

FLMENGINEERING

January 2, 2025

Michael Elabarger
Assistant Planning Director
TRC Coordinator
Town of Rolesville
P.O. Box 250
502 Southtown Circle
Rolesville, NC 27571

**Reference: SDP-24-05 Pine Glo
Review #3 Comment Response Letter**

Dear Mr. Elabarger:

Per the comments received on December 9, 2024, please see the below comment responses and revised site development plan and associated documents:

Planning

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

This letter contains written responses to all comments.

2. Continue to Add revision dates to all submittal materials.

Revisions dates have been added (see revision block on plans).

3. Continue to Cloud or bubble all changes to Staff knows where/what a Revision is, greatly improving Re-review and helps avoid “repeating” comments due to lack of clarity as to if/where revisions were made.

To avoid plan clutter, the revisions have not been clouded but are clearly noted in this letter for reference.

4. FYI Demolition Permit was issued on 10/31/2024.

This comment is noted.

5. FYI – Building Height – TA-24-02, to revise Building Heights in all LDO Non-residential Zoning Districts, is now anticipated to be presented to the Town Board of Commissioners at the January 7, 2025 Business meeting; IF adopted by the Board, all references to Permitted Building Height will need to be revised to mesh with the LDO as amended by TA-24-02.

This comment is noted. Please provide the approved amendment once adopted.

6. FYI - Alternative Parking Plan (APP) request – this request is anticipated to be presented to the Town Board of Commissioners at the January 7, 2025 Business meeting; The remainder of the review of this SDP hinges on the parking decision by Town Board.

This comment is noted.

7. REPEAT Comment from Elevations mark-ups – No response was provided for the following comment and does not appear to have been addressed in the updated elevations: Per LDO Section 6.8.D.3.c, the maximum continuous blank wall area for any building shall be a maximum of 50-sf without a break by windows, doors, architectural features greater than one foot in depth or substantial material change. Please alter this portion of what appears to be more than 50-sf of blank wall to comply with these requirements. The architect should provide a written response as to why this comment appears to have been ignored.

Revised elevations are included with this resubmittal.

8. REPEAT Comment from Elevations mark-ups – No response was provided for the following comment and does not appear to have been addressed in the updated elevations: Please provide a legend with building materials. Note, building materials shall comply with LDO Section 6.8.2.D.4.a. Building colors shall comply with LDO Section 6.8.2.D.5. Without a legend illustrating building materials or colors, compliance with non-residential building standards in accordance with the LDO cannot be determined. Please provide with updated elevations. Refer to the markups provided as part of the V2 review.

Revised elevations are included with this resubmittal.

9. Partial Repeat - Sheet C-10, Landscape Plan – A note should be added to sheets C-6, 8, 9, 10, & 11 stating that all Tree Protection Fencing shall comply with the requirements of LDO 6.2.4.5 which requires all TPF to remain in place until a CO is issued and that no more than 25% of the CRZ may be disturbed.

We are awaiting a response from Meredith Gruber per my email dated December 12, 2024. Pending Meredith's response, we will address any remaining tree preservation items with the last submittal following the results of the January 7th board meeting.

Engineering

Sheet C-6:

1. Please confirm if the proposed crosswalks will be ADA accessible and if pedestrian ramps will be provided at the concrete sidewalk and the mulch trail.

a. If pedestrian ramps are to be provided, please show spot elevations.

b. Please confirm whether a curb cut will be provided for the mulch trail locations if a pedestrian ramp is not going to be provided.

Per our discussion during TRC, the crosswalks at the concrete sidewalk and mulch trail will not be ADA accessible since the walk and trail will not be ADA compliant; thus, not ADA ramps will be provided at those locations. Curb cuts will not be provided to keep the mulch from washing into the parking lot.

2. REPEAT: NCDOT will require a structure to connect the storm system on the south side of the site, instead of outlet-ing with an FES..

The FES has been moved 6' away from the existing storm inlet per coordination with NCDOT.

Miscellaneous:

Previously we requested for confirmation there is adequate tree protection.

Per LDO 6.2.4.5.B.8, for a 24" DBH tree, the tree protection fencing should be placed 24-feet from the tree trunk. In total, tree fencing should be ~48-feet in diameter. Please revise the site plan, grading limits, and/or tree protection plan.

While we recognize the tightness of the site, by protecting only the trunk of the tree, the tree could result in damage if the roots are impacted during construction or if the equipment damages the

branches when working underneath the trees. Please coordinate with the contractor at the time of construction to take care when working in this area, specifically when grading.
- No action is needed for the SDP Approval.

This comment is noted.

COR PUD

1. I understand that the plan maybe the use the ex. WMs if needed but these will require Raleigh approved BFPs (RPZ) in heated enclosures within 50' of piping from the water meters. Please go ahead and show the BFPs (size, make and model # "or Raleigh approved equal) and call out the sizes of the ex. WMs.

The existing meter sizes and size, make, and model of the existing RPZs at each location have been noted on the existing conditions plan and utility plan, sheets C-3 and C-5, respectively.

2. Please show a valve at the property line for the proposed fire line.

A valve has been shown at the property line as requested. See the utility plan, sheet C-5.

NCDOT

1. REPEAT -- A (ITE) Trip Generation Memo will be needed to determine if a TIA is required or not. Looking at the plans on the town's TRC website, the proposed land use is a highly variable use in terms of trip intensity.

The trip generation memo has been uploaded.

2. Full review of the plans will occur as a part of the NCDOT Driveway Permit review process.

Per our offline emails, we have shown the concrete island at the northeastern driveway and have moved the flared end section 6' from the existing storm inlet such that the flared end section and dissipator are not within the right-of-way.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need any additional information.

Sincerely,



Jon D. Frazier, PE, LEED AP
Principal
919.610.1051
jfrazier@flmengineering.com