

Commercial Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan Applicant's Letter

Date: Friday, March 01, 2019

To:

Applicant: ARIA LS, LLC

Email: DMOBLACK@REALEQUITYMANAGEMENT.COM

Fax #: <NO FAX NUMBER>

Property Owner: UNITY REALTY LLC

Email: swanson@unityonline.org

Fax #: (816) 607-0602

Engineer: OLSSON ASSOCIATES

Email:

Fax #: <NO FAX NUMBER>

From: Jennifer Thompson, Planner

Re:

Application Number: PL2019075

Application Type: Commercial Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan

Application Name: ARIA/SUMMIT VILLAGE NORTH

Location:

Tentative Schedule

Submit revised plans by noon on Monday, March 18, 2019 (4 full size paper copies, 1 reduced 8 ½" x 11" copy, and 4 copies of the comment response letter).

Applicant Meeting: March 05, 2019 at 09:00 AM

Planning Commission Meeting: April 11, 2019 at 05:00 PM

City Council Public Hearing: May 07, 2019 at 06:15 PM

City Council Public Hearing: May 21, 2019 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

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:

- Plat - All plats shall be provided in multi-page Portable Document Format (PDF).
- Engineered Civil Plans – All engineered civil plans shall be provided as multi-page Portable Document Format (PDF).

- Architectural and other plan drawings – Architectural and other plan drawings, such as site electrical and landscaping, shall be provided as 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.

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 Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan:

Fire Review

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. Projects reviewed after April 1, 2019 will be subject to the 2018 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 locations of the FDC. A hydrant shall be within 100-feet.

3. IFC 507.5.1 - Where a portion of the facility or building hereafter constructed or moved into or within the jurisdiction is more than 300 feet from a hydrant on a fire apparatus access road, as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the facility or building, on-site fire hydrants and mains shall be provided where required by the fire code official.

Action required: Provide a hydrant for building #7 to meet this requirement.

4. IFC 503.2.1 - Fire apparatus access roads shall have an unobstructed width of not less than 20 feet (6096 mm), exclusive of shoulders, except for approved security gates in accordance with Section 503.6, and an unobstructed vertical clearance of not less than 13 feet 6 inches (4115 mm)

SECTION D105

AERIAL FIRE APPARATUS ACCESS ROADS

D105.1 Where required. Where the vertical distance between the grade plane and the highest roof surface exceeds 30 feet (9144 mm), approved aerial fire apparatus accessroads shall be provided. For purposes of this section, thehighest roof surface shall be determined by measurement to the eave of a pitched roof, the intersection of the roof to the exterior wall, or the top of parapet walls, whichever is greater.

D105.2 Width. Aerial fire apparatus access roads shall have a minimum unobstructed width of 26 feet (7925 mm), exclusive of shoulders, in the mmediate vicinity of the building or portion thereof.

D105.3 Proximity to building. One or more of the required access routes meeting this condition shall be located not less than 15 feet (4572 mm) and not greater than 30 feet (9144 mm) from the building, and shall be positioned parallel to one entire side of the building. The side of the building on which the aerial fire apparatus access road is positioned shall be approved by the fire code official.

D105.4 Obstructions. Overhead utility and power lines shall not be located over the aerial fire apparatus access road or between the aerial fire apparatus road and the building. Other obstructions shall be permitted to be placed with the approval of the fire code official.

Action required: Adjust fire lane width and set back from the building.

5. IFC 503.2.3 - Fire apparatus access roads shall be designed and maintained to support the imposed loads of fire apparatus and shall be surfaced so as to provide all-weather driving capabilities.

6. IFC 507.1 - An approved water supply capable of supplying the required fire flow for fire protection shall be provided to premises upon which facilities, buildings or portions of buildings are hereafter constructed or moved into or within the jurisdiction.

Planning Review	Jennifer Thompson (816) 969-1239	Planner Jennifer.Thompson@cityofls.net	Corrections
------------------------	-------------------------------------	---	-------------

1. Please submit an electronic copy of the legal description. Microsoft Word document or selectable text PDF are the preferred file formats. The legal description can be emailed to the planner's email address above.

2. The Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) lists criteria for considering rezoning and preliminary development plan applications. Please refer to Article 2, Section 2.260.B. & C. Please respond in narrative form to the listed criteria in sections B & C, to the extent they are pertinent to this application.

3. Where a preliminary development plan is required, an approved preliminary development plan may substitute for a preliminary plat where the preliminary development plan contains all information required for preliminary plat as set forth in Article 7.

