

02/03/2024

To:

Town of Rolesville Planning Department
Attn: Michael Elabarger
502 Southtown Circle
Rolesville, NC 27571

SUBJECT: Reserve @ Mitchell Mill 3rd Submittal CD set
CID-24-04 – Reserve at Mitchell Mill

In response to review comments provided on 12/04/2024, we are providing the following comment responses:

Sheet C6.1

1. REPEAT - Please confirm if the overhead power has an existing easement that will need to be removed during plating.

SREG RESPONSE: No power pole easements have been found in our research to date.

2. REPEAT - Remove drainage easement from the lot area square footage calculations.
 - a. This comment applies to all lots. Your previous comment response was related to overhead power, not the drainage.

SREG RESPONSE: As per previous discussion from the December TRC review call, it has been agreed upon that the minimum lot size must remain, therefore still including storm easement area as part of total lot area. Thank you.

3. REPEAT - All pedestrian ramps should be defined for what type/detail they should be constructed as; include the relevant details.

SREG RESPONSE: All pedestrian ramps on site have been identified as Type 3 curb ramps. Standard curb ramp details have been added as Sheets D2.1 and D2.2

4. REPEAT – The striping is shown on the plan, but the signing is not clear. It appears stop signs are shown, but a signing/striping plan should be considered. Additional signs to include (if applicable), but not limited to: Speed limit, Pedestrian Crossings, Dead End/Future Roadway, No Parking, etc.

SREG RESPONSE: The signage throughout the plans has been updated, and additional sheets have been provided as Sheets C13.0 – C13.9.

5. REPEAT – The sidewalk and sidepath should be considered for revision based on previous conversations throughout the PSP submittals. Please let us know if there are any concerns with revising. It was previously discussed (during PSP and CID) about adjusting this walk/crossing so the sidewalk doesn't end at a dead end. Due to the bridge and no improvements being done across the bridge, there is very little chance for future connecting in this location to the south. Is there a reason the sidewalk can't end at the intersection? Since there is nowhere to go the farther south you go, it seems like adding additional infrastructure is fairly meaningless.

SREG RESPONSE: This sidewalk/sidepath crossing has been revised, see Sheet C6.1

Sheet C6.3

6. REPEAT - Confirm the property lines and retaining wall locations. There appears to be a couple of areas of overlap.

SREG RESPONSE: The wall locations are accurate with consideration to the proximity to wetlands and/or stream buffer zones. All on-site walls are to be the responsibility of the HOA.

Sheet C6.4

7. REPEAT - The sidewalk and sidepath should be considered for revision based on previous conversations throughout the PSP submittals. Please let us know if there are any concerns with revising. It was previously discussed (during PSP and CID) about adjusting this walk/crossing so the sidewalk doesn't end at a dead end. Due to the bridge and no improvements being done across the bridge, there is very little chance for future connecting in this location to the south. Is there a reason the sidewalk can't end at the intersection? Since there is nowhere to go the farther south you go, it seems like adding additional infrastructure is fairly meaningless.

SREG RESPONSE: This sidewalk/sidepath crossing has been revised, see Sheet C6.4

Sheet C6.8

8. REPEAT - Please confirm if there is enough room for a vehicle parked in the north-most parking stall in the trailhead parking lot to back out. It is fairly common to have a bump out in parking lots like this to allow backing out.

SREG RESPONSE: The trailhead parking lot has been updated to provide a bump out to allow for backing out of the northernmost parking spot, see Sheet C6.8

9. REPEAT - Confirm if pedestrian ramps will be located at the trailhead parking entrance.

SREG RESPONSE: Type 1 Curb Ramps have been added at the trailhead parking lot crossing, see Sheet C6.8

10. REPEAT - Please confirm the status of the offsite plans for Mitchell Mill Rd. The signing and striping, as well as widening widths and construction information should be included/notes added.

SREG RESPONSE: The offsite improvements to Mitchell Mill Rd. are also under permitting review from NCDOT. The latest improvements are shown on the plans while we await their comments.

Sheet C9.1

11. REPEAT - A profile or elevation information needs to be provided for SCM #6 Wet Pond outlet pipe; Please confirm there is not a crossing conflict with existing sanitary sewer.

SREG RESPONSE: A plan and profile sheet has been added for SCM #6, please see Sheet D3.6

12. Please clarify if the areas for the off-street multi-use path will be graded or matching existing grade. If any grading is to occur, they need to be included in the plans as plan and profile. If the plan is to match existing grade with limited disturbance, information needs to be included on the plans to define the section and how the construction of the path is to occur.

SREG RESPONSE: The multi-use path will be graded, plan & profile sheets have been included as Sheets C11.43 – C11.49

Sheet C9.2

13. REPEAT - Verify slopes near the greenway path, across the road from Lot 78.

a. Max slopes are 3:1, but it looks like the goal is to try to tie into something that is much steeper; the retaining wall may need to wrap around.

SREG RESPONSE: The retaining wall in this location has been updated to alleviate the steep slopes in this area, see Sheet C9.2

14. REPEAT - A typical section for the greenway should be included; per the Town's Standards Manual, the greenway should have 2' shoulders and 3:1 slopes or flatter.

