

To: Richard Collier, McKim & Creed
From: Brian Chambers, Senior Planner; 910.342.2782
CC: File;
Date: 1/10/2022
Re: Riverlights MX 2A Townhomes TRC Rev 1

The following is a list of comments for review from planning regarding the project. Please provide your corrections as listed below. A staff summary of comments:

Staff	Department	Notes
Brian Chambers	Planning, Plan Review	Comments below
Eric Seidel	Engineering	Comments attached
Chris Walker	Comments attached	Comments attached
Mitesh Baxi	Traffic Engineering	Comments attached
Bill McDow	Transportation	Comments attached

Planning Review

Brian Chambers, brian.chambers@wilmingtonnc.gov, 910.342.2782

Comments:

- A new easement will be required for the relocated MUP and the existing easements will need to be abandoned via City Council action.
- Consider master plan exhibit similar to what was submitted for Riverlights MX-3 with all information on a single sheet for ease of reference and update.
- Provide building lot coverage in site data table.
- Provide total number of units in site data table.
- Save protected tree east of Building 9, back corner of lots 27/28.
- Adjust sidewalk location in open areas away from protected trees. Apply CRZ setback and maximum disturbance within this area.
- Identify trash compactor location, provide screening detail.
- Provide covenants/restrictions that demonstrate unified control/ownership of site (Sec 18-185(d)(6).
- Provide documentation verifying community property owners association (Sec 18-185(d)(7).
- Provide narrative describing how project incorporates required site design elements. Provide building elevations. (Sec. 18-185 (d)(13))
- Provide updated master tree removal exhibit.
- Identify streets as public/private rights-of-way.

Project Name: Riverlights MX-2A Townhomes
Pre-TRC Date: 01/13/2022
Reviewer: Eric Seidel, PE
Department: Engineering – Plan Review Section

1. Provide updated SWP2015012R4 pages 3 & 4, which accounts for the Future BUA allocation used for the Townhome project. The overall Future Development Allocation, on page 3 of the R4 permit, is 150,957sf with the Townhomes proposing 108,552sf, this would leave 42,405 sf for Future development. However, the BUA allocated for SCM #7, on page 4, is 108,552sf so this would ultimately go to 0.
2. There are concerns regarding the substantial difference in horizontal street curve radii when compared to the City Technical Standard of 100'. Plan for discussion during Formal TRC.
3. There are concerns regarding lots 38-43 fronting on an Alley. Typical Road section D found on sheet CT300 labels it as an Alley. Plan for discussion during Formal TRC.
4. There are constructability concerns along Road B concerning the transition between curb inlets, curb & gutter, and driveways. Typical Detail shows standard curb & gutter while keynote labels show it as Valley. If the curb is to be valley then a standard valley curb frame and grate needs to be used and appropriately labeled on the plans with detail. Would a reverse crown street section work along Road B?
5. Please Note with the amount of variance to technical standard design criteria and standard cross sections the City would like these streets to remain Private.
6. CS-100: Update Impervious Areas within the Site Data table to match Application & Narrative.
7. Please Note: The Re-aligned Multi Use path must be constructed prior to the issuance of any CO's.
8. Unless BUA Deed Restrictions are provided, the restrictive covenant must have language restricting property owners the right to impervious expansion on individual lots.

Project Name: **RiverLights MX-2A Townhomes**

Formal TRC Date: Jan 13, 2022

Reviewer Name: Chris Walker

Reviewer Department/Division: Fire

Please address the following:

- Road B appears to be 13' on CS100 and differs on the cross section. Please clear this up on which is correct. Emergency Vehicle Access needs to be a minimum of 14' for one way.
- The turning movements appear to be calculated using a 35' garbage truck. Please illustrate auto-turns using the 46' Ladder Truck. (Sutphen SPH 100) for reference.

