



---

**MEMORANDUM**

---

**TO:** Town of Zebulon  
Planning Department  
1003 N. Arendell Ave.  
Zebulon, NC 27597

**FROM:** Josh Leab  
Pabst Design Group, PA  
107 Fayetteville St., Suite 200  
Raleigh, NC 27601

**SUBJECT:** Old Bunn Road Subdivision  
#1555968  
PD - 2<sup>nd</sup> Submittal  
Comment Responses – Review Cycle 1

**DATE:** February 14, 2025

---

To whom it may concern,

In reply to 1<sup>st</sup> review comments received, Pabst Design Group, PA, offers the following responses as described below. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact our office. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance with this project.

**City of Raleigh – CORPUD**

---

Michael Fowler – 919.996.2524 ([mike.fowler@raleighnc.gov](mailto:mike.fowler@raleighnc.gov))

1. Show size and material of existing mains.

**PDG Response:** Size and material of existing water main in Old Bunn Road is now provided on the utility plan. Existing 12" DIP water main (data source: Barrington Subdivision Phase 1 As-builts from Priest, Craven & Associates, Inc., dated 7.1.2020). To be updated when field located by project surveyor.

2. Extend public water mains along all interior & abutting ROWs of development - Sections 8-2063 & PU Handbook pg. 34.

**PDG Response:** Public water mains are extended along all interior and abutting ROWs of development.

3. Annexation into Zebulon ETJ and city limits required before any connection to Raleigh Water public utility system.

**PDG Response:** Noted. Annexation Petition is currently under review with ToZ.

4. In all residential districts, mains shall be six inch and eight-inch, six inch to be used only where it completes a good gridiron, but in no case in blocks of more than 600 feet in length. Maximum length of six-inch and eight-inch lines, without connection to a larger main are 1200 feet and 2000 feet, respectively. The maximum length of dead end six-inch and eight-inch lines are 600 feet and 1200 feet.

**PDG Response:** Noted. The water mains have been preliminarily designed throughout this development to comply with these standards but will be fully addressed at time of CD submittals.

5. When responding to staff comments, please indicate the method of resolution and reference the location on the plans where corrections were made. If the comment remains outstanding, please respond that it is not resolved and provide a status or description of ongoing efforts. Further review may be required after re-submittal. Please feel free to contact me if any clarity is needed regarding the comments at [mike.fowler@raleighnc.gov](mailto:mike.fowler@raleighnc.gov).

**PDG Response:** Noted. We have provided revision clouds around areas that have changed due to Raleigh Water comments. We have thoroughly responded to all comments and made clear which issues are addressed or still outstanding.

6. More comments will be made at CD plan review

**PDG Response:** Noted.

#### **Engineering – LJB**

Sam Williams – 919.594.6735 ([swilliams@ljbinc.com](mailto:swilliams@ljbinc.com))

---

1. Per UDO Section 6.8.1.A, "Sidewalks shall be provided along both sides of all streets in the residential, mixed-use, and NC, GC, and HC districts. Applies throughout site plan.

**PDG Response:** Noted. All proposed streets have now been updated to provide sidewalks along both sides of the street throughout the development.

2. Ensure that the parking lot stem length meets UDO requirements in Section 5.1.F

**PDG Response:** Noted. Parking lot stems now updated to comply with code.

3. Provide parking lot space dimensions to meet UDO requirements in Section 5.8.5.B.

**PDG Response:** Noted. Parking lot space dimensions are now provided on Site Layout Plan sheets (C-2.0/2.1) and meet the UDO requirements of Section 5.8.5.B.

4. Provide street parking space dimensions to meet UDO requirements in Section 5.8.5.B.

**PDG Response:** Noted. Street parking space dimensions are now provided on Site Layout Plan sheets (C-2.0/2.1) and meet the UDO requirements of Section 5.8.5.B.

5. Provide crosswalk markings. Applies throughout the site plan.

**PDG Response:** Noted. Crosswalk markings have been provided throughout the site.

6. Is there public access to this open space from within the development?

**PDG Response:** Yes. This open space entry point has now been revised to provide access between the two parcels that frame it.

