

11/01/2024

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

SUBJECT: Hills at Harris Creek 2nd Submittal PSP-24-03 Comment Response

In response to review comments provided on 10/04/2024, we are providing the following comment responses:

Planning and Zoning – Planning Staff and WithersRavenel

1. Continue to Provide a Written Response to ALL comments
SREG RESPONSE: Written responses to all comments are included within this submittal.
2. Continue to Add revision dates to all submittal materials.
SREG RESPONSE: Revision dates have been updated on all materials within this submittal.
3. **REPEAT** - Complete and submit the Property Owner Consent Form [V2 did not include this, though Response said it was]
SREG RESPONSE: Apologies for the miscommunication, the consent form is now included within this submittal.
4. **Partial REPEAT** - Cover Sheet – Update the now provided Table regarding New Public Right-of-ways being Proposed in this PSP; see next note on this topic too.
SREG RESPONSE: The street names table has been updated, see Sheet C1.0
5. **REPEAT** - 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: A street name and address exhibit was provided in the V2 submittal. The site plan now incorporates the address of each lot, see Sheets C6.1 – C6.6
6. **Partial REPEAT** – Shts C5.1, C5.2 – With required 25' ROW dedication on Mitchell Mill now clearly shown (striped area), these sheets are showing a shaded “bike lane” / “10' side path” (see Parks comment on that) – First, PSP is for creating and showing new properties, right-of-ways, and easements primarily, not constructable features like an actual paved Sidepath; easement for it Yes, actual built feature, No; that detail is for Construction Drawings. Defer to Parks as to whether or not a Sidepath should be Back-of Right-of-Way of a Planned 4-lane divided road like Mitchell Mill; Applicant failed to respond to this part of V1 Comment #12. Suggest this topic get pushed to Construction Drawing review, and PSP simply show/call-out the Required Streetyard Buffer dimensioned area for now. This topic can be discussed with Planning, Parks, and Engineering as needed. Thank you.
SREG RESPONSE: The 10' sidepath is shown and labeled as per previous suggestions from the TRC. This topic can be pushed to CD review as noted.
7. **NEW** – V1 Plan set was 50 sheets; V2 Plan set is 57 Sheets – what 7 new sheets were added?

Per Planning Comments, the expectation was that the Plan set would be reduced by removing some sheets that are more CD level of detail. Was the inclusion of 7 new sheets in response to a particular TRC Review Comment? Was the inclusion of 7 new sheets otherwise broached in the Response documents, to inform TRC Staff that there are 7 new sheets that require essentially a V1 Review?

SREG RESPONSE: The concept sketch plan was added at the direction of the TRC. 4 Fire Truck Turning sheets were added at the direction of the TRC. Detail sheets were added as a common PSP element.

8. **NEW** – Cover Sheet – Per response regarding Phasing, add a clarifying note: “This subdivision shall be developed and recorded in a single phase; there is No Phasing Plan.” This will clearly answer this question for the future, and future CID and FSP submittals should include that note, again for clarity of intent. Thank you.

SREG RESPONSE: This note has been added to the cover sheet, see Sheet C1.0

9. **NEW** – Lot 164 – what is the viability of developing this lot given its dimensions? As shown, it appears as an SFD Development lot.

SREG RESPONSE: Lot 164 has been removed due to its lack of viability. See sheet C6.5

10. See PDF of WithersRavenel Written Memo – V1 Comments # 5.b, 5.c., 5.e., 8, and 11 are still outstanding.

SREG RESPONSE: Responses to these comments are provided separately, thank you.

Parks & Recreation – Eddie Henderson

1. Please revise to show the 50’ greenway easement following the entire length of Harris Creek from the plan north and south property lines. It currently looks like it stops mid-way where it connects to the sewer easement. It should continue across the sewer easement and go on the backside of the SCM#8

SREG RESPONSE: Responses to these comments are provided separately, thank you.

2. Revise greenway to not cross in front of lot 169 and cross the street directly from where it runs in between lots 169 and 168. The Town is trying to minimize the number of homes this greenway crosses in front of.

SREG RESPONSE: The greenway route has been revised, see Sheet C6.5

3. Please check all sheets to ensure consistency of the sidepath/bike lane terminology. Sheet C-5.0 for example still has a label for the sidepath that reads ‘bike lane’.

SREG RESPONSE: All sidepath labels have been updated, see Sheets C6.1 – C6.6

4. Please confirm if bike lane is a consistent 5’ wide for all of this projects road frontage. It looks like it tapers off and the 5’ bike lane is only present in the plan south entrance.

SREG RESPONSE: Bike lane width is a consistent 5’ along both sides of Flatrock Ridge Street. The 2 site entrances from Mitchell Mill Rd. now show the 10’ sidepath in lieu of a bike lane.

Engineering – Brian Laux / Jacque Thompson

1. See PDF of Written Memo comments produced by Bolton&Menk – there are 17 numbered comments (plus some for future CID plans).

SREG RESPONSE: Responses to these comments are provided separately, thank you.

2. See PDF of mark-up comments produced by Bolton&Menk – there are 27 entries/comments.

SREG RESPONSE: Responses to these comments are provided separately, thank you.

Wake County Watershed Management – Janet Boyer

V2: No comments were received.

SREG RESPONSE: This is noted, thank you.

COR Public Utilities – Tim Beasley

See PDF of mark-up comments on 2 Sheets of the Prelim Plat -- C-1.0 and C-6.0.

SREG RESPONSE: Responses to these comments are provided separately, thank you.

Wake County Fire / EMS – Brittany Hocutt

*STREET G WILL NEED TURNAROUND NEAR LOT 104/105. ELIMINATION OF TURNAROUND UNACCEPTABLE AT 750'.

SREG RESPONSE: A temporary hammerhead turnaround has been added to the end of Street G, see Sheet C6.3

NCDOT – Jacob Nicholson

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.