



QUANTECH ENGINEERING
INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS | ENGINEERING THE FUTURE

PROJECT NAME: Harris Creek
SUBMITTAL TYPE: Preliminary
TOWN'S CASE NUMBER: PSP-24-05



THE CSC GROUP
CONTRIBUTE TO THE SUCCESS OF LOCAL COMMUNITY

COMMENT REVIEW AND RESPONSE DOCUMENT

COMMENT		1 ST SUBMITTAL RESPONSE
PLANNING & ZONING – Planning Staff & WithersRavenel		NOT APPROVED
1	Provide a Written Response to ALL comments.	Done
2	Add revision dates to all submittal materials.	See Title Block
3	Cloud or bubble all changes.	We have added revision clouds
4	Add "PSP-24-05" to the Cover sheet and on every plan set sheet.	See Cover sheet above Sheet Index
5	See PDF of mark-up comments, many/most of which relate to the following written comments.	Included
6	Cover Sheet:	
a	Remove the title block line of 'Map amendment (conditional rezoning)' – replace w appropriate 'Preliminary Subdivision Plat'.	Replaced See top Center of sheet
b	Revise header of 'Voluntary Rezoning Conditions' to MA 22-08 Rezoning Conditions".	Changed, this has been moved to the next sheet, see Sheet 2
c	Please move the list of 39 "General Notes" – which are industry standard types of generic notes, and not something specific to this land/entitlement project per se' – to a subsequent sheet. Suggest making the 2nd sheet of the plan set a spot for 'General notes'. Also note, this is Preliminary Subdivision – this is NOT a constructable plan set. If these notes are intended for the construction contractors they are more appropriate on the next-step Construction Infrastructure Drawing (CID) plan set, in which case, they could be removed altogether.	I agree that a lot of these notes are for the contractor but some are also for the information that is on the plans and I would advise that they not be removed if we are adding construction level detail in the plans like the erosion control sheet and grading sheets
d	Site specific notes 6 & 7 concerning well and septic are believed to be inaccurate and should be removed.	Apologies, I failed to look over these notes before, This note has been removed.
e	Site Data Table/PIN number – This lists just one PIN, 1757277811; in IMAPS, this appears and is noted as 71.52 acres by Wake county; MA 22-08, the Rezoning, was for 94.99 acres comprising 19 separate PIN identified properties. Please explain the acreage discrepancy.	All PINs have been added
f	Site Data Table/Total Site Area – MA 22-08 was for 94.99 acres; this states 96.33 acres; please explain the discrepancy.	We accidentally had an extra parcel in the calculations, this has been corrected
g	Site Date Table/Existing Zoning – MA 22-09 rezoned the land to an RM-CZ District; this says "R-30" which is a Wake County zoning district; revise.	The GIS was behind as it still states R-30, we changed the zoning to reflect the recent map amendment
h	Site Data Table/Proposed Zoning – remove this row/entry it is inappropriate for a PSP. It is also incorrect stating "RH-CZ" which is Not the zoning of this land.	Done
i	Site Data Table/Plat Book / Page reference – BM2007/pg01224 seems to only include a portion of the land that is part of this subdivision, being the present day PIN of 1757471559, 14.9 acres owned by KENNETH INVESTMENT LLC. Revise to reference ALL the Book of Maps or Deeds that cover all the acreage of this subdivision (see previous comment, where there is a discrepancy between the 94.99 acres that was rezoned and the 71.52 acres that is in a PIN the Applicant states is the subject property.	There is one Deed and one plat that is for all parcels
j	Parking Calculations table – remove the Row for 'Dwelling, Single family, Attached' as this subdivision is ONLY Single family Detached units.	Done
k	FYI – Impervious Coverage per Lot – if 4,900 SF per residential lot is the final number, this will be required to be commemorated on the Final Subdivision Plat, and then govern Building Permit review for impervious coverage.	We have reduce the limit on each lot to maintain no more than 20% of Impervious on the entire site.
l	Right-of-Ways – Move the "Dedicated Road R/W" row from under 'Residential Density Calculations' to the "Street Data" portion. ADD the additional right-of-way for Jonesville Road being dedicated.	Done
m	Lot Design Standards – everything thing in this section should include the LDO Section reference from which they derive. See overall comment about referencing "Cluster" across the board in this PSP.	Done
i.	Min Lot size - There is, nor never was, an RM District minimum lot size standard of 6,000 SF – from where does this derive?? This should be the regulatory Minimum standard, be it the LDO or a voluntary Condition more-restrictive than the LDO.	MRA did the Map Amendment annotating and showing lots to have no less than 6,000 and most maintained in the 6K range. If the CZ in the zoning does not include this then let us know how to apply for 6K lots.

