

## Response to Comment SUMMARY document.

### PSP-23-03–Reserve(fka5109) @ Mitchell Mill–3rdSubmittal review cycle

#### PLANNING/ZONING

1.Continue to Provide a Written Response to ALL the comments received.

**SREG: We shall do our best efforts to comply with staff requests**

2.Continue to Update/add revision Dates to all submittal documents.

**SREG: We shall do our best efforts to comply with staff requests**

3.Cloud and Bubble all areas of revisions in the plan set–this is critical for Staff to know what has/not been changed and to compare versions(which will be even more important comparing V3 to V2 and V1).

**SREG: We shall do our best efforts to comply with staff requests Some areas are new and thus not applicable.**

4.Continue to Flatten or “OPTIMIZE” the PDF’s when creating(especially the PSP plan set).

**SREG: We shall do our best efforts to comply with staff requests**

5.See PDF Memo from WithersRavenel with39written Comments– many are Repeats, some are New based on changes made.

**SREG: We shall do our best efforts to comply with W&R Comments**

6.See PDF from WithersRavenel of Mark-up comments on the PSP plan set–there looks to be about 73 entries/comments.

**SREG: We shall do our best efforts to comply with W&R Comments. They are a separate document.**

7.NEW–THIS APPLICATION CANNOT UTILIZE TA23-06–THIS PROPERTY ATTAINED ZONING APPROVAL PRIOR TO ITSEXISTENCE AND THE TEXT LANGUAGE INLDO SECTION5.1.2.b.5.c.1 requires “Private Access Easements may be utilized for subdivision Lot frontage requirements only where the associated development plan has been approved by the Town Board of Commissioners via a

Conditional Zoning (CZ) District process. “Thus, this property and this project did not request/receive Rezoning approval to utilize this section. Therefore, this project is subject to LDO9.2.1.A.1.– “All subdivision lots shall abut at least twenty (20) feet on a public street.

**SREG: As noted, all townhomes are located on public alleys and streets with mini frontage being met.**

“8.REPEAT AGAIN-Phasing-Staff strongly suggests a Phasing plan be created that is logical and constructable, and can relate to Construction Drawing approvals, Wake Co. stormwater permitting requirements, and recording lots in Phases to facilitate/speed up the home construction.

**SREG: Our Client is still in progress with builders and such a phasing plan is not finalized at this moment due to unusual market conditions.**

9.REPEAT AGAIN-Addresses & Street Names–Contact Wake County GIS/911 to go through the Street Naming process and have Lot Addresses assigned. Every lot–residential, open space, HOA, etc.–should attain an Address.

**SREG: After the 3<sup>rd</sup> Submittal, we received final streets names from Wake County 911 and street names are now shown on the plan.**

10.REPEAT-Cover Sheet/Site Data Table–Site Information / Acreages for the two districts–MA 22-06 Exhibit 2stated the NC District was 54.558 Net Acres and the RM District 84.033 Net Acres. Given this is the Preliminary Subdivision Plat of the land, items like the now Right-of-way dedication is determined, and any further fine-tuning of surveying is completed, the acreages of the 2 Districts should not be expressed as (EST), or estimates. Revise to include the actual surveyed acreage of both Zoning Districts. Either add/include the Exhibit 2 from MA 22-06 or add/include a new Survey of the entire subject property that includes the breakdown of the 2 Zoning Districts. Staff suggests adding [accurate/actual Acreages] to current Sheet C-3.0 unless that makes this drawing busier than it already is. Applicant response is “New survey is ordered and in-progress.

**SREG: The open space calculations have been revised as per new sheets C-6.0 thru C-6.3.**

11. REPEAT V2 Comment#14-Response was the clip below; Staff cannot locate the noted Note 8; always tell Staff on what sheet in the plans to find (a revision); also, if going to reference a meeting, include Notes/Minutes of that meeting, not

relying on Staff's memory to recall the same that the Applicant recalls. Again, clarify in detail.

**SREG: It is best to share our meeting notes to ensure that they are accurate and agreed upon in the future.**

12.REPEAT–Cover Sheet is not reflecting this. Cover Sheet/Site Data Table–The LDO Section 3.4/Table 3.4.3. NC District Development Standards uses the terminology of “Building Placement (min/max)” and “Front/Side/Rear”–revise the Table replacing “Front Yard”, Side yard”, etc. with the appropriate terminology. Ex for NC-CZ–“Building Placement / Front–15’ minimum”.