7. Provide dimensions for all alleys.

**PDG Response:** Dimensions have now been provided on all alleys on the Site Layout Plan (sheet C-2.0).

8. Ensure that parking lot stem length meets UDO requirements in Section 5.1.F.

**PDG Response:** Noted. Parking lot stems now updated to comply with code.

9. Ensure that parking lot stem length meets UDO requirements in Section 5.1.F.

**PDG Response:** Noted. Parking lot stems now updated to comply with code.

10. Ensure that greenway crossing of street complies with Zebulon greenway standards.

**PDG Response:** Noted. It is confirmed that greenway crossing complies with ToZ greenway standards.

11. What are these lines showing?

**PDG Response:** Those two lines were stray lines and have been deleted from plans.

12. Provide sight triangles in both directions.

**PDG Response:** Noted. Sight triangles now provided in both directions.

13. Potential for vehicle to block sight triangle.

**PDG Response:** Noted. Parking space has been deleted.

14. Potential for vehicle to block sight triangle.

**PDG Response:** Noted. Parking space has been deleted.

15. Provide access easement to all SCMs. Applies throughout the site plan.

**PDG Response:** Access & maintenance easements are now provided for all SCM devices throughout plan.

16. Potential for vehicle to block sight triangle.

**PDG Response:** Noted. Parking space has been deleted.

17. Consider providing pedestrian crossing to allow pedestrians using greenway to cross street.

**PDG Response:** Noted. A hi-visibility pedestrian crossing has been provided for pedestrians using greenway to cross street.

18. **Traffic Impact Analysis Comment:**

Per Zebulon UDO Section 6.13.D.5, "The analysis year for all future scenarios is one year following the development's scheduled completion year (build + 1)."

**Stantec Response:** Town staff approved the study (MOU) of 2028 per emails from Adam Culpepper (6.21.2024) and Catherine Farrell (10.2.2024). These emails can be provided if necessary.

---

**Zebulon Fire Department (Chris Bissette)**

919.823.1808 – ([fire.idt@townofzebulon.org](mailto:fire.idt@townofzebulon.org))

1. Minimum road width must be 26'

**PDG Response:** Noted. All the dimensions for the proposed roads throughout the plan were mistakenly placed in the wrong places. All plan dimensions for road widths have been updated to be in the correct locations, and all proposed roads are 26' and greater in width.

2. Dead end streets must have a turnaround per NC Fire Code Appendix D.

**PDG Response:** Noted. Fire apparatus turnarounds are provided via the private alleys. Minimum pavement width of the alley is 20', heavy duty pavement section meeting fire code requirements, and curb returns of 28' are now provided. Turnaround has been provided w/in a "fire apparatus" access easement outside of the public right-of-way.

Truck turning template provided.

3. Tree growth will hamper future fire apparatus access.

**PDG Response:** Noted. Both of these areas have been updated to provide fewer trees and/or much smaller trees to alleviate this potential future conflict.

#### **Town of Zebulon – Planning**

---

Catherine Farrell – 919.823.1809 ([cfarrell@townofzebulon.org](mailto:cfarrell@townofzebulon.org))

1. The PD format allows flexibility for the developer to propose a district that varies from what is allowed by right in the UDO. It is the Board of Commissioners' role to determine if what is being provided by the PD, through alternate means of compliance, meets the intent of the UDO. As you go through this process, we urge you to keep in mind the requests you make and how you hope to offset any proposed conditions.

**PDG Response:** Noted.

2. The UDO defines Active Open Space as, "Land set aside for the residents or a development and under common ownership that is configured for active forms of recreation. Active open space typically includes playgrounds, athletic fields and courts, and similar features devoted to movement, activity, or sports pursuits." Staff Recommends adding in a requirement for a % of the open spaces to be dedicated to Urban Open Space. This would include amenities such as dog parks, pocket parks, outdoor gathering areas with grills, etc.). By adding Urban Open space, it allows the project to better align with the requirements of the ordinance while still meeting the intent of providing outdoor amenities.

**PDG Response:** Noted. See revised Open Space callouts on Layout Plan sheet C-2.0 & C-2.1 and updated Open Space calculations in The Site Data Table on the Cover sheet. Also see list of potential Open Space amenities in the narrative included in this 2<sup>nd</sup> PD submittal package.