	ii. Min Lot Width – There is, nor never was, an RM District lot width of 42' – where does this derive from?? This should be the regulatory Minimum standard, be it the LDO or a voluntary Condition more-restrictive than the LDO.	Lots have been adjusted to meet this requirement
	iii. Min Building Setbacks – Add the appropriate Corner/Side setback applicable to corner lots; there is none provided.	The table has been updated
7	"(Cluster Option)" should be added next to the proposed based on the applicant's proposed minimum lot width. Any references to lot dimensional requirements, open space, and landscaping within this preliminary plat should include the word "Cluster Subdivision" and note compliance with LDO 3.1.B.	Cluster has been added to the table
8	Sheet 2 (Existing Conditions):	
a	We assume the light brown bubble symbology reflects existing tree line but nothing has been included in the legend. Please update.	Legend has been added
b	Remove reference to Durham County within the Existing Condition Notes. Additionally, this is believed to be an inaccurate statement as condition of approval #14 commits to the dedication of a 100-sf historical monument related to the Jonesville area. Please advise.	We have removed the Durham reference and added the 100 sf monument dedication
c	Please update with the individual or entity that performed the delineation and the date during which it was conducted.	Done
9	Sheet 3 (Overall)	
a	Per Table 6.2.1.3 in the LDO, greenways are considered passive open space features and should be removed from this calculation. Certain segments of the greenway that are activated through the construction of outdoor exercise equipment and similar uses may count towards provided active open space.	The Greenway along the Sewer easement is now labeled public and the rest is remaining private.
b	Please review Section 6.2.1.G of the LDO and provide updated calculations for passive open spaces. Note, a maximum 50% of the total required passive open space may be stormwater facilities. Additionally, only 20% of the total required passive open spaces may be environmentally sensitive or unique lands. The applicant will need to provide updated open spaces totals to confirm compliance with LDO 6.2.1.G.	I hope we got this Open Space done correctly, the area south of the public trail will be our main "large" active open space used for a Frisbee golf course.
c	Please note that a limited number of parking spaces may count toward open space requirements. This comment may not apply during this preliminary subdivision review but will need to be considered if any proposed parking is a part of active open space totals. Being as the project requires 3.5 acres of active open space and is proposing 6.3ac, it is recommended that the applicant investigate any potential challenges with compliance. Please also see comment regarding greenways being considered passive open spaces and advise on how this may affect open space compliance.	We have complied with limiting the open space counted over parking spaces.
10	Sheet 3 (Overall)	
a	Per LDO Table 6.2.1.3, Greenways are considered passive open space features and should be removed from this calculation. Certain segments of the Greenway that are activated through the construction of outdoor exercise equipment and similar uses may be considered/counted towards provided Active open space.	We have added a frisbee golf course to substitute what we are required to meet.
b	Review LDO Section 6.2.1.G and provide updated calculations for Passive open spaces. Note, a maximum 50% of the total required Passive open space may be stormwater facilities (SCM). Additionally, only 20% of the total required Passive open spaces may be 'environmentally sensitive' or unique lands.	We have more than enough Passive space that we provided in the table a row that shows that we are meeting the requirement without including the SCM area or the Environmental areas.