**SREG: Revised as per town code Vocabulary.**

13.REPEAT–It is still just saying “Commercial Tract (15%): 8.08 acres–this is the mathematical Minimum, there is no expression of what is actually being Proposed. Sheet C-5.7 notes Lot 1/Block A as 8.51 acres; Clarify/revise. Cover Sheet/Site Data Table–LDO3.4.3.D.1. requires an NC District to have a Minimum 15%allocation of gross area for non residential uses–This expresses8.18 acres, which calculated as15% of the expressed 55 AC (Est)–This is the minimum requirement, but what is the Proposed amount? Add this and annotate each as “Min. Req./Proposed” .It would be appropriate to also cite the LDO for these requirements so it is clear as where they originate (a supposed to something voluntarily committed to via a Zoning Condition for instance).

**SREG: The Commercial area is set aside for an 8.08 acre development. However, at this time not final decisions have been made on the design or content of the commercial clients. Thus, it must remain a future element.**

14.Repeat–The Town does not possess a signed set of Conditions of Approval; as the Applicant, the Applicant should provide that to Town Staff, and then include those signed Conditions in the plan set. Removing blank signature blocks is not including Signed Conditions of Approval. Sheet C-1.1/C-1.2–These Conditions of Approval are un-signed; if they are going to include signature blocks, they should be signed. Staff notes that the Version of Conditions included in the Town Board packet for January 17, 2023 were also unsigned; a Signed Version of these Conditions should be supplied to Town Planning for final records of the Rezoning, and those Conditions included in the PSP plan set.

**SREG: The approved Zoning conditions from the Jan 17 meeting are attached and under separate cover the signed conditions will be sent to the town.**

15. NEW–Sheet C-1.2–The ‘right side table’– it says “RH”–This project does not have RH zoning, but rather RM–revise these erroneous references to RH; this was also present on V2 Sheet C-1.2, but not caught error.

**SREG: This typo has been revised, and to remove confusion this sheet has been removed from the set**

16. REPEAT--Sheet C-1.2--(Now, V3, the [should be RM, and NOT RH, table) –Now this says “Required Conservation Space” – it makes not mention of “Cluster” nor LDO Sec.3.1.B.1.” –why is this NOT referencing the key LDO development standard that is the crux of this entire subdivision??

**SREG: To remove confusion this sheet C1.2 has been removed from the set, see new sheet C-6.0 to 6.3.**

17. NEW– Sheet C-1.2–the “right side table” –a. What is “Total Buffer” of 3.77 acres supposed to be demonstrating? b. What is “50% Buffer” of 1.88 acres (obviously 50% of the 3.77 acres of ‘ Total Buffer’ –but what is that? What is the “Total Area” line of 47.93 (acres??) expressing? The 5 lines above it, those 5 acreage amounts total 51.69 acres. This is terribly confusing. d. What is “ Bonus Space exceeding 40%” supposed to be demonstrating? e. Generally there is no following what any of the figures in this table are supposed to be representing. There is only 1 LDO section reference in this whole table, which does not help.

**SREG: To remove confusion this sheet C1.2 has been removed from the set, see new sheet C-6.0 to 6.3.**

18. NEW– Sheet C-1.2–the NC-CZ District(left) table–ditto the questions observed in the “right side” table.

**SREG: To remove confusion this sheet C1.2 has been removed from the set, see new sheet C-6.0 to 6.3.**

19. REPEAT--Sheet C-5.0 through C-5.9–Every Lot shall be labeled–Block and Lot–including all non-residential lots.

**SREG: This is still in progress and will appear on later CD drawings.**

20.REPEAT–Addresses are still not present on Plans–Original Comment : Like lot number references, there are host of lots with no addresses; defer to Wake Co. GIS/911 as to whether or not they will provide an address to every open space or park lot, but in Staff’s opinion, they should have an address just like a Lot reference.

**SREG: This is still in progress and will appear on later CD drawings. Please indicate which code section we should be following to comply with this comment.**

21.NEW–Street Names–attain approved Street Names from Wake County GIS/911 and include on plans.

**SREG: Street names have been approved by Wake County GIS/911 and are shown.**

22.NEW–See Example clip; Detach the highlighted lines of information from this Underlined header of Building Setbacks–Required Buffer areas are totally different than Building Setbacks; Buffer areas are overall, site or subdivision perimeters areas, whereas Building Setbacks delineate a buildable envelope **within each individual development lot.**

**SREG Cover sheet revised.**

23.NEW–Cover Sheet/“Site Information” Table/ Impervious Areas–this states the 53.88 acre NC-CZ District will only develop 8.47 acres of “Total On-Site Impervious Area” –how is that possible, to build all the houses and all the non-residential development in the ~8 acre non-residential tract? Is this the wrong interpretation of this information?

**SREG Cover sheet revised.**

24.NEW–Sheet5 is “Civil Notes” – these are all about actual construction; remove and include in CID plan set, which isa constructable plan set; PSP is not a constructable plan set. Revise Cover Sheet Sheet index accordingly.

