

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Commercial Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan Applicant's Letter

Date: Tuesday, April 17, 2018

To:

Property Owner: OAKVIEW CAPITAL PARTNERS, Email: BRAD@OAKVIEWCP.COM

LC Fax #: <NO FAX NUMBER>

Applicant: OAKVIEW CAPITAL PARTNERS, LLC Email: BRAD@OAKVIEWCP.COM

Fax #: <NO FAX NUMBER>

Engineer: SCHLAGEL & ASSOCIATES Email:

Fax #: <NO FAX NUMBER>

From: Christina Stanton, Senior Planner

Re:

Application Number: PL2018033

Application Type: Commercial Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan

Application Name: OAKVIEW STORAGE DEVELOPMENT PHASE II **Location:** 1410 NE DOUGLAS ST, LEES SUMMIT, MO 64086

Electronic Plans for Resubmittal

Beginning Monday, May 23, 2016, all Planning application and development engineering plan resubmittals shall include an electronic copy of the documents as well as the required number of paper copies. This will allow us to provide a higher level of electronic correspondence with our Planning Commission, City Council, and the City's GIS Division.

Electronic copies shall be provided on CD in the following formats

- Plats All plats shall be provided in Tagged Image Format File (TIFF) Group 4 compression.
- Engineered Civil Plans All engineered civil plans shall be provided in Tagged Image Format File (TIFF) Group 4 compression. All sheets shall be individually saved and titled with the sheet title.
- Architectural and other plan drawings Architectural and other plan drawings, such as site electrical and landscaping, shall be provided in Portable Document Format (PDF).
- Studies Studies, such as stormwater and traffic, shall be provided in Portable Document Format (PDF).
- It is requested that each plan sheet be a maximum of 2MB.

Please contact Staff with any questions or concerns.

Excise Tax

On April 1, 1998, an excise tax on new development for road construction went into effect. This tax is levied based on the type of development and trips generated. If you require additional information about this development cost, as well as other permit costs and related fees, please contact the Development Services Department at (816) 969-1200.

Planning Commission and City Council Presentations

Presentations before the Planning Commission and City Council shall be (1) in electronic format or (2) reduced drawings for use on the document camera to display on the screen. Electronic presentations shall be on a laptop, CD-ROM, DVD, or flash drive. The City's presentation system can support Word, Excel, PowerPoint, Adobe, Windows Media Player and Internet Explorer applications. Presentation boards will no longer be allowed. The presentation(s) shall be submitted to Development Services Department staff no later than the day of the Planning Commission meeting by 4:00 pm.

Analysis of Commercial Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan:

Planning Review	Christina Stanton	Senior Planner	Corrections
	(816) 969-1607	Christina.Stanton@cityofls.net	

- 1. Please reconcile the land area numbers. The legal description says it is 4.2124 acres +/-, I realize a chunk of this is right-of-way so I tried just adding the 3 lots we are dealing with (1.24+0.92+0.81=2.97 acres). But, when I add the square feet for the sites (42,014.4+40,075.2+35,283.6=117,373.2; which, if you divide by 43,560 is 2.69). Please check these numbers to let me know what is off where.
- 2. Revise the number of trees provided for street frontage along NE Douglas Street to reflect the true number shown on the plan.
- 3. Reconcile differences on the Landscape Plan between the 5' height requested on the modifications request and the 6' shown on the planting table. In addition, label landscaping on the plan so staff can easily discern where the various species are located (it is difficult to determine the difference between the BSW and the JCSP on the plan).
- 4. Add a request for modification to the required 3' caliper to allow 2' caliper for the ornamental trees.

Engineering Review	Gene Williams	Senior Staff Engineer	Corrections
	(816) 969-1223	Gene. Williams@cityofls.net	

- 1. The detention study states that the entire site detention system will comply with all requirements of Section 5600 of the Design and Construction Manual. This is not an accurate statement, since at least three (3) design waivers will be required which waive certain aspects of the release rates at the various points of interest. These waivers were not discussed in the report. A revised detention study must be submitted which discusses these waivers, including any undetained portions of stormwater which exceed the allowables.
- 2. In the previous applicant letter, we had asked that a separate utility sheet be prepared. None was provided in the resubmittal.
- 3. In the previous applicant letter, we had asked that a private easement be shown for the interior water line. A public easement was shown.
- 4. Grading along the northeast portion of the project will alter the drainage flow patterns onto adjacent property, which may have an adverse impact on this property owner. In the previous applicant letter, we asked for a gradinig plan which showed elevations, since it was not possible to gain a clear understanding of what was being proposed in this area. Following the inclusion of elevation labels, it is clear that the drainage flow patterns are being affected in a potentially adverse way.
- 5. In the previous applicant letter, we had asked that sidewalk be shown along Victoria Dr., and it appears that none was provided. There is an outline of what appears to be a sidewalk, but no labeling. In addition, existing