c	Per LDO 6.2.1.G.10 - only limited numbers of parking spaces may count toward open space requirements. At PSP, it may be premature to be able to vet and demonstrate compliance to this standard. With 3.5 acres of active open space Required, and 6.3 acres being Proposed, it is recommended that the Applicant investigate any potential challenges with compliance. See also comment regarding Greenways being considered Passive open spaces and determine how this may affect open space compliance.	Same as above
11	Sheet 28 -- Remove City of Raleigh reference and replace with Town of Rolesville. Note, additional comments may be triggered once the required Preservation Plan is provided.	Done
ENGINEERING - Brian Laux / Jacque Thompson		NOT APPROVED
1	See two PDF's – (1.) Memo dated 08-29-2024 with 67 comments, plus A-G for future CID plans; (2.) Mark-ups on the PSP plan set, with 2085 Comment entries (but many/most are Autocad – Applicant should eliminate those to make Commenting easier/clearer).	I do not know how to remove these AutoCAD text in comments

PARKS & RECREATION - Eddie Henderson		NOT APPROVED
1	Revise Public Greenway Easement section - the section that runs along the creek to the south - to be labeled as "Public" [NOT private].	Done see sheet 9 & 11
2	Per LDO 6.2.1.J.2.(a) - Revise Public Greenway Easement to be 50' wide from proposed 30'. This section does go on to state: " <i>An alternative may be granted to reduce the minimum [50' wide] Easement...to 30' if site constraints including topography and/or environmental features do not allow for a 50' Easement. Cost shall not be considered a constraint.</i> " If Applicant wishes to request less than 50', do so in writing.	Done see sheet 9 & 11
3	Confirm that Public Greenway will stub all the way to property lines (no gaps) in southeast & southwest corners.	That is correct, it will go to the property line
4	The private greenway looks to be constrained where it goes up to Street C near SCM #2. Please clarify if this is a 10' wide sidewalk in this location.	We were not showing a 10' wide sidewalk as the sidewalk will not fit in the R/W we consider these are entry/exit points from the trail
5	FYI – The shown 10' wide Sidepath along Jonesville Road is not required by the Town's Greenway Plan.	understood, we have reduced it to 5' as is required per MA 22-08 conditions.
6	In Landscape Plans, replace Lespedeza thunbergii with another plant as it is considered an invasive species - https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/plantmaterials/gapmctn7775.pdf	We have removed Lespedeza
COR PUBLIC UTILITIES - Tim Beasley		NOT APPROVED
1	See PDF mark-up of comments on the Utility Plan Sheet.	Understood
	This waterline is certainly not existing. For approval of this PSP, you must show the full waterline extension from the closest ex. waterline to bring water to this proposed subdivision and across the development frontage of Jonesville Rd.	our apologies, in working with the adjacent development, they had it on the CAD under ex w/l, we have made this change.
	Public waterline must be extended to the end of the road stub and terminate with a BOA	Done see sheet 26
	All FHs should be located behind sidewalks.	Done see sheets 23-28
	Will this be a bore/jack?	it will be open trench cut unless we exceed our impact allotment.
WAKE COUNTY FIRE / EMS - Brittany Hocutt		NOT APPROVED
1	Revise cul-de-sac to be 96 ft diameter;	Street B is 150' thus does not exceed what is required for an appuratus turnaround, Street E has an alternate turnaround where the use of a Drive at the end of the cul-de-sac is there specifically for an appuratus turn around, see sheet 12
2	Revise so that no trees are within 3ft of fire hydrants;	Done See landscaping sheets
3	Revise/provide radii on turning (provide truck diagram for 50 ft truck for turning).	see sheet 14 for a typical of an appuratus taking a turn.
NCDOT – Jacob Nicholson		NOT APPROVED
1	The PSP should account for the roadway improvements required by the TIA.	See sheets 33 - 34
2	4:1 pavement tapers will be required to tie into existing pavement for ultimate section widening.	done, more detail will follow in CD's
3	This subdivision is responsible for improvements at the Jonesville/Mitchell Mill intersection; the Reserve at Mitchell Mill subdivision also has TIA/traffic impact responsibility at this intersection. Monitoring for signal requirement/warrants will be an on-going effort.	See sheet 34
9		
WAKE COUNTY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT - Janet Boyer		
	No comments were received, which is not atypical for preliminary subdivision	

PSP REVIEW - Jacqueline Thompson		NOT APPROVED
	Sheet 1:	
1	Consider moving the General Notes to another sheet so the cover sheet is not so crowded.	General notes, Site specific notes, and Voluntary Rezoning Condition notes were moved to plan sheet #2.