SREG RESPONSE: A typical greenway section detail has been added to Sheet D2.0

15. Please clarify if the pollinator garden areas will be graded or matching existing grade. If any grading is to occur, they need to be included in the plans as plan and profile. If the plan is to match existing grade with limited disturbance, information needs to be included on the plans to define the section and how the construction of the path is to occur.

SREG RESPONSE: The pollinator garden path will be a mowed area – no proposed grading will occur. A reference image can be seen on Sheet L2.1 and L2.2

Sheet C9.3

16. REPEAT – Add contour labels.

SREG RESPONSE: Contour labels have been added throughout the grading sheets, see C9.1 – C9.9

Sheet C9.4

17. Impacts to 100-year flood zone will require additional stormwater analysis; please include the stormwater calculations and confirm the required permitting is being pursued.

SREG RESPONSE: Proposed grading has been updated to no longer encroach into the 100 year floodplain. Land disturbance permitting is currently being pursued with Wake County.

18. REPEAT – Add a detail and dimensioning for the riprap.

SREG RESPONSE: Rip-rap design will be included within future submittal of CDs, in coordination with Wake County stormwater review as well.

Sheet C11.0

19. The Town of Rolesville follows the NCDOT Subdivision Roads Minimum Construction Standards minimum design criteria; the minimum K value is 30 for crest and sag curves on level terrain for local roads.

a. This comment applies to all profiles and curves.

SREG RESPONSE: All road profiles have been updated to provide a minimum k value of 30.00 as per the NCDOT Standard, see Sheets C11.0 – C11.24

20. REPEAT – Profiles for the greenway need to be included.

SREG RESPONSE: Plan & Profile sheets for the multi-use path and greenway have been added to the CDs, see Sheets C11.43 – C11.49

Sheet C11.6

21. REPEAT - With the steep grades for streets, sidewalks will not be ADA compliant. Please review and adjust as much as possible.

SREG RESPONSE: Steep grades on streets and sidewalks have been adjusted as much as possible throughout the site, see Sheets C9.0 – C9.9

22. REPEAT - The maximum grade allowed for local streets when approaching an intersection is 5% for the last 100 feet of pavement, per the Town's Standards Manual.

SREG RESPONSE: The grading has been revised to provide a maximum of 5% slope for a minimum of the first 100 feet from the intersection, see Sheet C11.6

23. REPEAT - With the steep street grades, please think through the catch basins and how drainage will flow past them; consider double catch basins on the steeper sloped roads.

SREG RESPONSE: Stormwater design will be submitted to Wake County and further revised in future CD submittals, thank you.

Sheet C11.19

24. REPEAT - Please confirm the grading limits with the roadway linework at the end of Monkeywrench Street. A temporary construction easement may be needed.

SREG RESPONSE: The pavement limits and road closure signs have been updated at this location, see Sheet C11.19

Sheet C11.26

25. REPEAT - Jonesville Road has proposed utilities and sidewalk; the proposed grade profile should be shown since new pavement and curb are being constructed.

SREG RESPONSE: The proposed utilities on Jonesville Rd are shown on Sheet C11.26. The road widening will maintain the existing grade. Please see the Jonesville Rd Improvements typical section on Sheet D2.0 for detailed view of the sidewalk and cross slopes along Jonesville Road.

Sheet C11.28 – C11.30

26. REPEAT – Confirm minimum cover is being provided. The dimension labelled is not actually 3 feet.

SREG RESPONSE: The inaccurate minimum cover labels have been removed from the plans. Stormwater design will be submitted to Wake County and further revised in future CD submittals, thank you.

Sheet L-2.4

27. REPEAT – Profiles for the greenway need to be included.

SREG RESPONSE: Plan & Profile sheets for the multi-use path and greenway have been added to the CDs, see Sheets C11.43 – C11.49

28. Boardwalk plans and details need to be included; reference the Town Standards Manual for Town requirements.

SREG RESPONSE: Boardwalk details have been included on Sheet D1.2

Sheet D-1.0

29. REPEAT - A 2' concrete flush curb will be required for alleys to provide support of the pavement, and additional driving surface for fire and garbage access.

a. We recognize the pavement width has been increased from 16' to 20', but the minimum lane width for the Town Standards is 12'; If alleys will use less than 12' lanes, please account for the concrete flush curb to support the pavement. Also, "No Parking" signs should be shown on the CD plans.

SREG RESPONSE: 2' concrete flush curb has been added on both sides of the alley cross section. The travel lane dimension has also been updated, as alleys will be one-way traffic – they now meet the Town Standards. No parking signs have been added to the plans, see Sheets 13.0 – C13.9

30. REPEAT - Plantings are not allowed within the 5' strip, per the Standards Manual; the area between the curb and sidewalk is considered a utility strip. A planting buffer will be needed behind ROW/sidewalk. Please revise.

SREG RESPONSE: Plantings have been relocated in the cross sections, and the utility strip is now labelled properly, see Sheet D2.0

31. Please include a typical section for the greenway; it doesn't appear the greenway section is defined within the plans.

SREG RESPONSE: Typical Greenway Section Details have been added to Sheet D2.0

Sheet D-1.1

32. Wake County Details should be used for all Erosion and Sediment Control. NCDOT Details should be used for Street and Storm. City of Raleigh Details should be used for Sewer and Water.

SREG RESPONSE: Wake County erosion details, NCDOT street and stormwater details, and City of Raleigh water and sewer details have all been added, see Sheets D3.9 – D6.2