposed easement. Revise the sewer easement accordingly.

SREG RESPONSE: The sewer easement has been adjusted, see Sheet C6.3

Sheet C-6.5:

26) Confirm if the fence east of the site is existing or proposed. If existing label as existing or

provide details for the fence if it is proposed.

SREG RESPONSE: The existing fence is now labeled and shown correctly, see Sheet C6.5

Sheet C-6.6:

27) Confirm pipe angles, size, inverts and structure size to confirm the layout at the storm structure adjacent to SSMH#72 will work.

SREG RESPONSE: The storm pipe layout has been adjusted, see sheet C6.6

Sheet C-6.7:

28) A public sewer easement will be required for the proposed sewer outfall.

SREG RESPONSE: A sewer easement has been added in this location, see Sheet C6.7

Sheet C-7.1:

29) Confirm how the rear lot drainage along Mitchell Mill Road will get to the storm network inside Street B. Revise the storm network to collect this area.

SREG RESPONSE: The proposed grading is preliminary and under geotechnical review anticipating a large amount of rock to be present on this site. The rear lot drainage design will be provided after review of the geotech report and revisions to the site grading occur.

30) ADA compliance will need to be met for the site with sidewalks, greenways and pedestrian ramps. Please keep this in mind with the grading.

SREG RESPONSE: This is noted, ADA compliance will be met throughout the site

31) If the mass site grading is to occur, building pads need to be shown, typ.

SREG RESPONSE: The proposed grading is preliminary and under geotechnical review anticipating a large amount of rock to be present on this site. Building Pads will be provided after review of the geotech report and revisions to the site grading occur.

32) Please clarify/label what this linetype represents. Is this the outfall pipe for the SCM?

SREG RESPONSE: This line has been removed from the plans.

33) Use different line types for walls vs. match lines for clarity.

SREG RESPONSE: A sewer easement has been added in this location, see Sheet C6.7

Sheet C-7.2:

34) Confirm Street E will have positive drainage.

SREG RESPONSE: Street E has positive drainage down to CBs #36 and #37

Construction Drawings:

Please consider the following for CDs; These comments are shown as green in the markups and are not required for approval of the preliminary plat:

Sheet C-1.0:

Provide standard details. NCDOT details should be used for street and drainage. Wake County details should be used for erosion control and grading. City of Raleigh details should be used for sanitary and water.

SREG RESPONSE: This comment is noted for future CD Submittals.

Sheet C-5.0:

All curb ramps will need to reference NDOT standard details in the site plans.

SREG RESPONSE: This comment is noted for future CD Submittals.

Sheet C-5.3:

The dead-ends at the end of street F and Street H will require street signs; Consider the grading in this area and how to prevent off-site drainage.

a. This comment applies to all street dead-ends.

SREG RESPONSE: This comment is noted for future CD Submittals.

Greenway dead-ends need grading considered with how to manage drainage until a future connection.

SREG RESPONSE: This comment is noted for future CD Submittals.

Sheet C-6.1:

CB casting should not be within driveways; adjust accordingly.

SREG RESPONSE: This comment is noted for future CD Submittals.

Sheet C-7.0:

There is tremendous grade change across buildable areas for house lots. Please review and account for building pads as mass-grading is the intention.

SREG RESPONSE: This comment is noted for future CD Submittals.

Sheet C-7.1:

Half of Mitchell Mill Road will be draining on-site toward the back of these lots. This area will need to be taken into account in your calculation during CD's

SREG RESPONSE: This comment is noted for future CD Submittals.

The grading tie ins will need to be considered and depicted for curb cuts along Mitchell Mill Road.

SREG RESPONSE: This comment is noted for future CD Submittals.

Additional wall elevations will be needed at CD level.

SREG RESPONSE: This comment is noted for future CD Submittals.

A general note for the plans: The page titles that show up in Bluebeam do not match the sheet

page titles.

SREG RESPONSE: This is noted and has been updated, thank you.