2	Update the submittal number to "PSP-24-05". Include the original submittal date below this as well. All revision dates can be included in the title block table.	Submittal # was updated to "PSP-24-05" and revision date was added to the title block.
3	Change "MAP AMENDMENT (CONDITIONAL REZONING) FOR" to "PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR".	"MAP AMENDMENT (CONDITIONAL REZONING) FOR" was changed to "PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR".
4	Update the title block to "PSP-24-05" for all sheets.	"PSP-24-05" was updated in title block for all sheets.
5	Add the watershed to the Site Data Table.	Watershed was added to the Site Data Table.
6	Fill in the data for Tree Coverage Summary.	Tree Coverage Data was filled in.
7	Please identify the Universal Drive 20' easement on the plans.	Universal Drive 20' easement is annotated on the plan sheets.
8	See the Sidewalk Easement note number 10: This (PIN) number isn't identified on the Site Plan. Please confirm.	The Parcel and PIN are now identified on the plans.
9	Consider moving the Site Specific Notes to another sheet so the cover sheet is not so crowded.	Site specific notes were moved to plan sheet #2.
10	Confirm cul-de-sac radii (Site Specific Note 5).	Cul-de-sac radii are 50' and annotated on Site Plans.
11	Note 4 under the Site Specific Notes, indicates that streets shall be 20' wide asphalt pavement but the street cross section shows 22' wide. Revise accordingly.	Note 4 has been revised accordingly to the street cross sections.
12	Please review all notes; several are not applicable for this project.	Notes that are not applicable to this project have been removed.
13	Fix the sheet number overlap in the lower right corner of the title block.	Sheet number overlap has been corrected.
	Sheet 2:	
14	Add existing property information for the project parcel.	Existing property information has been added to the existing plan sheets.
15	Label the existing water main size. Show and label any existing hydrants.	Done
a	Confirm the existence of water along Jonesville Road; City of Raleigh stated this does not exist.	The waterline shown on Jonesville Road is proposed in current construction drawings for the town of Rolesville project # PSP-23-03.
16	Fill in the wetland and stream delineation information or delete the information.	The wetland and stream delineation note has been removed.
17	Please remove the soil survey information from this sheet to make existing conditions (topography and wetlands limits) easier to follow.	The soil survey information has been removed from this sheet.
18	Add any and all demolition notes to this sheet or add an additional demolition plan with any required demolition labeled.	Existing overhead electrical lines, power poles, utility poles are now on the Existing Conditions plan and noted to be removed.
19	Add Use and Zoning for each property in the Adjacent Properties table.	Use and Zoning were added to the Adjacent Properties table.
20	Change the legend from "EXISTING FLOOD PLAIN" to "100 YEAR FLOOD PLAIN".	"EXISTING FLOOD PLAIN" was changed to "100 YEAR FLOOD PLAIN" in Legend.
21	The Town prefers black and white plans. Please consider removing the color.	We use color so the lines does not get congested and confusing, we try to limit the color for only the items that are pertaining to that sheet, i.e. sewer and waterline are colored on the utilities sheets but B&W on other sheets. I have found this proves very helpful for Contractors
	Sheet 3:	
22	Please clarify if the future roadway improvements along Jonesville Road will be part of these plans or submitted separately.	The future roadway improvements along Jonesville Road will be added in with construction drawings.
23	Fix the leader to point to the mail kiosk near SCM #3.	The future roadway improvements along Jonesville Road will be added in with construction drawings.
24	Add "PASSIVE" to the site plan legend.	Passive was added to the site plan legend.
25	Make the passive open space hatch something other than solid gray; it is similar to the pavement hatch on the roads and can cause confusion	The passive hatch was changed.
26	Add dimensions to the typical lot layout for typical setbacks, lot dimensions, etc.	Setback back dimensions were added to the Typical Lot Layout detail.
27	Add sidewalk and associated hatch pattern to the site plan legend and on all site plan sheets. Add relevant existing conditions legend items to these sheets as well.	Sidewalk and hatching are now in the legend.