A separate plan sheet is needed to reflect the requirements for a preliminary plat for both proposed areas of development (if desired). Please refer to the UDO, Article 7.100 C. for submission requirements.

4. Specific platting items needed/missing, but not limited to, include (for more detail on these requirements please refer to UDO):

- floodplain reference
- location of oil and gas wells, whether active, inactive, or capped, if any, including reference of determination
- layout, number and approximate dimensions of lots and approximate lot areas
- location and width of proposed sidewalks and pedestrian walkways
- location and width of proposed easements
- building setback lines from streets with dimensions
- overall development phasing

5. Modification requests. Provide a narrative statement that explains the need for all requested modifications to the applicable zoning district regulations. It's been noted modifications are requested for:

- building height
- density
- buffer requirements

6. It is noted three monument signs are proposed. The UDO allows a maximum of two for this lot. If seeking approval for the number of signs with this application, please provide a sign specifications. Also, staff would recommend the sign be incorporated within the retaining wall located along NE Douglas. Has this been considered?

7. Landscaping comments.

It's noted that a modification for the landscape buffer is requested around the SW and NW property lines to allow the existing high density vegetation on the neighboring property be allowed to serve as the buffer. Please provide photos and a survey of the tree massing. In addition, a trees preservation plan/easement would need to be provided from the neighboring property.

It doesn't seem the landscape numbers are quite right. To calculate the open yard requirements the total sq. footage of the lot is subtracted from the total footprint square footage of the proposed buildings. Please confirm.

It's noted a high impact fence is required between the RP-4 and CP-2 zoning district. Is this being proposed?

8. Provide four-sided elevations for the apartments, clubhouse, maintenance building, and garages. Elevations were not received for the garages and maintenance building.

Can an axonometric view/perspectivte be provided from NE Douglas looking into to the development?

9. Provide the manufactures specification sheets for the proposed lighting. Exterior building lighting shall be accounted for at the final development plan stage. All lighting shall meet the UDO standards.

11. The dashed lines seem to reference 3 phases? Is there an extra dashed line?

12. Most of the standard details are missing, please note curbing, pavement thicknesses, accessible signage, and other details shall meet UDO standards.

13. Is it know at this time the proposed screening method of GMU's?

14. Please break down the # of units/bedrooms for each phase and reference parking requirements for each phase. It seems the provided parking exceeds the required parking needs based on the break out of bedroom #'s.

Staff doesn't recommend exceeding the number of parking spaces required for this site. Our calculations require 924 spaces and 1,005 are provided.

15. As part of the site development table provide the impervious/pervious percentages.

In the site data table revise the proposed zoning district to RP-4, rather than CP-4.

16. Please see the definition in the UDO for determining building height. Please confirm the building height for the apartments using this method.

17. Staff suggests and is curious if an alternative layout could be provided for phase 2. If some of the parking could be removed, perhaps more open space or common amenity space could be provided on Phase 2.

19. The minimum island width for islands with planted trees is 10-feet. It appears some of the parking lot islands are too narrow.

20. Provide the ROW width for NE Douglas Street.

21. Just for clarification, is the Aria development a 55 and older product?

Engineering Review

Gene Williams
(816) 969-1223

Senior Staff Engineer
Gene.Williams@cityofls.net

Corrections

1. The "Sanitary System Capacity Analysis" dated Jan. 30, 2019 (hereinafter referred to as the sanitary study) needs to specifically define what is meant by "Ultimate Build-Out". Please provide an explanation within the document concerning how this is defined.