3. A dog park would not be considered as Active open space but would be considered Urban Open Space.

**PDG Response:** Noted. This dog park is now designated as Urban Open Space. See revised Open Space callouts on Layout Plan sheet C-2.0 & C-2.1 and updated Open Space calculations in The Site Data Table on the Cover sheet.

4. Please note how this space will be activated. Details of what may be used to activate the pocket parks could be included in the PD Narrative. This could be in the form of specific amenities or a list of potential amenities that the developer can pick from at a later date.

**PDG Response:** Noted. See revised Open Space callouts on Layout Plan sheet C-2.0 & C-2.1 and updated Open Space calculations in The Site Data Table on the Cover sheet. Also see list of potential Open Space amenities in the narrative included in this 2<sup>nd</sup> PD submittal package.

5. Please show NC HWY 97 as a 4 Lane Median Divided as required by the Comprehensive Transportation Plan. This would include the additional lane, width for half of the median, Curb, Gutter, Planting Strip, and Sidewalk. It will be the responsibility of the developer to construct their half of the road.

**PDG Response:** Offsite Road improvements are now provided along NC HWY 97.

6. Please show Old Bunn Rd as a 4 Lane Median Divided as required by the Comprehensive Transportation Plan. This would include the additional lane, width for half of the median, Curb, Gutter, Planting Strip, and Sidewalk. It will be the responsibility of the developer to construct their half of the road.

**PDG Response:** Offsite Road improvements are now provided along Old Bunn Road.

7. Per section 6.8.1.A of the UDO sidewalks are required on both sides of the street.

**PDG Response:** Noted. All proposed streets have now been updated to provide sidewalks along both sides of the street throughout the development.

8. Greenway paths are not considered Active open space.

**PDG Response:** Per dialogue with ToZ Planning staff at Town Hall on 10.19.23, Planner Adam Culpepper stated that we could “activate” the greenway with exercise equipment in multiple locations to consider calling that area Active Open Space. We propose to provide exercise stations approximately every 350-400 linear feet of greenway to activate the entire greenway system corridor (easement area) throughout all instances of new greenway within the development.

9. Please note how this space will be activated. Details of what may be used to activate the pocket parks could be included in the PD Narrative. This could be in the form of specific amenities or a list of potential amenities that the developer can pick from at a later date.

**PDG Response:** Noted. See revised Open Space callouts on Layout Plan sheet C-2.0 & C-2.1 and updated Open Space calculations in The Site Data Table on the Cover sheet. Also see list of potential Open Space amenities in the narrative included in this 2<sup>nd</sup> PD submittal package.

10. Please note how this space will be activated. Details of what may be used to activate the pocket parks could be included in the PD Narrative. This could be in the form of specific amenities or a list of potential amenities that the developer can pick from at a later date.

**PDG Response:** Noted. See revised Open Space callouts on Layout Plan sheet C-2.0 & C-2.1 and updated Open Space calculations in The Site Data Table on the Cover sheet. Also see list of potential Open Space amenities in the narrative included in this 2<sup>nd</sup> PD submittal package.

11. Please note how this space will be activated. Details of what may be used to activate the pocket parks could be included in the PD Narrative. This could be in the form of specific amenities or a list of potential amenities that the developer can pick from at a later date.

**PDG Response:** Noted. See revised Open Space callouts on Layout Plan sheet C-2.0 & C-2.1 and updated Open Space calculations in The Site Data Table on the Cover sheet. Also see list of potential Open Space amenities in the narrative included in this 2<sup>nd</sup> PD submittal package.

12. Please note how this space will be activated. Details of what may be used to activate the pocket parks could be included in the PD Narrative. This could be in the form of specific amenities or a list of potential amenities that the developer can pick from at a later date.

**PDG Response:** Noted. See revised Open Space callouts on Layout Plan sheet C-2.0 & C-2.1 and updated Open Space calculations in The Site Data Table on the Cover sheet. Also see list of potential Open Space amenities in the narrative included in this 2<sup>nd</sup> PD submittal package.

13. A community garden could be counted as Urban Open Space.

**PDG Response:** Noted. This community garden is now designated as Urban Open Space.

14. Please note how this space will be activated. Details of what may be used to activate the pocket parks could be included in the PD Narrative. This could be in the form of specific amenities or a list of potential amenities that the developer can pick from at a later date.