non-compliant 4 foot sidewalk is shown along Douglas St., with no explanation on upgrades (i.e., minimum 5 feet). There are additional lines showing what appear to be a sidewalk along Douglas St., adjacent to the pavement, with no indication of width, or whether this sidewalk will be replaced. If adjacent to pavement, a minimum of 6 feet width is required.

- 6. In the previous comment letter, we had asked the question of whether the sanitary sewers would meet the depth requirements (i.e., no more than 15 feet of cover). The applicant failed to respond.
- 7. In the previous applicant letter, we had asked the a question concerning the connection of the west detention basin outfall to a private system owned by a separate entity. Although the applicant did not provide a written response, the plans show the same configuration (i.e., a storm line discharge is shown with a questionable connection point to the northwest of the project). It is unclear what adverse effects may occur by taking what was sheet flow, to a concentrated flow situation, or whether this discharge point will be connected to an existing private underground system. If daylighting at this location, it appears this will create an adverse situation for the adjacent property owner, since what was draining via sheet flow, will now be concentrated point flow.
- 8. In the previous applicant letter, we had asked the applicant to ensure that all retaining walls are outside the limits of any public easements. It appears the north retaining wall is partially contained within a public utility easement.
- 9. It is still unclear where the northeast detention basin will discharge. The PDP shows a detention basin with no apparent point of discharge. We had asked the applicant the question of whether as-builts or actual field measurements were consulted to determine whether the basins could be constructed as shown, but received no response. We are assuming the northeast detention basin will connect to the existing City system along Douglas St., but without a response, and without this shown on the plans, it can only be speculated.
- 10. It is not clear from the revised detention study how or where the emergency spillway will function. The emergency spillway must be designed assuming 100% clogging of the primary outlet works. Please see Section 5600 of the Design and Construction Manual for specific references to emergency spillway design.
- 11. In regard to the above comment, it is not clear whether the receiving system can manage the 100 year storm event assuming a 100% clogging event (i.e., assuming 100% clogging of the primary outlet works). If utilizing the existing curb inlets, junction boxes, etc., they may not have the capacity to manage the 100 year event. They are required to provide an emergency overflow spillway which is capable of managing the 100 year storm event, and if connected to a system which is unable to manage the 100 year storm event, then it will require a re-design. We see no evidence that this condition was evaluated in the detention study.
- 12. The detention study used 40% void space to calculate a portion of the available storage. We do not agree with this figure. This assumes all interstitial water within the voids is mobile. Surface tension lowers this number considerably, and it would appear that 40% cannot be used in the calculation of available storage.
- 13. The detention study appears to show the available storage for the northeast basin, the west basin, and the southwest basin which contradict that which is shown on the plans.
- 14. A "response to comments letter" is required for the resubmittal. The letter should address each comment, and the response by the applicant.

Fire Review	Jim Eden	Assistant Chief	Approved with Conditions
	(816) 969-1303	Jim.Eden@cityofls.net	

- 1. All issues pertaining to life safety and property protection from the hazards of fire, explosion or dangerous conditions in new and existing buildings, structures and premises, and to the safety to fire fighters and emergency responders during emergency operations, shall be in accordance with the 2012 International Fire Code.
- 2. IFC 903.3.7 Fire department connections. The location of fire department connections shall be approved by the fire code official. Connections shall be a 4 inch Storz type fitting and located within 100 feet of a fire hydrant, or as approved by the code official.

Action required: Show hydrants and FDC's on FDP.

Traffic Review	Michael Park	City Traffic Engineer	Corrections
	(816) 969-1820	Michael.Park@cityofls.net	

1. The plan must include a southbound right turn lane along Douglas at each of the two proposed driveways serving the development. These turn lanes are also associated with each respective FDP projects on Lot 1 and Lot 5. These turn lanes are in compliance with the Access Management Code and consistent with the Traffic Study recommendations. Each turn lane shall be 150' in storage length with a 150' taper.