**You may omit note 5 on CS100 regarding radio signal strength testing as this project does not trigger a test

Project Name: **RIVERLIGHTS MX2A TOWNHOMES**
Formal TRC Date: **01.13.2022**
Reviewer Name: **Mitesh Baxi**
Reviewer Department/Division: **PDT/Traffic Engineering**

- Please clarify and callout whether the proposed ROWs will be public or private. Comments are subject to change based on the interpretation whether the proposed Roads are public or private ROWs.
- All private streets shall be designed and constructed to meet or exceed the public street standards as specified by the [city's] Technical Standards and Specifications Manual. [[Sec.18-495 \(C\) CofW LDC](#)]
- For proposed ROWs, provide a separate sheet for signage and pavement marking plan showing all proposed traffic control signs, street name signs, and related pavement markings locations and types. [[CofW Sign Specification and Installation Guide](#)] Subject to further comments based on this plan.
- Streetlights shall be installed within subdivisions in accordance with the Technical Standards and Specifications Manual. At the time of submittal to the technical review committee, it shall be noted on the plan whether standard or non-standard streetlights will be provided. [[Sec. 18-498 CofW Updated LDC](#)]. If the streets are proposed as public ROWs and clarified on the plans, a layout for the Standard Street lighting will be provided with the next review.

TECHNICAL STANDARDS:

1. Provide the stopping sight distance for the proposed mid-block crosswalk on Road A. [[AASHTO](#)]
2. MUTCD Section 2B.11: *'If yield (stop) lines and Yield Here To (Stop Here For) Pedestrians signs are used in advance of a crosswalk that crosses an uncontrolled multi-lane approach, they should be placed 20 to 50 feet in advance of the nearest crosswalk line (see Section 3B.16 and Figure 3B-17), and parking should be prohibited in the area between the yield (stop) line and the crosswalk.'*
If Road A is not a multi-lane, 'Yield Here To Pedestrians' signs and relevant pavement markings are not required. Ideal location of crosswalk is, out of the horizontal curve and close to the street intersection. Additional pedestrian crossing warning signage may be required.
3. Keynote SR-2 at the end of Watercraft Ferry Ave. An accessible ramp is not required mid-way of the sidewalk. Please explain the requirement.
4. Show and apply the City's 46'x46' sight distance triangle at the intersection of Road D on the site plan and landscaping plan. [[Sec. 18-667 Figure 18-667 CofW Updated LDC: Vision clearance](#)].
5. Proposed on-street parallel parking shall not be striped.
6. Provide a turning movement analysis of a fire vehicle, if expected to access these streets.
7. Provide the detail of proposed accessible curb ramp at the street corners. Detectable warning domes shall be installed at the transition of curb to aisle.

Please let me know if you have any questions or if I can be of further assistance.

Project Name: **RIVERLIGHTS MX2A TOWN HOUSES**

TRC Date: **01.13.2022**

Reviewer Name: **BILL McDow**

Reviewer Department/Division: **PDT/Transportation Planning**

TECHNICAL STANDARDS:

1. The proposed Riverlights Townhouses do not appear to be part of the original Riverlights TIA. The project appears to be changing the number/ location of access points, trip generation and trip distribution for the project. Changes to the existing TIA may be required. Please contact the WMPO, Scott A. James, PE (910) 473-5130, scott.james@wilmingtonnc.gov to discuss these changes.
2. Please clarify how the proposed estimated Trip Generation numbers are determined, specifically the methodology applied for internal capture percentages. Please contact Scott A. James, PE. Scott.james@wilmingtonnc.gov to discuss the methods applied.
3. The proposed centerline dimensions for the proposed street and alleys do not meet the minimum requirements of the Standard Detail in the City Technical Standards. [\[Table 2, page 7-5, City Technical Standards.\]](#) A variance request has been submitted to the DCA review committee.
4. The Road A, Road B, and Road C do not appear to meet minimum technical standards for the Horizontal Center Line Radius for a local street or alley. [\[Table 2, page 7-5, City Technical Standards.\]](#) A variance request has been submitted to the DCA review committee.
5. The proposed Road A Street Cross Section does not meet the minimum technical standard for an alley and for driveway access width for Emergency vehicles. Please increase the cross section, (paved street and header curbs), from 14 feet to 16 feet minimum. [\[Table 1, page 7-4, City Technical Standards.\]](#) A variance request can be submitted to the DCA review committee.
6. The proposed Road D Cross Section does not meet the minimum technical standard for an emergency vehicle turnaround. Please revise the cross section for the turnaround. [\[Standard Detail, SD-3-05, City of Wilmington Technical Standards.\]](#) A variance request can be submitted to the DCA review committee.
7. Please provide approved street names for the subdivision streets, (Road A, Road B, Road C and Road D).