



**Application Number:** PRSUBD20245707  
**Application Type:** Public Infrastructure  
**Application Name:** Oldham Village - Street and Storm, Sanitary, and Water

Please note our comment responses in bold below.

### Traffic Review – Streets

1. The sidewalk along the south/west side of Oldham from Jefferson to the field house should be a 10 FT multi-use path. Please change.

The 10 FT multi-use use is not consistently shown on all sheets. Specifically, the Plan and Profile sheet for Oldham still shows a 5 Ft sidewalk. Additionally, the Profiles need to be updated and the reference should be for a multi-use or Shared use path as the design is different from that of a sidewalk. **REVISED.**

2. Plans should include demo of the driveway at the church property.

If the church drive is not being removed with these plans, please add a note to the plans that the north most entrance to the site should not be built until the church parking lot is build and the existing church drive is removed. **ADDED LABELS SHEET C.202.**

3. A traffic phasing plan will need to be included with plans, i.e. how will traffic be handled during construction and any detour routes that may be needed.

This is still not sufficient. You will need to show which roads will be closed when, which closures will be done at the same time and how the local traffic will access their homes. This cannot be left to construction but should be worked out now as with any Capital Improvement project within the City. **STILL BEING COMPLETED**

4. The east/west leg of the intersection at Oldham and Fieldhouse should be named SW Fieldhouse Drive on both sides of Oldham. There cannot be two intersection streets with the same name. The north/south leg of the "seven street" can remain SW Jefferson Street. **RENAMED STREETS.**

5. The sag vertical curve on Oldham Pkwy at Low PT Sta. 11+57.28 has a K Value below the minimum required of 49. Please adjust to as close to the minimum as possible. **UPDATED**

6. There are some misc. notes at the bottom of the profiles that need to be cleaned up. **REVISED.**

7. All public streets in this development should be concrete rather than asphalt. Please revise the profiles to reflect this. **REVISED.**

8. No Streetlight plans were included with this submission. **STILL BEING COMPLETED**

9. No signal plans were included with this submission. **STILL BEING COMPLETED**



**Engineering Review - Street and Storm**

1. Refer to comment #1 in previous applicant letter. Sheet C.220: Scale is incorrect. Correction required. **REVISED.**
2. Refer to comment #4 in previous applicant letter. Details for the ADA-accessible ramps were requested, but the response only identified a standard detail on Sheet C.601 which is not adequate. All ADA-accessible ramps shall be designed and detailed for each case. Correction required. **ADDED SHEETS C.210, C.211.**
3. Refer to comment #5 in previous applicant letter. Detailing of the ADA-accessible route across intersections was requested, but not provided. All ADA-accessible routes across intersections shall be detailed with width, cross-slope, running slope and location. Particular care shall be taken to ensure ADA-accessible routes across intersections in the stop-controlled condition are less than 1.5% cross-slope, 5 foot minimum width. Correction required. **REVISED.**
4. Index on cover sheet does not match the order or naming of the plans contained within the plan set. Correction required. **REVISED.**
5. Sheet C.211 Detail 4: The ADA accessible route shown at this location does not line-up with the north side of the street. Correction required. **REVISED.**
6. Refer to comment #6 in previous applicant letter. Signage plan is still missing. It is not possible to perform a full review without the signage plan, as it makes the review of stop-controlled intersections difficult. Provide a signage plan for the resubmittal. Correction required. **ADDED.**
7. Refer to comment #17 in previous applicant letter. A design for the 10 foot shared-use path was requested, but only a schematic was provided on Sheet C.100. This is not sufficient for design of the shared-use path. A complete design is required, including plan, profile, and typical section view. Correction required. **PLAN WAS INCLUDED ON C.100 AND GRADING IS SHOWN ON C.200**
8. Refer to comment #19 in previous applicant letter. A drainage table and drainage area map were requested, but was not submitted within the plans. Correction required. **ADDED.**
9. Refer to comment #22 in previous applicant letter. Rip rap design and dimension callouts and material callouts were requested, but the response to comments stated it is still "under design". No further review was conducted. Correction required. **ADDED.**
10. Sheet C.301: There is still a smaller 36 inch pipe entering a larger 48 inch pipe below the crown of the 48 inch pipe. Correction required. **REVISED.**
11. Refer to comment #25 in previous applicant letter. None of the typical sections provided for this project in regard to street construction is sufficient for arterial streets. The Design and Construction Manual requires the design to be completed with the aid of a geotechnical report based on actual sampling and based on Section 5203.11 of the Design and Construction Manual. Correction required. **PAVEMENT HAS BEEN UPDATED PER GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEER RECOMMENDATIONS**



12. Refer to comment #25 in the previous applicant letter. In addition to a engineered design of the pavement based on a geotechnical report, all pavements shall include either chemically-stabilized subgrade or geogrid in the design of the base layer. Correction required. **PAVEMENT DESIGN IS BASED ON GEOTECHNICAL DESIGN**