3. Please define what "Current Build-Out without Proposed Development", "Current Build-Out with Proposed Development", and "Full Build-Out with Proposed Development". There is some confusion on how this relates to Ultimate Build-Out.
4. The assumption that the Lee's Summit Pump Station is fully-rated at 1250 gpm appears to be critical to the analysis. Further information will be provided concerning the capability of this pump to meet the design flowrate.
5. Page 6 of the sanitary study states that it was assumed the sanitary sewer segments discharged to open air. Isn't this going to produce unrealistic results? In addition, the report states that the criteria used to demonstrate a sanitary sewer line is acceptable, is to ensure the hydraulic grade line within the pipe is at or below the rim of the manhole for segments that do not have attached laterals. Where was this criteria found? The Design and Construction Manual is clear in this regard, and requires that the hydraulic grade line within the pipe be at or below the crown of the pipe. This may be waived on a case by case basis, but should not be used as a criteria in which to make a determination whether the system is adequate.
6. It is not really clear why "ultimate build-out" is not being considered part of this development. In other words, why is "ultimate build-out" (as we understand it from the exhibit) not included in the "proposed build-out"?
7. Page 8 of the sanitary study states that upsizing of the pumps and expansion of the excess flow holding basin may be required "...at this time." What does this mean?
8. Ultimate conditions appear to show unacceptable surcharging above the top of the rim elevation for all of the existing sanitary sewer lines crossing the development. If these lines are not adequate to manage "ultimate conditions", then it would appear the time to perform these upgrades would be during the first phase of this project.
9. The sanitary study appears to show a lake or wet detention basin on top of the sanitary sewer line. As discussed during the pre-application meeting, this scenario is not desired by Water Utilities. Sanitary sewer lines may be installed beneath dry detention basins, provided they do not conflict with the dam; however, sanitary sewer lines should be placed completely out of the limits of any wet detention basin with a permanent pool.
10. The "Aria and Summit Village North Preliminary Stormwater Drainage Study" dated Feb. 18, 2019 (hereinafter referred to as the stormwater study) presented what we feel is a low time of concentration value for the existing condition. When used to calculate the allowable release rate, a low time of concentration will produce unrealistic values for the existing condition for off-site drainage areas, and boost the allowable peak flow rate.
11. The stormwater study discusses extending the culvert under Douglas St. What calculations were performed to determine the upstream headwater on this extension? Is this culvert operating under outlet control? If so, extending the culvert is going to affect the headwater elevation.
12. It appears that 40 hour extended detention is not being proposed due to USACE issues. We will not support this waiver. There are numerous downstream issues related to water quality (e.g., Unity Lake, and Unity Village property) that should be addressed. Waiving this requirement is in our opinion, not a good option.
13. The stormwater study is not clear on whether this will be a dry detention facility, or a wet detention facility with a permanent pool. Please see previous comments, however, concerning the sanitary sewer line in relation to permanent pool wet detention basins. These are not allowed.
14. The stormwater study discusses the stream buffer requirements. However, it is not clear where the limits of this stream buffer is located, and is vague in terms of a explicit definition. The report appears to premature in this regard. Please show the limits on the plan.

15. Where were the time of concentration calculations shown? As discussed earlier in this letter, it appears these values are too low. Please show time of concentration calculations.
16. It appears some of the off-site drainage areas were classified as "agricultural farmland", perhaps row crops? We are not aware of any row crops in this area, but rather, pasture land. It would appear this would also boost your allowable peak flow rate.
17. The stream buffer must be shown on the plans.
18. Please show the location of the 100 year water surface elevation within the detention basin. Ensure there is a minimum 20 feet setback from any adjacent property line, or building.
19. A minimum 10 foot wide utility easement should be shown along Douglas St. Ensure that any tie-backs for the retaining wall are outside the limits of the easement.
20. A profile view rendering of the retaining wall should be provided.
21. The water line is shown connecting to the City 20 inch transmission main. This is not allowed. This line is not intended for any sort of domestic use, as it serves as a supply transmission line to the Lee's Summit water tank near Chipman Rd. and Douglas St. As discussed in the pre-application meeting, there is a 12 inch water main available to the west, and a 12 inch to the northeast, as well as a new 8 inch along Douglas (see comment below concerning new 8 inch water line).
22. Please label all interior water, sanitary sewer, and storm lines as "private".
23. Staff does not support the request for a waiver to the stormwater detention requirements as requested in the stormwater study. In other words, the request to compare pre-existing versus post-development will not be supported. In addition, we feel the calculation of existing condition peak flows are too high. Please see previous comments related to this issue.
24. A water line extension appears to be warranted along Douglas St., from the dead-end 8 inch line at Colbern Rd. and Douglas St., to the north end of the project (i.e., to the existing 12 inch water line to the north of the dual 120 inch by 84 inch box culverts).

Traffic Review

Michael Park
(816) 969-1820

City Traffic Engineer
Michael.Park@cityofls.net

Corrections

1. Sidewalk is required along Douglas/Lee's Summit Road.
2. The Unimproved Road Policy needs to be discussed; whether the existing interim standard condition for Lee's Summit Road/Douglas will be improved to urban standards (e.g. curb and gutter) in association with this development in accordance with the Council Policy or if a waiver to the Council Policy will be requested. This Policy requires improvements to Lee's Summit Road to the urban standard from Colbern Road to the existing urban section about 1/2 mile north of the project for the proposed development.
3. Traffic Study Comments were sent to Olsson (the applicants traffic engineer that prepared the traffic impact study).