**SREG Cover sheet revised.**

## **Eddie Henderson - Rolesville Parks and Recreation**

- 1.(REPEAT V2 Comment #\_1) Sidewalks within NRB crossing areas– Please confirm the width of these sidewalk so revise plans to show the width of these sidewalks; they appear to be wider than a “normal location” sidewalk, but lack dimension call-out. FYI, the Town considers a/any 10’ wide off-street-but-parallel-to-street pedestrian facility to be a Sidepath, regardless of concrete or asphalt.

**SREG These paths are intended to be 10’ wide.**

- 2.Confirm the Greenway will connect to the proposed Greenway at the proposed Harris Creek Farm project.

**SREG: The updated plans show connections to the now approved Harris Creek Farm Project.**

- 3.(V2 Comment)-Previous Bike Lane comment/clarification–(A.) Revise Plans (or confirm that they are presently shown) to show Bike Lanes within Right-of-ways of adjacent Jonesville Road and Mitchell Mill Road. Please reach out to staff for a meeting if desired. (B.) Revise Plans to show Bike Lanes on Street J, as a street with bike lanes that connects/stubs to Gro Peg Lane in this area is shown on the 2022 Bike Plan. (see Page 59 specifically)

**SREG: Bike lanes are shown on the plans.**

4. (NEW)-The routing of the greenway is significantly less desirable compared to the previous(V2) version. The Greenway now has been rerouted to the home side of three additional stormwater ponds and no longer follows the wetlands in these areas. Additionally, there are several sections of Greenway that are no longer present. Please provide a written response to explain these changes or revise the Greenway to show how it was (Previously).

**SREG: The Greenway routing is now along the high side of the SCMS to avoid conflicts with the spillways that would wash out any greenway path in the case of a catastrophic storm event. The Greenway is still connecting to the off-site locations for future connectivity.**

## Engineering-Brian Laux / JacqueThompson

See Two(2)PDF's of:

(1.)Memo written comments (52+ some for future CID plans) dated04/02/2024;

**SREG: This is noted, please see the comment responses within this submittal.**

(2.) Mark-up comments on the PSP Plan set.

**SREG: This is noted, please see the comment responses within this submittal.**

## COR Public Utilities-Tim BeasleyV3

-Waterlines have now been added to Mitchell Mill and Jonesville Rd but the proposed full extensions bring water to this subdivision should be shown.

All public streets should have full waterline extensions.

The sewer design must be changed so that sewer does not exceed 20' installation depth.

**SREG: Drawings have been revised to meet COR requirements and the sewer line re-routed to avoid exceeding 20ft depth.**

## Wake Co Watershed Mgmnt-Janet Boyer

See PDF of Wake County Presub Plan Review, dated 02-07-2024.

**SREG: This is noted.**

## Wake County Fire /EMS-Brittany Hocutt

1.CUL-DE-SACS MEASURING 74 FT-80 FT MINIMUM REQUIRED.

**SREG: As Noted Cul de sacs have been redesigned with 80ft minimum radius**

2.NO PARKING SIGNS SHALL BE PLACED ON ALLEYS 1-4 AND THE ENDS OF THE PRIVATE R/W AS THIS WILL BE USED FOR FIRE TRUCK TURNAROUND.

**SREG: Construction drawings will note no parking signs on the alleys**

3.PLANTS/TREES SHALL NOT BE INSTALLED WITHIN 3 FT OF FIRE HYDRANTS-MULTIPLE NOTED WITHIN 3 FT-PAGES 54-62.

**SREG: Plants and Trees shall be planted no less than 3ft from fire hydrants.**

Note added to CD's

## NCDOT Jacob Nicholson

1. See PDF, NCDOT Congestion Management TIA Review Report dated October 7, 2022, for 5109 Mitchell Mill project.

**SREG: This is noted, the plans have been designed in accordance with the TIA**

2. Revise plans to show the TIA improvements so that the R/W can be set properly. This would include the Right-turn lane agreed to with DOT to shift from the now eliminated "Access 6" to "Access 7".

**SREG: The plans have been updated to reflect the TIA recommendations. Please see the site plan sheets.**

3. Note—"Access 5" (Street E on the plans) is supposed to be restricted to right-in/right-out, so some sort of channelization will be needed. That might change the R/W and or the width of the driveway throat.

**SREG: Access 5 has been adjusted to be a right-in/right-out entrance, see Sheet C5.8**

4. Clarify if a Median Island is planned to be installed, and/or if the Town has any opinion (on accepting a median island in a new Town street).

**SREG: There will be no proposed median on Mitchell Mill Road, there will be a proposed dedicated future right-of-way for future improvements by other developers.**