

**DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

**Commercial Final Development Plan  
Applicant's Letter**

**Date:** Wednesday, February 06, 2019

**To:**

**Property Owner:** MID-CONTINENT PUBLIC  
LIBRARY

Email:  
Fax #: <NO FAX NUMBER>

**Applicant:** MID-CONTINENT PUBLIC LIBRARY

Email: QFUNG@MYMCPL.ORG  
Fax #: <NO FAX NUMBER>

**Engineer:** OLSSON ASSOCIATES (BRIAN LADD)

Email: BLADD@OLSSONASSOCIATES.COM  
Fax #: (913) 381-1174

**Architect:** SAPP DESIGN ARCHITECTS

Email: STUFFLEBEAM@SDAARCHITECTS.COM  
Fax #: <NO FAX NUMBER>

**From:** Shannon McGuire, Planner

**Re:**

**Application Number:** PL2019043

**Application Type:** Commercial Final Development Plan

**Application Name:** MID-CONTINENT PUBLIC LIBRARY

**Location:** 2240 SE BLUE PKWY, LEES SUMMIT, MO 64063

---

**Electronic Plans for Resubmittal**

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.

Electronic copies shall be provided in the following formats:

- Plats – All plats shall be provided in multi-page Portable Document Format (PDF).
- Engineered Civil Plans – All engineered civil plans shall be provided in multipage Portable Document Format (PDF).
- Architectural and other plan drawings – Architectural and other plan drawings, such as site electrical and landscaping, shall be provided in multi-page Portable Document Format (PDF).
- Studies – Studies, such as stormwater and traffic, shall be provided in Portable Document Format (PDF).

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.

### **Review Status:**

Revisions Required: One or more departments have unresolved issues regarding this development application. See comments below to determine the required revisions and resubmit to the Development Services Department. Resubmit six (6) full size sets of plans (no larger than 24"x36") folded to 8-½"x11", four (4) copies of the comment response letter, and one (1) digital copy following the electronic plan submittal guides as stated above. Revised plans will be reviewed within five (5) business days of the date received.

### **Required Corrections:**

<b>Fire Review</b>	Jim Eden (816) 969-1303	Assistant Chief Jim.Eden@cityofls.net	Corrections
--------------------	----------------------------	--	-------------

---

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 the location of the fire department connection (FDC) to the sprinkler system.

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

---

1. Please label the dimensions of the ADA stalls and standard stalls nearest to the proposed building.

2. A note on C1.0 states ADA parking details are on C3.0. Sheet C3.0 was not included with this submittal. Please provide details for the ADA stalls, aisles and signage.

3. The proposed light pole in the northeastern most island is with 100' of the residentially zoned district on the northeast property line and is limited to 15'. Additionally, as you adjoin a residential use the remaining lights height cannot exceed 20'. Please revise the plan sheets to comply with this UDO requirement. Please show pole details including the base.

4. Please provide the manufacturer's spec sheets for the proposed rooftop equipment.

5. Sheet C1.0 show the location of a proposed monument sign however there are no details for this on sheet FDP4. Additionally the proposed location is not acceptable as it is located in the ROW. Please revise the location so that it is not in the ROW and provide details or remove it from the plan.

6. As no details are being provided for the future building expansion, please remove the proposed footprint from the site plan and remove the information from the site data table.