	Sheet 5:	
28	It is our understanding the east-west segment of the greenway, on the south side of the project site, will be a public greenway. If so, a 50' easement will be required per LDO Section 6.2.1.J.2.	A 50' easement has been added to the east-west segment on the southside.
	Sheet 6:	
29	The storm drainage easement encroaches into the property at Lot 91. Consider shifting it to the southwest so it covers the greenway and does not encroach into property.	The storm drainage easement has been revised and removed from lot #91.
30	It is hard to read all the text over the sidewalk hatch. Consider relocating the text or masking the text.	A combination of shifting and masking has been done and the sidewalk hatch has been lightened to make the text legible.
31	Label the curb radii at all intersections.	All curb radii at intersections have been labeled.

32	Dimension the parking at all applicable locations.	Parking lot dimensions have been added.
33	Label all existing linework at the intersection of Gideon Drive and Universal Drive, to make it clear pavement edge vs ROW, etc.	Edge of pavement labeled on site plans.
34	Please label and clarify what the lines that cross the 2 existing lots at the intersection of Gideon Drive and Street C.	These lines are the standard NCDOT sight triangles. They have been labeled at this intersection and several other intersections noted as "Typical" as to not obscure the plans.
Sheet 7:		
35	There appears to be existing gravel shown on the plans in the upper right corner of the plan view. Please freeze or remove if applicable, or adjust accordingly.	The existing gravel shown has been removed from the sheet.
36	Label all cul-de-sac radii. Confirm it meets the minimum for fire requirements.	The cul-de-sac on Street "B" (Gideon Dr) is 150' from the intersection from Street "C". The cul-de-sac on Street E will have an extended drive section to meet the alternative to hammerhead specifications to allow a fire apparatus to turn around.
a	This comment applies to all site sheets.	understood
Sheet 8:		
37	Label all retaining walls "BY OTHERS" and reference the note on Sheet 12.	Retaining walls will be added and noted "By others" in construction drawings.
38	Please provide additional information for future roadway improvements of Jonesville Road to understand the Street A connection.	The future proposed roadway improvements to Jonesville Rd are now shown.
a	Details can be worked out during CDs, but please clarify what improvements are being proposed at Jonesville Road.	More detail will be provided the closer to CD we get, see sheet 33
39	The SCM easement overlaps the pedestrian bridge. Adjust accordingly to provide access and maintenance to the SCM.	The SCM easement overlap has been corrected.
40	The drainage easements encroach into building area for Lots 11 & 12, and Lots 13 & 14. Consider revisions to not limit buildable area.	The drainage easements have been modified and are out of the building areas.
Sheet 10:		
41	The minimum street centerline radius shall meet NCDOT Subdivision requirements based on terrain; the minimum centerline radius is 230' for local subdivision roads.	All street centerlines now have a min radius of 230' for local subdivision roads.
42	The Town Standards Engineering Manual requires valley curb on local residential streets and standard curb on residential collector streets. Please clarify the typical sections.	The local residential street sections now callout valley curb.
43	The Town Standards Engineering Manual calls for residential collector roads to be 15' lanes with a 34' F-F width. Define the collector vs. residential for these sections. Not all roads will be collectors.	15' lanes have been added to the collector street section and the section detail designates where it will be.
Sheet 11:		
44	Confirm if additional EC measures are needed or that all appropriate EC measures are provided at the wetlands.	The Erosion Control Plan will show more specificity in the wetlands for the submittal to Wake County.
45	While Wake County will provide final approval of the EC plans, it is recommended to break out these sheets like is done with the site plan and grading plan to provide more detail. Missing items include: limits of disturbance, proposed contours; dimensions and/or details for EC measures; grading for sed basins. Some of this will be required during CDs.	The additional sheets will be added for the Erosion Control submittal.
Sheet 12:		
46	Note 7 of the Stormwater Notes references Durham; adjust accordingly.	Note 7 was removed.
Sheet 15:		
47	Show the grading for SCM #1 and the access.	Detailed grading conforming to required standards outside of streets will progressively get more complete through PSP submittals as we get closer to CD's so as to not waste time on grading for changes that may occur before CD submittals.