**PDG Response:** Noted. See revised Open Space callouts on Layout Plan sheet C-2.0 & C-2.1 and updated Open Space calculations in The Site Data Table on the Cover sheet. Also see list of potential Open Space amenities in the narrative included in this 2<sup>nd</sup> PD submittal package.

15. A dog park would not be considered as Active open space but would be considered Urban Open Space.

**PDG Response:** Noted. This dog park is now designated as Urban Open Space.

16. Staff suggests providing an additional stub in this area to provide better future site access.

**PDG Response:** Noted. An additional stub has been provided in this area.

17. Staff suggests providing an additional stub in this area to provide better future site access.

**PDG Response:** Noted. An additional stub has been provided in this area.

18. All parking spaces must be within 50 ft of a shade tree (UDO 5.6.9). These trees will have to be separate trees than the street trees show in the ROW. Please note an additional tree may be required. If you would like to propose a condition to deviate from this requirement, please add it to the listed conditions.

**PDG Response:** Noted. An additional shade has been added outside of the right-of-way to ensure all parking spaces are within 50' of a shade tree. Furthermore, all other parking lots have been checked and revised/confirmed to meet this code as well.

19. **SHEET L-1.0**

Staff recommend a 20' type B buffer to be provided along the eastern boundary line (UDO Section 5.6.10). This buffer would be the most consistent with the required buffer between a dense residential district and a low-density district.

**PDG Response:** Noted. The southeastern corner of the site has been revised to provide a 20' wide Type D (opaque) Perimeter Buffer along the eastern property line for the portion adjacent to parcel identified by PIN:2715-39-7060 and inhabited by the Paul Family. No buffer is proposed to be provided north of that parcel along the eastern property line adjacent to parcel identified by PIN:2715-58-9125. That parcel is currently vacant, owned by a business corporation, and when developed, will most likely be a PD adjacent to a PD development.

20. **SHEET L-1.0**

Staff recommend a 10' type A buffer to be provided along the ~~eastern~~ western boundary line (UDO Section 5.6.10). This buffer would be the most consistent with the required buffer between two similar residential zoning districts.

**PDG Response:** Noted. For clarification, markups on Master Plan sheets provided by ToZ staff show this comment placed with a cloud around the western boundary line. No buffer is proposed to be provided along the western property line for this development. The first 1,890 linear feet projected north of the Old Bunn Road right-of-way along the western property line is adjacent to a +/-120' wide permanent conservation easement on parcels identified by PIN:2715-19-5341, 2715-19-5860, 2716-10-5069, 2716-10-5368, & 2716-10-5772, found on DB 18542, PG 1854. The remainder of that property line (north of the Conservation Easement parcels) is adjacent to the recently approved/constructed Barrington Subdivision which consists of single-family homes located up against the property line with no buffer provided. The adjacent uses will be the same and the treatment on our side of the boundary will match existing with no buffer.

21. Please provide a 15' Modified type C buffer along Old Bunn Rd and NC HWY 97 (UDO Section 5.6.12) where no town homes are being fronted.

**PDG Response:** A 15' Modified type C buffer is now provided along Old Bunn Rd and NC HWY 97 where no town homes are being fronted.



22. **SHEET L-1.1**

Staff recommend a 20' type B buffer to be provided along the eastern boundary line (UDO Section 5.6.10). This buffer would be the most consistent with the required buffer between a dense residential district and a low-density district.

**PDG Response:** Noted. The southeastern corner of the site has been revised to provide a 20' wide Type D (opaque) Perimeter Buffer along the eastern property line for the portion adjacent to parcel identified by PIN:2715-39-7060 and inhabited by the Paul Family. No buffer is proposed to be provided north of that parcel along the eastern property line adjacent to parcel identified by PIN:2715-58-9125. That parcel is currently vacant, owned by an business corporation, and when developed, will most likely be a PD adjacent to a PD development.

23. **SHEET L-1.1**

Staff recommend a 10' type A buffer to be provided along the ~~eastern~~ western boundary line (UDO Section 5.6.10). This buffer would be the most consistent with the required buffer between two similar residential zoning districts.