7. Please provide the details for the enclosure for the trash storage container.

8. Please provide details for the proposed drive and parking surfaces. Also, provide details for the proposed curbing.

- 
1. The Final Development Plan is incomplete from a site plan standpoint. As such, only cursory comments are being provided. A more thorough and detailed review shall be provided following submittal of a complete Final Development Plan package.
  2. Missing Items Include (the following list is not intended to be an all-inclusive list of missing items): 1) detention basin outlet structure details, in accordance with Section 5600 of the Design and Construction Manual, including any anti-closing measures, 2) emergency spillway design, including the required freeboard between the nominal 100 year water surface elevation, and the crest of the spillway, and the 100% clogged condition/zero available storage condition 100 year water surface elevation within the spillway, and the lowest point of the dam (i.e., 1.0 feet minimum), 3) plan and profile views of all storm drains, including pipe material, pipe slope, location, 4) typical section views of the pavement thickness and base, in accordance with the Unified Development Ordinance, 5) typical section view of curb and gutter sections, with additional details showing the extension of the subgrade a minimum of one (1) foot beyond the back of curb, 6) hydraulic grade line within all pipe sections, shown on the profile view, 7) lack of labels on key features, such as the backflow vault and backflow assembly, and water meter, 8) lack of a gate valve immediately prior to the backflow vault, 9) lack of a call-out for a cut-in tee for the new fire line, 10) lack of ADA-accessible ramp details in accordance with the minimum design information required by Section 5304 of the Design and Construction Manual (i.e., field design is not allowed, nor are "standard drawings" allowed to substitute for a site-specific design of these features), 11) lack of a dedicated grading plan, 12) lack of a dedicated erosion and sediment control plan, 13) lack of a SWPPP, 14) lack of specific details on the commercial entrance, including the required 8 inch KCMMB mix concrete from the right of way line, to the existing public pavement, 15) lack of a sidewalk detail, 16) lack of dimensions showing the limits of temporary construction easements, 17) lack of slope call-outs within the detention basin bottom showing a minimum slope of 2.0% in all directions, to the nearest tenth of a percent, 18) lack of information concerning the condition or suitability (i.e., does it meet current standards in terms of longitudinal slope, cross-slope, and tactile warning device) of the existing ADA-accessible ramp shown at the intersection of Blue Pkwy., and Battery Dr., 19) lack of a dedicated utility plan sheet, 20) lack of any specific detail concerning the sanitary sewer lateral, including materials, slope, required clean-outs, cut-in tee, and distance from the manhole, 21) lack of a water main plan, showing materials (C900 for fire protection line), diameter, 22) lack of standard details showing water meters, sanitary sewer connection with tracer box, backflow vault, including the method used to drain the required sump via daylighting or installation of an infiltration trench, curb and gutter, commercial entrances, sidewalk, inlets, and any other item necessary to complete the project, 23) lack of a grading plan in the vicinity of the new culvert on the southern commercial entrance, keeping in mind the maximum slopes allowable, and 24) lack of sufficient grading detail showing that the proposed southern public sidewalk will be constructable, and still meet the maximum slope requirements adjacent to the swale.
  3. The southern monument sign is shown within MoDOT right of way. Has permission been granted for this action?
  4. The new commercial entrance and culvert will require MoDOT approval.
  5. The "Final Stormwater Study" (hereinafter referred to as "the stormwater study") dated Jan. 25, 2019 contains contradictory information. The "Methodology" section of this report states that the APWA "Comprehensive Control Strategy" was utilized, but elsewhere in the report, it appears the allowable release rate was based on the existing condition. The "Comprehensive Control Strategy" relies on a flat release rate per acre of drainage area, for the 2, 10, and 100 year events, not the existing condition drainage. Revisions to the report are required.
  6. The stormwater study shows a total storage volume of 1.64 (assumed to be acre-ft, but not specifically defined in the report). The single-sheet civil plan set shows 1.2 acre feet.

7. The stormwater report shows there will be insufficient freeboard between the 100 year water surface elevation, and the top of the dam. In fact, there is no information provided on the emergency spillway design, nor are there any calculations showing the clogged condition/zero available storage condition compared to the top of the dam.
8. The report failed to provide calculations showing the allowable release rate.
9. Drainage area maps are provided within the stormwater study, however, the following comments are provided: 1) drainage "areas" are provided, but without any convergence to a concentrated flow condition, calculation of "area" is meaningless. The placement of the two (2) areas of interest (i.e., outfall A and outfall B) are not points associated with a convergence of flows, and therefore, how can you assign any drainage area to these points? Please review generally-accepted methods for producing a satisfactory stormwater study, because this report appears to be deficient in terms of a defensible report. It appears the sizing may be sufficient, but the final report fails to adequately present the results in a coherent manner.
10. Please be aware it may be necessary, and in all likelihood, will be necessary to extend the limits of the stormwater study to off-site drainage areas where the stormwater converges to a concentrated flow condition. Only then can you calculate a drainage area to a particular point of interest. By simple accounting, allowable release rate can then be adjusted up or down based on these off-site drainage areas, in relation to their existing condition runoff.
11. The stormwater study included sheet C8.0, which is illegible. In addition, also missing from the report were the minimum requirements set forth in Section 5608.6 of the Design and Construction Manual.
13. Appendix D of the stormwater report includes curves that are illegible. The y axis cannot be read.
14. The report must discuss and show calculations of the time of concentration. Only a brief mention of this critical portion of the report was provided, with no results shown.
15. There are numerous references to the 1 year event in the report. In other places, the 2 year event is described. Again, the Comprehensive Control Strategy requires calculation of the 2, 10, and 100 year event, not the 1 year event.
16. Calculations were not provided on the sizing of the water quality riser and/or orifice(s). Only a mention in the report that it was sized according to the BMP manual. Calculations must be shown and included in the report.
17. The 100 year water surface elevation is closer than 20 feet to the right of way line on one portion of the detention basin.
18. The geometry of the storm sewer in the northern portion of the project appears to be shown erroneously. We are showing the private line from Village Cooperative attached directly to the curb inlet on Battery Dr.
19. Has permission been granted from Village Cooperative to re-route the storm sewer as shown? Why are there no construction details and notes concerning this relocation. Again, the plans must be submitted in a complete fashion for the next submittal. Otherwise, they will be rejected.
20. It appears a single 2 inch orifice is being used to manage the 40 hour extended detention requirement for the water quality volume release. The BMP manual states that a single orifice value that is calculated less than 4 inches, should be changed to either a perforated riser, or a v-notched weir.
21. A sealed Engineer's Estimate of Probable Costs is required prior to approval of the plans. It may be advantageous to wait until after the next submittal and review comments, since these plans are incomplete.

<b>Traffic Review</b>	Michael Park (816) 969-1820	City Traffic Engineer Michael.Park@cityofls.net	No Comments
<b>Building Codes Review</b>	Joe Frogge (816) 969-1241	Plans Examiner Joe.Frogge@cityofls.net	Corrections

1. Water meter may be oversized.

Action required: Provide calculations to justify use of 2" water meter. (fyi - a 2" meter costs over \$25,000)