

09/03/2024

V5 - Response to the  
V4 Comment  
SUMMARY  
Document

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

**SUBJECT: Reserve @ Mitchell Mill 4<sup>th</sup> Submittal PSP-23-03 TRC Summary Comment Response**

In response to review comments provided on 07/10/2024, we are providing the following comment responses:

**Planning & Zoning – Planning Staff and WithersRavenel**

1. *Continue* to Provide a Written Response to ALL the comments received.  
**SREG Response: Written responses to all comments are provided within this submittal**
2. *Continue* to Update/add revision Dates to all submittal documents.  
**SREG Response: Revision dates have been added to all elements of this submittal**
3. Continue to 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.  
**SREG Response: Revision clouds have been added to all revised elements on this submittal**
4. Continue to Flatten or “OPTIMIZE” the PDF’s when creating (especially the PSP plan set).  
**SREG Response: The PDF plan set within this submittal has been flattened as requested.**
5. See PDF Memo from WithersRavenel with 39 written Comments – many are Repeats, some are New based on changes made.  
**SREG Response: Responses to these comments from WithersRavenel are included as a separate file within this PSP submittal. Thank you**
6. Why were there 2 PDF’s submitted, one being a 1 Sheet property survey, the other being a 10-sheet set of drawings termed “topographic exhibit”.  
**SREG Response: These documents were requested as comment #10 of the previous TRC cycle**
7. **REPEAT (4th Time)** – Cover Sheet - Remove the references to TA 23-06 –

<b>BUILDING SETBACKS (MIN) NC-CZ (EMPLOYMENT OF TA 23-06)</b>	
FRONT:	15'
SIDE:	10'
REAR:	10'
SITE PERIMETER BUFFER TYPE 2:	15'
THOROUGHFARE BUFFER (JONESVILLE & MITCHELL MILL):	30'
<b>TOWNHOME SETBACKS NC-CZ (EMPLOYMENT OF TA 23-06)</b>	
FRONT 20:	20'
SIDE (STREET FRONTAGE):	10'
REAR:	20'

**SREG Response: This comment is labelled as “new” on the previous round of TRC comments. The reference to TA 23-06 has been removed.**

8. **REPEAT for the 4th Time - Phasing** – Applicant states “Client is still in progress with builders and such a phasing plan is not finalized at this moment due to unusual market conditions”. DO NOT resubmit this PSP without a Phasing plan; it will not be accepted without Phasing.

**SREG Response: A Phasing Plan is included as Sheet C4.0**

9. **REPEAT for the 4th Time - 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. Applicant response did not even broach the lack of Addresses; Street Names are now provided.

**SREG Response: Addresses are now shown on all Site Plan Sheets.**

10. **REPEAT for the 3rd Time** (Applicants V3 response is about open space calculations on Shts C-6.0 – C-6.3, which is not what this comment is about at all. The V2 Response was “New survey is ordered and in progress ) - Cover Sheet/Site Data Table – Site Information / Acreages for the two districts – MA 22-06 Exhibit 2 stated 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.

**SREG Response: The acreages of the 2 Districts are no longer expressed as “estimated”.**

**Surveyed acreages of both Zoning Districts is now used; survey was submitted in the previous PSP submittal. The acreages were not added to Sheet C3.0 for clarity purposes as advised.**

11. **REPEAT V2 Comment #14 (AGAIN)** – Applicant response is “It is best to share our meeting notes to ensure that they are accurate and agreed upon in the future”; Just comply with the LDO, period. - 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.

plan to go through the Rezoning process so as to take advantage of IA-23-05 for Townhome lot frontage purposes? \*\*\*\*

**SREG RESPONSE: See note 8, meeting of Jan 17, 2024 addressed this item. Plans on this submittal reflect the meeting agreement for the townhomes**

**SREG Response: All alleys are proposed as public ROW, therefore no longer requiring the need for TA 23-05.**

12. **REPEAT (AGAIN) – Cover Sheet -** “Commercial Tract (15%)” now says 9.66 ac, but it continues to delineate if this is the MINIMUM or the PROPOSED, which is the crux of the original Comment. NC District acreage is 53.89 x 0.15 : acres, so 9.66 acres being > 8.08 acres, presumption is 9.66 acres is

the “Proposed”. Cover Sheet/Site Data Table – LDO 3.4.3.D.1. requires an NC District to have a Minimum 15% allocation of gross area for nonresidential uses – This expresses 8.18 acres, which calculates as 15% 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 (as opposed to something voluntarily committed to via a Zoning Condition for instance).

**SREG Response: All sheets now show and label the proposed acreage of the future commercial site. The required minimum vs. the proposed amount is also clearly shown in the table on Sheet C6.0**

13. **REPEAT 3rd Time – Unsigned Conditions of Approval -** Applicant response of “The approved Zoning conditions from the Jan 17 meeting are attached and under separate cover the signed conditions will be sent to the town.”

- Sheet C-1.1 - there continue to be no signatures.
- V4 submittal did not contain any “attached” Conditions of Approval from the January 17th mtg - ?
- To date, the Town has not received signed Conditions under separate cover - ?

**SREG Response: The signed approved zoning conditions are included in the plans on Sheet C1.1**

14. **REPEAT for 3rd Time -- Sheet C-5.0 through C-5.9 –** Every Lot shall be labeled – Block and Lot – including all non- residential lots. Applicant response: “This is still in progress and will appear on later CD Drawings.” NO – Blocks and Lots is basic and primary Preliminary Subdivision information – DO NOT RESUBMIT without providing Blocks and Lot numbering.

