



PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Commercial Preliminary Development Plan Applicant's Letter

Date: Friday, July 06, 2018

To:

Property Owner: TUSTIN LLC

Email:

Fax #: <NO FAX NUMBER>

Applicant: ENGINEERING SOLUTIONS

Email: MSCHLICHT@ES-KC.COM

Fax #: (816) 623-9849

Engineer: ENGINEERING SOLUTIONS

Email: MSCHLICHT@ES-KC.COM

Fax #: (816) 623-9849

From: Shannon McGuire, Planner

Re:

Application Number: PL2018100

Application Type: Commercial Preliminary Development Plan

Application Name: REECE AND NICHOLS

Location: 222 SW MAIN ST, LEES SUMMIT, MO 64063

Tentative Schedule

Submit revised plans by noon on Monday, July 23, 2018 (4 full size paper copies, 1 reduced 8 ½" x 11" copy, and 4 copies of the comment response letter).

Applicant Meeting: July 11, 2018 at 09:00 AM

Planning Commission Meeting: August 14, 2018 at 05:00 PM

City Council Public Hearing: September 06, 2018 at 06:15 PM

City Council Ordinance: September 20, 2018 at 06:15 PM

If the revised submittal deadline is not met or plans are deficient, the item will be moved to a later meeting and a new deadline will be set. Future deadlines and meeting dates can be found on the "Planning Commission Meeting Dates" handout. Dates are subject to change; we will keep you informed throughout the process.

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.

Notice Requirements

1. Notification of Surrounding Property Owners.

- **Mail Notices.** The applicant must mail letter notices to all property owners within 185 feet from the boundaries of the property for which the application is being considered at least 15 days prior to the hearing. Sample notices are available. The notice must include:
 - time and place of hearing,
 - general description of the proposal,
 - location map of the property,
 - street address, or general street location
 - statement explaining that the public will have an opportunity to be heard
- **File Affidavit.** An affidavit must be filed with the Planning and Codes Administration Department prior to the public hearing certifying the notices have been sent. Provide a list of the property owners notified and a copy of the sent notice .

2. Notice Signs.

- **Post Sign.** The applicant shall post a sign on the premises, at least 15 days prior to the date of the hearing, informing the general public of the time and place of the public hearing. When revised plans are submitted, staff will prepare the sign and provide it to the applicant for posting.
- **Maintain Sign.** The applicant shall make a good faith effort to maintain the sign for at least the 15 days immediately preceding the date of the hearing, through the hearing, and through any continuances of the hearing. The sign shall be placed within 5 feet of the street right-of-way line in a central position on the property that is the subject of the hearing. The sign shall be readily visible to the public. If the property contains more than one street frontage, one sign shall be placed on each street frontage so as to face each of the streets abutting the land. The sign may be removed at the conclusion of the public hearing(s) and must be removed at the end of all proceedings on the application or upon withdrawal of the application.

Analysis of Commercial Preliminary Development Plan:

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

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.

Show the location of the FDC on the FDP.

3. IFC 304.3.3 - Dumpsters and containers with an individual capacity of 1.5 cubic yards [40.5 cubic feet (1.15 m3)] or more shall not be stored in buildings or placed within 5 feet (1524 mm) of combustible walls, openings or combustible roof eave lines.

The alley has numerous dumpsters about. Is there a proposed plan on how this will be handled?

Planning Review	Shannon McGuire (816) 969-1237	Planner Shannon.McGuire@cityofls.net	Corrections
------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	-------------

1. Please check and update the scale on sheet C.001 it does not seem to match the drawing.

2. Please add the ROW widths for SW Main St and SW Market St.

3. In an effort to make this building easily re-tenanted for retail use in the future staff would like to see the first floor raised to 14'.

4. Please label the proposed building colors. It would be helpful if you could provide a sample of the proposed brick and color samples.

5. All proposed signs are required to comply with the sign requirements as outlined in the sign section of the UDO. The elevations appear to show a raceway behind the sign. Please remove the raceway from the elevations as they are prohibited.

6. On new construction in the downtown core all mechanical equipment is required to be roof mounted and screened by a parapet wall. Please note the location of all proposed mechanical equipment and include a dashed line on the elevations indication the height/location of the units in relation to the height of the screening wall.

