



---

**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 2

**DATE:** March 17, 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.

**Engineering – LJB**

---

Sam Williams – 919.594.6735 (swilliams@ljbinc.com)

1. Provide ADA ramps at locations where sidewalks cross the road (typical throughout the plan).

**PDG Response:** Noted. ADA ramps have been provided at all locations throughout the plan where sidewalks cross the road.

2. There are no crosswalks across Street E.

**PDG Response:** Noted. There are now (2) crosswalks provided across Street E with associated ADA ramps.

3. Consider adding crosswalks to north and south legs of roundabout. The southernmost crossing of Street A is at Street P.

**PDG Response:** Noted. Hi-viz crosswalks have been added to the north and south legs of the roundabout.

4. Consider adding crosswalks at driveways connecting to NCDOT roads (typical).

**PDG Response:** Noted. Crosswalks and ADA ramps now provided at all driveways connecting to NCDOT roads.

5. Consider crosswalk at this location.

**PDG Response:** Crosswalk and ADA ramps now provided at this location.

6. Consider crosswalks here.

**PDG Response:** Crosswalks and ADA ramps now provided here.

7. Add an ADA ramp.

**PDG Response:** ADA ramp now added here.

8. Add an ADA ramp.

**PDG Response:** ADA ramp now added here.

9. Cul-de-sac on Street E shows sidewalk around the bulb. Why does sidewalk not go all the way around the cul-de-sacs on this sheet? Consider extending sidewalk.

**PDG Response:** All cul-de-sacs now provide sidewalk around the entire bulb.

10. Consider adding crosswalks and/or ADA ramps.

**PDG Response:** Noted. Crosswalks and ADA ramps now added at this location.

11. Will erosion control measures be included in the next submittal?

**PDG Response:** No. They will be provided at time of CD submittals.

12. For documentation purposes, please upload these emails to the GeoCivix portal.

**PDG Response:** Noted. The emails have been added to the current (3<sup>rd</sup> PD) submittal package.

**Town of Zebulon – Planning**

---

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

1. The town would like to encourage the applicant to evaluate where more active and Urban open space could be provided to better align with the required amount of open space for a typical single family attached development.

**PDG Response:** Noted. We evaluated and found opportunity for a bit more Urban Open Space in the Northern half of the development. We've also now provided more potential elements in the narrative that may be included within the various Urban and Passive Open Space areas distributed throughout the site.

2. Staff acknowledges request for no buffers being provided in this location, but staff still suggests providing a buffer that would be consistent with UDO Section 5.6.10.

**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.

3. Staff acknowledges request for no buffers being provided in this location, but staff still suggests providing a buffer that would be consistent with UDO Section 5.6.10.

**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.

4. Staff acknowledges request for no buffers being provided in this location, but staff still suggests providing a buffer that would be consistent with UDO Section 5.6.10.

**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.

5. Staff acknowledges request for no buffers being provided in this location, but staff still suggests providing a buffer that would be consistent with UDO Section 5.6.10.

**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.

6. Parks and Rec: This portion of the greenway would be considered private and would not be maintained by the town.

**PDG Response:** Noted. The Site Layout Plan sheets (C-2.0 & C-2.1) now have labels reflecting this accordingly.

7. Parks and Rec: Recommends moving the pickleball courts further away from the single-family lots due to the noise produced by the courts.

**PDG Response:** Noted. The pickleball courts and the pool area have switched locations with each other to provide a greater horizontal separation between the single-family residential lots and the pickleball courts. The labels on design sheets reflect this for now, and more detail will be provided for these amenities at CDs.

8. Parks and Rec: This portion of the greenway would be considered private and would not be maintained by the town.

**PDG Response:** Noted. The Site Layout Plan sheets (C-2.0 & C-2.1) now have labels reflecting this accordingly.

9. Parks and Rec: This portion of the greenway would be considered public.

**PDG Response:** Noted. The Site Layout Plan sheet (C-2.1) now has labels reflecting this accordingly

10. Parks and Rec: This portion of the greenway would be considered private and would not be maintained by the town.

**PDG Response:** Noted. The Site Layout Plan sheets (C-2.0 & C-2.1) now have labels reflecting this accordingly.

11. Parks and Rec: Have requested that none of the fitness trail be on the public portion of the greenway.

**PDG Response:** Noted. The fitness trail exercise stations have now been removed from the public portion of the greenway.