**PDG Response:** Noted. For clarification, markups on Master Plan sheets provided by ToZ staff show this comment placed with a cloud around the western boundary line. No buffer is proposed to be provided along the western property line for this development. The first 1,890 linear feet projected north of the Old Bunn Road right-of-way along the western property line is adjacent to a +/-120' wide permanent Conservation easement on parcels identified by PIN:2715-19-5341, 2715-19-5860, 2716-10-5069, 2716-10-5368, & 2716-10-5772, found on DB 18542, PG 1854. The remainder of that property line (north of the Conservation Easement parcels) is adjacent to the recently approved/constructed Barrington Subdivision which consists of single-family homes located up against the property line with no buffer provided. The adjacent uses will be the same and the treatment on our side of the boundary will match existing with no buffer.

24. Where are you proposing this typical section be used? If you are proposing it along Old Bunn Rd and 97 staff would prefer that the required 4 Land Median divided be followed.

**PDG Response:** That referred to Longstanton Ave., the major subdivision corridor E-W through the northern half of the development.

25. This is an old version of the Utility Allocation policy. Please see the Town of Zebulon website for the updated policy.

**PDG Response:** Noted. The Utility Allocation policy being used is now the current version found on the ToZ website. The table on the cover sheet has been updated and the Policy document submitted with the PD resubmittal package has been updated.

26. This item requires the activation of the Open Space. Examples of this would include Lakes with Boat launch, a Frisbee Golf Course, etc.

**PDG Response:** Noted. The bonus points from section 2A in the UAP are no longer being considered for this development.

27. Please note that in order to get points these shade trees would have to be in addition to any required landscaping.

**PDG Response:** Noted. 9 native shade trees will be provided in addition to any/all required landscaping to get these 9 specific bonus points in section 3A of the UAP. They are currently shown in the northern-most proposed dog park but may shift to other open space areas throughout the design/review/approval process.

28. The new version of the UAP requires the greenway to be built to Town of Zebulon standards.

**PDG Response:** Noted. Those standards will be adhered to at the time of Construction Drawings submittal, review, and approval.

- 29. Comment Cate brought up at 1.8.25 TRC meeting that she said she just overlooked during plan review:**

Although we know that it is an environmentally sensitive area, staff would like to see a street stub or some sort of right-of-way dedication provided to the north, like somewhere near Street H.

**PDG Response:** Noted. Right-of-way is now provided as proposed dedication to the northern property line in the northwest corner of the site. The Street H alignment was continued north of Longstanton Ave. to create this right-of-way dedication and a stub w/ curb returns provided.

---

**Wake County – Soil & Erosion Control**

Carrie Mitchell – 919.856.6386 (carrie.[mitchell@wake.gov](mailto:carrie.mitchell@wake.gov))

1. Additional comments uploaded in the Wake Review Checklist.

**PDG Response:** Noted. Per correspondence with Carrie Mitchell at the TRC meeting on 1.8.25, most of the Wake Review Checklist comments will be adequately addressed with upcoming CD submittals.

2. Provide public and private drainage easements.

**PDG Response:** Noted. Public and private drainage easements are now provided.

3. Will the existing pond be used as a SCM i.e. detention?

**PDG Response:** No. Per this pond's jurisdictional classification, it's not allowed.

4. Provide SCM access and maintenance easements; will need to ensure access to the Public Right of Way.

**PDG Response:** Noted. Access & maintenance easements are now provided for all SCM devices throughout the plan.

5. Verify/review the location of this headwall.

**PDG Response:** Noted. The headwall has been relocated and no longer exists on the single-family home lot.

6. Will need to consider the SCM outfall and the SS and FM in some locations.

**PDG Response:** Understood. This has been preliminarily reviewed for conflict resolution, but we'll be fully addressing this at the time of CD submittal. We do not have that level of detail yet with the sanitary sewer alignment subsurface elevations.

7. How is runoff from Street H being treated?

**PDG Response:** Stormwater runoff from Street H is being captured by catch basins within Street H, conveyed through storm pipes heading north, then east, then northeast until it is directed to SCM Wet Basin north & east of cul-de-sac at the northern end of Street K.