7. On new construction in the downtown core all electrical and gas meters, conduits and other equipment should be located on the rear facades. Please not the location of these on plans.

8. Is a trash enclosure being proposed? If so, please provide details.

9. As an FYI, backflow prevention/anti-siphon valves shall be integrated into the building design and concealed from public view. Such devices shall not be located within the public right-of-way.

10. Recessed entries are required in new construction in the downtown core area. Please update the plans to show a recessed entry way.

11. All Street facing facades including alley facing facades on new construction shall consist of brick on the first and second floors. Please update the plans to reflect the compliance of this requirement on the rear façade if it is adjacent to an alley and visible from SW Market St.

12. New buildings shall be delineated both vertically and horizontally to reflect traditional patterns and convey a human scale. The facades of new buildings shall have vertical divisions similar in width to the pattern of existing buildings of the district. Staff would like to see additional vertical divisions be added to the facade to give the appearance of a more consistent scale in relation to existing buildings in the district.

13. Is any wall mounted lighting being proposed? If so please provide details.

14. Sheet L.100's landscape worksheet, planting schedule and drawing all show different information on what is being proposed. The worksheet and planting schedule numbers are completely different while the drawing does not show any proposed landscaping. The UDO prescribes a certain number of trees and shrubs be planted on the site based on the street frontage and total land area. While I understand this not the typical method of development for Downtown Lee's Summit the only process to seek relief from this requirement is to request a modification by submitting a written request that includes justification. This modification request would be supported by staff as it would be consistent with the development of the downtown core.

15. Staff has reviewed the inventory of currently available parking in the vicinity of the proposed building and feels that there is sufficient capacity of public parking spaces in the area to support the proposed use. Please remove the parking lot from the proposal as staff feels that it is not warranted. Should you choose to proceed with proposing the parking as submitted, lot Staff's recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council will be to remove the parking lot from the proposal. That being said staff has reviewed the proposal with the parking lot as presented.

16. Parking lots require a 20' setback from the ROW and 6' setback from the side/rear yards. While I understand this not the typical method of development for Downtown Lee's Summit the only process to seek relief from this requirement is to request a modification by submitting a written request this includes justification.

17. Please label the minimum width of the parking lot drive and aisle widths.

18. All commercial developments providing parking lots accommodating 11 or more parking spaces shall provide parking lot lighting in accordance with Article 7 of the UDO. Please provide a photometric plan and parking lot lighting details to include the type of fixtures and light pole height.

19. Please label the dimensions of the ADA parking stalls and aisle.

20. Please provide the ADA parking sign details.

Engineering Review

Gene Williams
(816) 969-1223

Senior Staff Engineer
Gene.Williams@cityofls.net

Corrections

1. The "Sanitary Study" dated June 22, 2018 is incomplete. The study contained numerous errors, and did not address the primary concern for this site, which is addressing potential downstream issues with the sanitary sewer after development. Will Lot 1 be directed a different direction on the relocated sanitary sewer line? Page 3 of the report would seem to indicate that all sanitary sewer flows will be directed to the south, but this assumption is vague. The

primary conclusions contained within the report are based on a 20 year old study which is outdated and no longer relevant. The City has almost doubled in size since the production of this report.

2. Errors Contained in the Sanitary Study: 1) 1998 study is outdated and no longer relevant, and the sanitary sewer system must be analyzed to points (to be determined) downstream of this development, 2) page 3 of the report references Section 5500 of the APWA, which the City does not recognize for sanitary sewers, 3) page 4 appears to contain a calculation error for the peak inflow (i.e., rainfall intensity should be 6.38, not 3.10 inches per hour), 4) conversion factor from cfs to gallons per day appears incorrect, 5) peak base flow should be based on residential units rather than a flat 1500 gallons per day per acre, 6) the conclusion section of the report contains a contradictory statement (i.e., ...will create not create a capacity issue), 7) page 4 provides a proposed condition analysis that completely neglects the hydraulic grade line of the receiving sewer, and 8) page 4 of the report provides an existing condition analysis that neglects the fact that there are known capacity issues downstream of the site.