13. Regardless of the design of the arterial street pavement sections, the asphaltic concrete or portland cement concrete sections shall be KCMMB mix. Correction required. **REVISED.**

14. It is difficult to determine how the 10 foot shared-use path can be constructed in a way that complies with ADA. For instance, the schematic view of the shared-use path shows the path ends at the top of the retaining wall. How will the path connect to the park? Corrections required. **C.100 SHOWS THE PLAN VIEW AND C.200 SHOWS THE GRADING**

15. Inlet 2-1 to 1-5 storm line should be private, not public. Change the label of field inlet 2-1 to private. Correction required. **REVISED.**

16. Are you proposing a straight cantilever retaining wall with no banter? Informational comment?

17. Go through the plans and correct north arrows that are not correct. I found instances where the north arrow was not aligned correctly. Corrections required. **REVISED.**

18. Cost estimate required prior to formal approval. Informational comment. **PROVIDED WITH SUBMITTAL.**

#### **Engineering Review - Streetlight**

26. Streetlight plans and traffic signal plans were missing. Correction required. **STREETLIGHT AND SIGNAL PLANS ARE BEING COMPLETED**

#### **Engineering Review - Water**

1. 1. Sheet C502: The connection point does not appear to have changed because it is still shown on the east side of Jefferson. Correction required. **REVISED.**

2. Sheet C502: There appears to be less than 18" minimum separation. There are other storm crossings near sta. 3+50, 6+60 7+40 and 10+20 not shown in the profile. Correction required. **REVISED.**

3. Sheet C.502: The tee at Sta. 2+79 was not changed to a cross. Change this to a cross. Correction required. **REVISED.**

4. Sheet C.502: Line 2 was moved south so it is out of the street. The tee at Sta. 10+48. 78 needs a corrected station. The 8" valve should be (E). The 12" valve should be (S). Correction required. **REVISED.**

5. Sheet C.502: Line 4 should have 3 valves at the tee. Correction required. **REVISED.**

6. Sheet C.503: It is difficult to see the location of the utility easement on this sheet for much of the water main. Correction required. **REVISED.**



7. Sheet C.503: The water main is above the storm between Sta. 13+00 and Sta. 14+00. These lines need to be separated. Can a junction box be installed to move the storm closer to the street? **REVISED.**
8. Sheet C.503: Add the Storm crossing near Sta. 22+00 to the profile. Correction required. **ADDED.**
9. Sheet C.504: Line 3, eliminate the bends at sta 1+53.5 and 1+66.63 and extend the water main northeast to the bend near sta 4+50. In other words, eliminate the jog. Correction required. **REVISED.**
10. Sheet C.504: Label the stationing and bend near sta 4+50. Correction required. **REVISED.**
11. Sheet C.504: Change the 8x8 inch tee stationing to match the stationing in line 2. Correction required. **REVISED.**
12. Sheet C.505: Add storm crossing near stations 0+15, 3+00, 4+65 and 5+50 to the profile. Add sewer crossing near Sta. 2+50 to the profile. Corrections required. **REVISED.**
13. Sheet C.504: Label the fitting near Sta. 0+30. Correction required. **REVISED.**
14. Sheet C.505: The alignment at 63+34.44 appears to line-up with the Jefferson St. water main. Make the connection with a bend to eliminate the tee and valve. Correction required. **REVISED.**
15. Sheet C.505: The segment of pipe on Line 5 is mostly less than 1200 foot radius of curvature from sta 1+00 and up, and thus needs fittings. Correction required. **ADDED.**
16. A cost estimate is required prior to formal approval. Informational comment. **PROVIDED WITH SUBMITTAL.**

#### **Engineering Review – Sanitary**

6. Lot 1 appears to be unserved by sanitary sewer. Response to comments states this lot is to be used for a parking lot, but this cannot be guaranteed if a new owner purchases this lot. Sanitary sewer service should be extended to serve Lot 1. Correction required. **DEVELOPER IS GETTING A LETTER FROM BUYER AND SELLER INDICATING THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE LOT DOES NOT HAVE SEWER BUT AN EASEMENT IS PROVIDED ON THE PLAT TO CONNECT TO THE SEWER MAIN ON OLDHAM**
7. Move manhole B-1 outside the limits of the intersection. Place it outside the limits of the wheel track area. The main issue is the manhole is still shown within the limits of the intersection, and needs to be moved. Correction required. **REVISED.**
11. Utility crossings are not shown in profiles. Correction required. **ADDED.**
14. Manhole A-5 is shown below finish grade on Sheet C.404. Correction required. **REVISED.**
19. Has there been any discussion with City of Lee's Summit Parks Department on the placement of the new sanitary sewer on Park's property? Shared-use path? We have had no discussions with Parks concerning this sanitary sewer line installation. Recommend meeting with Parks. Informational comment. **NOTED.**



21. Estimate required prior to formal approval. Informational comment. **PROVIDED WITH SUBMITTAL.**

Feel free to contact me should you have any additional questions regarding this project.

Thank You,

Matt Schlicht