



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		2nd RESPONSE
PLANNING & ZONING – Planning Staff & WithersRavenel		NOT APPROVED
1	Continue to Provide a Written Response to ALL comments.	Will Do
2	Continue to Add revision dates to all submittal materials.	Will Do
3	Continue to Cloud or bubble all changes.	Will Do
4	REPEAT – Regarding LDO Sections 3.1.B. (Residential Districts/Cluster Development) and 3.1.2.B./Table 3.1.2.	
b.	Text Amendment TA-23-02 was adopted on 04-04-2023 – this revised LDO Sec 3.1.2/Table 3.1.2. for the	Table has been revised - see Cover sheet
c.	THEREFORE – this subdivision is entitled to the following LDO Section 3.1.2.B./Table 3.1.2 development standards exclusively for “Cluster developments”:	Understood, site data table revised to reflect.
d.	the Rezoning Concept Plan includes a Site Data Table that clearly states Minimum Lot Width to be 42’, rather than the LDO’s standard of 40’ – Staff interprets this as a Voluntary Condition by the Applicant to a More Restrictive Lot width that is binding and applicable now at the PSP stage.:	Understood, site data table revised to reflect.
e.	See the example clip from another project, created to capture the version of the LDO that is applicable to that subdivision. Please create a Note such as this (staff suggested language below) and place this PROMINENTLY on the Cover Sheet and any other Sheets that include typical Site Data information. “Project Rezoning was submitted August 2022. The property’s RM-CZ Zoning District is therefore subject to LDO Section 3.1.B/3.1.2.B/Table 3.1.2. Cluster Development standards for Minimum Lot Area (size), Width, and Building Setbacks in effect as of August 2022. Specifically this is prior to the April 4, 2023 Adoption of Text Amendment TA-23-02 which modified these Cluster Development standards.”	Note added, see cover sheet bottom left corner just right of Parking Calculations
f.	Make any/all revisions to the Plan set to be consistent with this summary of how the “Cluster” standards apply to this particular subdivision.	Done
ENGINEERING - Jacquie Thompson		NOT APPROVED
1	Fix overlap.	Shifted
2	Label cul de sac radii, typical.	Labeled
3	According to the Town's Standards Manual, a collector street has 15' lane widths instead of 12'. Based on conversations during the August 2024 TRC meeting, we discussed having Street A (from Jonesville Rd to Gideon Dr) and Gideon Street (from Universal Dr to Street A) be collector streets. It was also discussed that a trip generation study could be done to reduce any of the potential collectors to local roads. Please clarify if the intent is for these roads to be local or collector roads, and correct the typical sections accordingly.	See sheet 14 for the revised typical cross-sections, more discussions between engineer / municipality about the north intersection of Road C at Gideon Dr where we can eliminate the sidewalk on the west side and ignore the horizontal curve minimum design criteria to get through this pinch.
4	SCMs should be designed during CD level; any design notes for SCMs should be provided in the CD set. Consider revising this note at that time.	Note # 10 (out of 12) on sheet 16 was removed, will add back in CID
5	While we recognize the grading detail is determined at CD level, some comments were made to confirm that grading will not impact the site layout and/or lots. Please provide a response for each individual comment if there is a reason for not addressing them, or providing clarity. I've copied over the relevant comments from the previous review and turned some of them green for CD/future submittal comments.	We have added Grading, there was an issue beside lot 13 the greenway trail was too high off the ground for too long so we shifted the lots and relocated the access to the greenway trail. See sheet 21
6	Confirm all grading does not exceed 3:1 slope throughout grading plans.	It appeared steep due to only showing road grading, we ensure all slopes are 3:1 or flatter across the site.
7	If details are to be included in the PSP submittal, they need to be updated accordingly so it is not assumed they are "approved". Please update details to include Wake County details for erosion control details.	Details remove, I miss read the last comment about adding the Tree Protection Fence.

8	Please show any grading or drainage improvements. We recognize there may not be any storm improvements but with new sidewalk and pavement, please clarify what grading will occur. Is there any pavement removal or other demo or is existing pavement just being restriped? Will any milling occur or how will existing pavement/stripping be removed?	See sheet 33, we added grading and storm pipes. Yes Milling will occur and will provide details on CID's
9	Please show any grading or drainage improvements. We recognize there may not be any storm improvements but with new pavement, please clarify what grading will occur. Is there any pavement removal or other demo or is existing pavement just being restriped? Will any milling occur or how will existing pavement/stripping be removed?	See sheet 35, we added grading and storm pipes. Yes Milling will occur and will provide details on CID's
A	Confirm additional/appropriate EC measures are provided at the wetlands.	We have Tree Protection & Silt Fence Combo Fences for the construction near the wetlands, we believe this is sufficient but will confirm when we get to the calculations for the EC Plans.
B	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.	We are still making changes to the plans due to sizing the SCM, submitting 401/404, and cut/fill tables, we are still working on where all the EC measures will be located, will have for CID's
C	Very steep greenway access. Grading for the greenways will be required during CDs. Ensure the greenway section fits within the easement. Per the Standard Engineering Manual, a 10' greenway with 2' shoulders and 3:1 grading is required for public greenways and recommended for private greenways.	It appeared steep due to only showing road grading, we now have the lots graded and you can see that the slope off the road is almost flat. See sheet 19
D	Show grading for parking lot. Show spaces and confirm ADA accessibility.	See sheet 19
E	Show grading for bio-retention pond.	See sheet 21
PARKS & RECREATION - Eddie Henderson		APPROVED
	No Further Comments	
COR PUBLIC UTILITIES - Tim Beasley		NOT APPROVED
1	SS must be extended to the upstream adjacent parcels.	Easement provided to the northern adjacent property, per meeting, the physical line and SSMH are not required due to unnecessary maintenance for a section that might not ever be used.
2	You are still not showing the full waterline extension. Raleigh Water will not be approving these plans until full utility extensions are shown.	Sheet 39-48 were showing extension, email sent and received the added comment #6 by email.
3	Please add a condition of approval note that states "A water model is required to be completed by the project engineer to demonstrate that the proposed water line extension will provide adequate fire flow and pressure for the proposed development."	See sheet 23 lower right corner, note has been added.
4	The public waterline ext. along Jonesville Rd should extend to the full extent of the property frontage.	See sheet 28, we thought it better to place on opposite side for other developer.
5	If this is not a future public road stub, the waterline should end with the FH.	It is a public road stub for future extension.
6	The ex. waterline at Mitchell Mill and Watkins Rd is located on the south side of Mitchell Mill Rd. Also, the proposed waterline extension would need to be DIP material, there would need to be a FH every 400' and there would need to be a 12" mainline valve every 1000' (located within 50' of a FH).	See sheets 40-49, we have complied with comments.
WAKE COUNTY FIRE / EMS - Brittany Hocutt		NOT APPROVED
1	*Fire apparatus turnaround near lot 1 will require signage indicating "no parking- fire apparatus turnaround" or similar verbiage.	See sheet 12
NCDOT – Jacob Nicholson		APPROVED
	No Further Comments	
WAKE COUNTY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT - Janet Boyer		APPROVED
	No comments were received, which is not atypical for preliminary subdivision	