12. Please consider making sure that all portions of the private or public greenway is on HOA property and not on individual lots.

**PDG Response:** The single-family rear & side lot lines have been reconfigured to assure that the entire greenway and associated easement is not on individual lots.

13. Please consider making sure that all portions of the private or public greenway is on HOA property and not on individual lots.

**PDG Response:** The single-family rear & side lot lines have been reconfigured to assure that the entire greenway and associated easement is not on individual lots.

14. Please consider making sure that all portions of the private or public greenway is on HOA property and not on individual lots.

**PDG Response:** The single-family rear & side lot lines have been reconfigured to assure that the entire greenway and associated easement is not on individual lots.

15. These points can only count for a private HOA maintained greenways. Looking at the prepared conditions and the Master Plan it appears the greenway will be publicly dedicated. These points would not be applicable.

**PDG Response:** Noted. Due to Master Plan review comments from ToZ Parks & Rec. department, all of the greenways/trailheads running N-S off of the main E-W greenway will be privately owned and maintained by the HOA. The total length of the private HOA maintained greenways is +/-4,065 linear feet, which is greater than 3,000 so the points can still be applied.

16. Please make sure that it is noted on the plans and within the narrative that this amenity will be provided.

**PDG Response:** Noted. A different selection has now been chosen for bonus points within the 4E Section of the Allocation Worksheet. This is now labeled on Site Layout Plan, sheet C-2.0, within the Master Plan set, and the narrative now states this amenity will be provided.

### **Town of Zebulon – Public Works**

---

Joseph Collins – 919.823.1808 (jcollins@townofzebulon.org)

1. If this is an alley please label. Alleys are private not part of the dedicated ROW.

**PDG Response:** Yes, that is a private alley. All alleys have now been labeled as PRIVATE ALLEY on Master Plan sheets C-2.0, C-2.6, C-3.0, C-4.0, and L-1.0.

2. Please ensure all street trees include the detail for the root barrier. TOZ detail 47.

**PDG Response:** Noted. ToZ standard detail #47 has now been added to landscape plan sheets L-1.0 & L-1.1. Also, a callout has been provided on these two sheets that states all street trees to provide ToZ root barrier and refers to the detail.

**Wake County – Soil & Erosion Control**

---

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

3. Confirm reference

**PDG Response:** Noted. This was a typo, and now refers to the correct sheet, C-4.1.

4. Confirm reference

**PDG Response:** Noted. This was a typo, and now refers to the correct sheet, C-4.0.

5. Please include the development standards for high density as the project is required to meet i.e. treating first inch.

**PDG Response:** Noted. This is now added into the SIA for this submittal.

6. What is the post with the SCM

**PDG Response:** This information will be provided with the CD submittal once grading is finalized.

7. Need to use the Wake County Municipal Stormwater Design Tool for Zebulon jurisdiction.

**PDG Response:** Noted. The correct spreadsheet will be used for this submittal.

8. Spelling

**PDG Response:** This is now corrected.

9. Is the drainage area map for the downstream impact analysis or the pre-development outfalls for the site?

**PDG Response:** It's for the pre-development outfall for the site (DA-1).

10. Is it possible to breakdown pre-DA1 into smaller sections to be consistent with the post-development SCM sections? Also, are you accounting for the development of the adjacent property?

**PDG Response:** We will include a breakdown of Pre-DA1 into smaller sections consistent with the post-development SCM sections in the CD submittal. This will allow for a direct comparison of pre- and post-development conditions. The adjacent

property's runoff is accounted for and discharges into the protected stream flowing north, bypassing our onsite SCM's.

11. Confirm that this is correct.

**PDG Response:** Noted. It was mislabeled and is now corrected.

12. Unable to review data without knowing the acres of drainage to each SCM.

**PDG Response:** Noted. Acreage/size of each SCM drainage area is now provided.