3. The Sanitary Study was missing the following items: 1) off-site drainage area map. 2) identification of off-site manholes and off-site sanitary sewer lines, 3) calculations of the flow within each segment of sanitary sewer line, slope, maximum capacity running nearly full, hydraulic grade line at the design flow, etc.

4. The "Macro Storm Water Drainage Study" dated June 22, 2018 (hereinafter referred to the stormwater study) states that detention is not required due to the exception listed in Section 5601.3.A.3 of the Design and Construction Manual. However, this section of the Design and Construction Manual only pertains to sites that have an increase in impervious surface area less than or equal to 10% of that previously existing. In other words, this logic does not meet the cited reference within the Design and Construction Manual.

5. The City has reviewed the particular situation of this site, and has concluded that stormwater detention, including 40 hour extended detention, is not required based on the fact that it meets the design exception listed in Section 5601.3A.2, not 5601.3A.3. For purposes of this site, it shall be considered as impervious coverage for Lot 1.

6. Why is the SCS method being used to determine peak runoff within the stormwater report? Wouldn't it make more sense to use the rational method to calculate peak flow rates?

7. It was our understanding that the stormwater report was to be scoped more along the lines of a stormwater memorandum, describing why detention is not required. It was also our understanding that a new curb inlet on the west side of Main St. would be constructed along with the improvements. The addition of the parking lot to the site, on an area previously covered with grass and in a depressed condition raises additional concerns for street flooding and icing on Main St.

8. The concrete flumes are a concern, due to concerns with stormwater being directed over City sidewalks. Although this may be a good idea for managing the larger storm events, it is not a good idea for normal stormwater management. It was our understanding that the storm system would be piped beneath the sidewalk, and a new public storm inlet be installed on Main St. This is still the City's expectation.

9. The location of the curb inlet on Main St. should be shown.

10. Sheet C.001: There is no mention or indication of the abandonment of the existing sanitary sewer, and re-routing to the northeast either in the notes or plans. Please be specific about what is going to occur both in the notes and the plans. Ensure that all affected sheets (i.e., not just this sheet) are updated.

11. Sheet C.001: Under "Site Improvement Notes", there is no mention of the sanitary sewer removal, abandonment, relocation, etc. Storm Sewer note and Storm Water Detention note and Storm Water Quality elements note references the wrong citation within the Design and Construction Manual (i.e., it is 5601.3A.2). Finally, no mention of the additional curb inlet is shown under the SW Main and Market St. note.

12. Sheet C.200: Grading is shown near the southwest corner of the project which appears to cross the property line. Has this been discussed with the owner of this property? In addition, the proposed versus existing contour elevations within the private alley do not appear to make sense (e.g., proposed elevations do not tie into the existing elevations shown within the alley). Is there a retaining wall that we do not know about?

13. Sheet C.300: It was our understanding that the existing sanitary sewer bisecting the property would be removed and/or abandoned in place, and relocated along the northern property line. Nothing on this sheet would indicate this is the case. Please revise as appropriate.

Traffic Review

Michael Park
(816) 969-1820

City Traffic Engineer
Michael.Park@cityofls.net

Corrections

1. It appears the site and alleys can accommodate a passenger vehicle and single unit truck (delivery truck/trash truck) in all directions of travel/turns. However, a passenger vehicle would have difficulty exiting the parking lot adjacent to Market and use of the alley towards Market without obstructing conflicting traffic. This could be improved by increasing the radius on the southwest corner of the westerly driveway to this parking lot to approximately 25'. This should have no impact on the currently shown parking layout.

2. Widen the east-west alley towards the north to the extent possible (adjacent to the utility enclosure/easement). There appears to be a few feet of unobstructed space between the easement and curb that may be available for additional widening to better accommodate two-way traffic and improve traffic visibility.

3. Some improvements across the alley at Market and at the southeast corner of the same intersection may be needed to tie existing conditions into the development plan.

4. Was there a proposal to provide sidewalk from W. Main Street to the public lot on Market (north side of the project) in consideration of a 2-hour parking restriction for all parking along W. Main Street?