**SREG Response: A Block and Lot plan is now included in the plans on Sheet C4.1**

15. **REPEAT AGAIN – Addresses are still not present on Plans –** Addresses are a basic subdivision component; Street names were attained, which means Wake Co GIS/911 can assign addresses. Addresses get officially created upon Final Plat recordation. The LDO is silent on this facet because it is so basic an item; Staff will perform a Text Amendment to make LDO require Lot Addresses at time of Preliminary Subdivision Plat.

**SREG Response: Addresses and Street names are now included in the plans.**

16. **REPEAT** – Cover Sheets/Site Information/ - the Perimeter Buffer and Thoroughfare Buffer is still immediately below the Front, Side, Rear Building setback information – Comment was to detach these Overall and Perimeter subdivision standards from those that apply to each and every residential lot – Applicant response is “Cover sheet Revised” – yet Cover sheet is unchanged. See the clip below, part of the original (V3) comment.

BUILDING SETBACKS (MIN) RM-CZ CLUSTER OPTION	
FRONT:	20'
SIDE:	5'
REAR:	20'
CORNER:	10'
SITE PERIMETER BUFFER TYPE 2:	15'
THOROUGHFARE BUFFER (JONESVILLE & MITCHELL MILL):	30'

  

BUILDING SETBACKS (MIN) NC-CZ	
FRONT:	15'
SIDE:	10'
REAR:	10'
SITE PERIMETER BUFFER TYPE 2:	15'
THOROUGHFARE BUFFER (JONESVILLE & MITCHELL MILL):	30'

TOWNHOME SETBACKS NC-CZ (EMPLOYMENT OF TA 22.08)

**SREG Response: The perimeter buffer and thoroughfare buffer information on the Cover Sheet has been relocated. See Sheet C1.0**

17. **REPEAT** – Cover Sheet/"Site Information" Table / Impervious Areas – Applicant response: Cover Sheet revise. The "Total On-Site Impervious Area" was revised from 8.47 acres to 9.62 acres – saying that within the entire 53.88 acre NC-CZ District, building ALL the houses, all the driveways, all the streets, and all the non-residential development in the ~8 acre non-residential tract – that all that development will only comprise 9.62 of the 53.88 acres??? Again, is Staff completely misinterpreting this information?

**SREG Response: The total on-site impervious area has been re-calculated and updated on Sheet C1.0**

18. **REPEAT** – The sheet of "Civil Notes" is still in this plan set; V3 is the 4th sheet, now V4 is the 3rd sheet – Applicant response: Cover Sheet revised. Staff see's no revision and again asks, these are all about actual construction, and this is Preliminary Subdivision so should they not be removed and include in CID plan set, which is a constructable plan set; PSP is not a constructable plan set. Revise Cover Sheet Sheet index accordingly.

**SREG Response: The Civil Notes have been removed from this plan set.**

### **Parks & Recreation – Eddie Henderson**

1. The routing of the Greenway is significantly less desirable compared to the previous (V2) version, now being rerouted to the home side of three additional stormwater ponds and no longer following the wetlands in these areas. Additionally, there are several sections of Greenway that are no longer present (Deleted) – WHY?. Please provide a written response to explain these changes or revise the Greenway to show how it was (Previously in V2). The previous response to staff's comment referencing a catastrophic storm event that may wash out a greenway is not a sufficient reason for the undesirable Greenway routing. Reminder: The Town is responsible for perpetual maintenance of the public Greenways; this is all taken into account at these location discussions/approvals. Greenways need to be not **directly adjacent to homes wherever possible (a Town decision)**. **Provide a response as to why the other sections of Greenway were removed.**

**SREG Response: The greenway routing has been updated, see Site Plan sheets.**

### **Engineering – Brian Laux / Jacque Thompson**

1. Memo written comments – there are just 2 on the PSP, and list for future CID plans.

**SREG Response: Responses to these comments from Bolton&Menk are included as a separate file within this PSP submittal. Thank you**

2. Mark-up comments on Part 1 PSP Plan set Sheets C-5.0 and C-5.4 only.

**SREG Response: Responses to these comments from Bolton&Menk are included as a separate file within this PSP submittal. Thank you**

### **Wake County Watershed Management – Janet Boyer**

1. V4: No comments were received, which is not unusual for Preliminary Subdivision; it is incumbent on the Applicant to vet whether or not the location and functionality of SCM's can be engineered and pass Wake County eventual SWF Permit requirements (without necessitating a major locational shift or excessive grading etc.).

**SREG Response: This is noted, thank you.**

### **COR Public Utilities – Tim Beasley**

1. See PDF of mark-ups – there are 18 entries/comments.

**SREG Response: Responses to these comments from CORPUD are included as a separate file within this PSP submittal. Thank you**

### **Wake County Fire / EMS – Brittany Hocutt**

1. ALLEYS WHERE HOUSES ARE TO BE ADDRESSED SHALL HAVE A NAME.

**SREG Response: All alleys now have street names, please see Site Plan sheets.**

2. ALLEYS SHALL HAVE THE SAME WEIGHT RATING AS MAIN ROADS TO SUPPORT LOADS OF FIRE TRUCKS THAT ARE THE PRIMARY ACCESS TO HOUSES- MINIMUM 80K POUNDS.

**SREG Response: This is noted, alleys will have the same weight rating as main roads on future CD submittals**

3. ALLEYS SHALL BE 20 FT WIDE AS THEY ARE THE PRIMARY ACCESS TO HOUSES.

**SREG Response: All alleys have been updated to a 20' wide pavement section, see Site Plan sheets and alley cross section on Sheet D1.0**

### **NCDOT – Jacob Nicholson**

1. 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.

**SREG Response: This is noted, thank you.**