48	Show the grading for the parking lot. Show the spaces and confirm ADA accessibility.	Detailed grading conforming to required standards outside of streets will progressively get more complete through PSP submittals as we get closer to CD's so as to not waste time on grading for changes that may occur before CD submittals.
49	Confirm all grading does not exceed 3:1 slope throughout the grading plans.	3:1 slopes will be maintained in grading slopes in construction drawings.
50	Confirm the grades where there will be driveways are buildable and do not exceed maximum slopes.	Detailed grading conforming to required standards outside of streets will progressively get more complete through PSP submittals as we get closer to CD's so as to not waste time on grading for changes that may occur before CD submittals.
Sheet 16:		
51	The proposed grading encroaches into the adjacent property on the east, north of Lot 16. Please adjust accordingly.	Detailed grading conforming to required standards outside of streets will progressively get more complete through PSP submittals as we get closer to CD's so as to not waste time on grading for changes that may occur before CD submittals.

52	Show the grading for SCM #2.	Detailed grading conforming to required standards outside of streets will progressively get more complete through PSP submittals as we get closer to CD's so as to not waste time on grading for changes that may occur before CD submittals.
Sheet 17:		
53	Due to the conservation efforts with the buffer along Lots 1- 7, the grading and drainage easement are limiting these lots. Consider grading within the buffer and shifting the drainage easement west to maximize the build-able area.	This will be considered in CD's when more extensive grading is done.
54	Grading is occurring within the buffer north of the cul-de-sac of Street E; if the intent is to conserve the buffer area, please adjust. Otherwise adjust the buffer labeling.	The grading has been removed from the buffer.
55	The building pads are not graded in; confirm that the grading will allow for them with adequate drainage.	Detailed grading conforming to required standards outside of streets will progressively get more complete through PSP submittals as we get closer to CD's so as to not waste time on grading for changes that may occur before CD submittals.
56	Show the grading for the bio-retention pond.	Detailed grading conforming to required standards outside of streets will progressively get more complete through PSP submittals as we get closer to CD's so as to not waste time on grading for changes that may occur before CD submittals.
57	The drainage pipe between Lot 11 & 12 does not discharge into an SCM or bioretention pond. Confirm how this water is being treated.	The intent here is that we will retain and treat enough of the water that a small amount of bypass from SCM #3 will be permissible here.
58	Adjust the grading so it does not encroach into wetlands, or confirm that permitting for wetland disturbance is occurring.	The grading will not encroach into the wetlands and will be shown in CD's.
Sheet 22:		
59	Consider extending the water to the intersection of Gideon Drive and Universal Drive for future water connections and possible improvements of Universal Drive. By ending the water line where it currently is proposed, any future improvements would require Gideon Drive to be torn up and redone.	The waterline is now shown as proposed up to the intersection with Universal Drive.
Sheet 27:		
60	Remove the "existing" tree line. If the black line is the proposed tree line, that should stay. If not, delete that one as well. If existing trees are to remain, show tree protection fencing.	These trees are not remaining, and the tree line was removed.
a	Tree protection fencing should also be shown on the erosion control sheets.	Tree protection will be shown as necessary on erosion control submittal.
61	Delete the repeated text in the Landscaping Notes.	The repeated text was deleted.
62	Consider adding horizontal lines to make the Planting Calculations table easier to follow.	Horizontal lines were added to the Planting Calculations table.
63	Update "Canopy Tree" to "Tree" in the Landscaping Plan Legend to be consistent within the plans.	Due to the Buffer type now being Type 2 "Canopy Tree" and "Understory Tree" now are relevant terms.
64	Add open space (active and passive) hatching to the Landscaping Plan Legend.	Active & Passive open space was added to the Landscaping legend.
65	Add water and sewer services to this plan sheet to check for interference with plantings.	Sewer and water services were added to the Landscaping Plan.
66	Confirm if there are power lines on site; show if there are.	Existing overhead electrical lines, power poles, utility poles are now on the Existing Conditions plan and noted to be removed.
Sheet 28:		
67	For erosion control details, please use Wake County Details.	Wake County erosion control details will be used for erosion control plans in CD's