

September 4, 2018

Mike Weisenborn
220 SE Green Street
Lee's Summit, MO 64063

Re: Artisan Point Apartments (Application #PL2018079)

Dear Mike,

Attached are the 2nd Development Plan for the above referenced project for your review and approval. The following actions have been taken in response to the 1st submittal development plan review.

ENGINEERING REVIEW:

1. *Author: Gene Williams*
The "Artisan Point Drainage and Detention Report" dated June X, 2018 (hereinafter referred to as the detention report) contains a Table of Contents which does not match what is shown elsewhere in the report. Please reconcile.

Response: See Drainage & Detention Report.

2. *Author: Gene Williams*
The detention report is missing the following items: 1) calculation of allowable release rate at each point of interest defined in the figure(s), 2) accounting method to determine the allowable release rate at each point of interest, with the inclusion of off-site contributing areas, 3) summary and conclusions, despite the Table of Contents showing the existence of this required item, and 4) discussion of why waivers are being requested.

Response: See Drainage & Detention Report.

3. *Author: Gene Williams*
Copy comment here Detention report: We do not agree with the curve numbers assigned to the existing condition undeveloped property with a soil group of C. The design and construction manual is specific in this regard (i.e., please see Section 5602.3 and Table 5602-3, which specifies a curve number of 74 be assigned to undeveloped areas).

Response: See Drainage & Detention Report.

4. *Author: Gene Williams*
Page 10 of the detention requests a waiver to the 20 foot setback requirement. We will not support such a waiver.

Response: See Drainage & Detention Report.

5. *Author: Gene Williams*
The detention report appears to be incomplete. There are missing drainage areas (i.e., there are several references to "xx acres", or "x sub-areas", missing justification for waivers, missing sections shown in the Table of Contents, missing methodology for determining the allowable release rate at each point of interest, and in general, is not reviewable.

Response: See Drainage & Detention Report.

6. *Author: Gene Williams*
The sanitary sewer analysis is incomplete in terms of required items. We will defer to the applicant meeting to discuss. In general, there were no discussion or analysis of the ultimate build-out condition, and there was no discussion of proposed downstream improvements to mitigate the bottlenecks shown in the report.

Response: Sanitary Analysis has been revised to include the bottlenecks and the future improvement conditions.

7. *Author: Gene Williams*
All interior water lines should be designated as private. The only water lines to be designated as public would be the water lines shown along Blue Pkwy. (misabeled as Shenendoah), and Road A.

Response: All interior waterlines are now shown as private. The associated easements have been removed from the development plan.

8. *Author: Gene Williams*
All interior sanitary sewer lines within Lot 1 should be designated as private. The only sanitary sewer lines to be designated as public would be the main trunk line running north/south through Lot 2, and the east/west portion on the extreme north side of Lot 2. All other interior portions of the sanitary line on Lot 2 would be designated as private. Please show this on the Preliminary Development Plan.

Response: Interior sanitary sewer lines (not including main trunk line and north lot 2 line) are now shown as private. The associated easements have been removed.

9. *Author: Gene Williams*
A waiver to the 20 foot setback requirement was requested in the detention study, but the 100 year nominal (i.e., unclogged primary outlet works, with detention basin functioning normally) water surface elevation was not shown. As previously discussed, we do not support a waiver to the 20 foot setback requirement to any property line, and any building.

Response: 20' setback has been adjusted.

10. *Author: Gene Williams*
Public sidewalk location within the right of way do not appear to have been labeled.

Response: Sidewalks within the right of way are now labeled.

11. Author: Gene Williams

Storm lines do not appear complete. Please ensure that all interior storm lines are designated as private. The only public storm lines on this project would include inlets, lines, and other structures within the right of way. Any "pass-through" drainage through the site would be considered as a private feature.

Response: The only public storm sewer shown on the development plan includes a pass through storm sewer receiving runoff from the south.

12. Author: Gene Williams

All public water lines should be placed in an easement, not the right of way. The public water lines should be centered within the easement. As shown, the public water lines are shown either at or inside the right of way.

Response: Water lines are now in the easements instead of right of way.

13. Author: Gene Williams

The grading plan does not provide contour intervals. It appears, however, the contour interval is 1 foot. If this is the case, insufficient slope is shown on the detention basin bottom. A minimum slope of 2.0% is required.

Response: Pond bottom slopes now maintain 2% down to the pond outfall for all ponds.

14. Author: Gene Williams

The grading plan shows what appears to be 1:1 slope along one of the buildings on Lot 1. Is this actually a retaining wall?

Response: Correct, retaining walls are now shown in plan.

15. Author: Gene Williams

The grading plan shows easements which are either not needed due to the private nature of the storm line, sanitary line, or water line. In addition, a drainage and general utility easement is called-out on the eastern edge of Lot 1. No drainage easement is desired by the City, and no general utility easement appears warranted, unless needed for utilities owned by other public utilities.

Response: Easements adjusted as requested.

16. Author: Gene Williams

Sheet PD07 shows off-site grading on the property to the west of Lot 2. Please be aware that suitable agreements must be executed prior to any off-site grading in these areas.

Response: Grading revised to keep off adjacent property.

17. Author: Gene Williams

City-owned utilities were not shown on the Landscape Plan. Please be aware that the location shown for the water line is not currently in the correct location (see previous comments concerning placement of public water lines within an easement, and centered within the easement). For help in establishing the location of trees in relation to City-

owned water and sanitary sewer lines, a minimum distance of five (5) feet is required between the outside of the mature tree trunk, and the outside of the water or sanitary sewer line or manhole. Smaller ornamentals and shrubs are exempt from this requirement, on condition that the owner is aware that future maintenance to the public utility line will not include the replacement of the ornamental or shrub. In other words, any future maintenance would require the owner to replace these items at their expense.

Response: See landscape plans for requested revisions.

18. Author: Gene Williams

A Development Agreement appears to be warranted for the off-site traffic, roadway, and drainage improvements.

**Response: It is agreed that a development agreement is warranted.
However, the details for such an agreement have not been worked out by either side.**

19. Author: Gene Williams

A Development Agreement appears warranted for the off-site water line.

**Response: It is agreed that a development agreement is warranted.
However, the details for such an agreement have not been worked out by either side.**

TRAFFIC REVIEW:

20. Author: Michael Park

Street name identified on the plans as Shenandoah, should be changed to Blue Parkway.

Response: Shenandoah street labels have been revised to “Blue Parkway”.

21. Author: Michael Park

Plan notes that refer to the design of "Road A", Collector, do not reflect the staff correspondence previously provided. The 60' right-of-way is okay, but the street width does not match collector standard.

Response: The “Road A” collector is now shown as a 40’ street section and labeled as such.

22. Author: Michael Park

The 60' right of way shown on the plans intersecting "Road A" to provide public access to the adjacent property towards the west may be 50' wide or remain 60'.

Response: No action taken. 60’ right of way is shown.

23. Author: Michael Park

The plans should note the driveway on Blue Parkway east of "Road A" is for emergency access only and provide information about gated conditions.

Response: "Emergency access only" note added, refer to arch plans for gate details.

We are confident that with this submittal we have addressed all the concerns noted in the 1st Submittal review comments. Please let me know if you have any questions or need additional information (918-745-9929).

Respectfully submitted,

Les Patterson