



FINKLE +
WILLIAMS
ARCHITECTURE

7007 COLLEGE BLVD, SUITE **P** 913 + 498 - 1550
415 OVERLAND PARK, **F** 913 + 498 - 1042
KANSAS 66211

March 19, 2019

Ryan Elam
Director of Development Services
City of Lee's Summit
220 SE Green Street
Lee's Summit, MO 64063

**Re: Paragon Star Village Commercial Preliminary Development Plan Applicant's Letter
Comments**

Mr. Elam,

Please see the following responses to the PDP review comments, dated March 4th, 2019, for the above referenced project:

FINKLE+WILLIAMS RESPONSES

HOERR SCHAUDT RESPONSES

GBA RESPONSES

Fire Review Comments:

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 2018 International Fire Code.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

2. 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.

RESPONSE: It is anticipated that IFC 304.3.3 Exception 1 and/or 2 will be applicable.

3. 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.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

4. 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.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

5. 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.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

6. 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)

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

Planning Comments:

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.

RESPONSE: Legal description provided.

2. On Sheet C002 define more clearly, the boundaries for the proposed lots and tracts.

RESPONSE: Lot lines bolded.

3. Label the NW orientation for all streets.

RESPONSE: Street labels revised.

4. The UDO requires parking lot islands to be 10 feet in width when trees are planted within the island, please revise.

RESPONSE: Parking lot islands revised.

5. There were no standard details provided for pavement thicknesses, the proposed vegetated porous pavement, accessible signs, trash enclosure, curbing, etc. It is assumed this will be provided at final development plan stage and will meet UDO standards.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

6. The parking lot setbacks from ROW are not met along I-470. A 20 foot setback is required, will this be requested as a modification?

RESPONSE: A variance will be requested.

7. On Sheet C007 provide dimensions of drive widths at the island bump outs. Driveway widths shall include the pavement and not the curb and gutters. Clarify the limits of the dimension. Call out the type of curbing that is proposed.

RESPONSE: Dimensions revised and clarified to show back of curb to back of curb, or face of curb to parking. Curb type called out to be 2' standard CG-1 and CG-1 dry.

8. Provide a standard comment indicating the location of all oil and gas wells, whether active, inactive, or capped. Reference the source for determination.

RESPONSE: Note added to general layout. No wells per MDNR.

9. Provide dimension for the south driveway, see Michael Park's comment regarding the need for sidewalk.

RESPONSE: Driveway dimensioned.

10. Label sidewalks on both sides of Paragon Pkwy. Label all internal sidewalks within the site.

RESPONSE: Dimensions added.

11. Provide a table establishing the proposed setbacks for each lot.

RESPONSE: Table added to sheet C002.

12. Provide additional detail for the proposed amenity courtyard. Provide additional detail for the proposed entertainment venue.

RESPONSE: Additional labels that detail proposed amenity courtyard uses and entertainment venue have been added to plans as requested.

13. Can a general phasing schedule be provided?

RESPONSE: Construction phasing is not anticipated, with the potential exception of Hotel 2 (Lot 11).

14. The parking calculation for a hotel with a restaurant or lounge is 1.5 parking spaces per room. It's noted the parking calculation used for the proposed hotels is 1 per room. Please clarify if the hotel(s) will have a restaurant or lounge (open to the public), associated with the use.

RESPONSE: We currently do not anticipate a public restaurant in either hotel.

15. Additional detail in a table format is needed for the total number of proposed apartment units (for each building), including the breakdown of number of bedrooms and or type of units. Are any efficiency or studio units proposed? Are the apartment units proposed above the retail/office building part of Lot 3? The total number of multi-family units listed on Sheet A1.01 indicates 410 apartments. The label for the apartment building states 390 units. There is no label indicating the number of units for the 2nd through 4th floors of the retail building. We are assuming there are more than 20 units proposed? Please clarify.

RESPONSE: A revised parking table is located on A1.01. Unit mix will be determined at a later date by the developer. Minimum number provided shall be 1.33 per unit.

16. It's noted a shared parking model is proposed. Can additional detail or a report be provided explaining the methodology used to determine the parking needs?

RESPONSE: See Appendix A attached.

17. The calculation for the medical office is 5 parking spaces per 1,000 sq. ft., is it the intent to use 4 per 1,000 or was this an oversight?

RESPONSE: Yes, this was an oversight. The calculated number was correct but was mislabeled. This has been corrected.

18. Revise the photometric plan to show the limits of where the foot candle reading reaches 0. Provide justification for the 28-foot parking lot pole height. The UDO does require lower pole heights when adjoining properties with residential uses. Staff understands the distance to the homes is quite long, however additional detail from the applicant is requested. Will there be proposed building lighting? Can this be included in photometric plan at this time? If provided at final development plan stage, all lighting shall meet UDO standards.

RESPONSE: Building lighting types and locations were not developed/designed under the PDP. Any building mounted lighting provided in future packages will comply with UDO standards. Top of parking lot fixture at 28'-0" AFG per UDO standards. This helps maximize light distribution and minimize quantity of parking lot poles required to effectively light the parking lots. Photometric plan has been adjusted to indicate where the foot candle readings drop to 0.

19. Provide a table detailing the proposed FAR and/or densities for each lot.

RESPONSE: A table has been added to A1.01.

20. There are conflicting building heights noted for the medical office building between sheets A1.01 and A2.01.

RESPONSE: Building heights have been coordinated on respective sheets.

21. Provide the hotel building heights and square footages.

RESPONSE: Potential building heights and square footages have been added. These are based on conceptual drawings from potential hoteliers. Final building heights may vary.

22. Elevations were not received for the proposed stand-alone restaurant, apartment building, hotel(s), and the parking garage. Is the intent for this preliminary development plan to cover all buildings?

RESPONSE: Stand-alone restaurant: See additional elevation added to A2.01. Multi-family: Portions of 3 sides of this building are shown (Elevation 1, 3, 5). Hotels: a hotelier has not been finalized. Aesthetic of hotel(s) will match character of development to the greatest extent the franchise will allow. Parking Garage: the parking garage is currently wrapped on all sides by the multi-family building so will be hidden.

23. Elevations for all sides of buildings are needed for review prior to moving forward to public hearings.

RESPONSE: Original submittal followed requirements listed on "C.5.a. Building Elevations" for a single elevation provided per building type in the event of several building types.

24. The medical office building elevation seems to be lacking additional elements. Perhaps, there could be additional details or material changes?

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

25. The entertainment building elevation is lacking vertical and horizontal elements. Can additional detail be added?

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

26. Provide leaders identifying the proposed exterior building materials referencing the exact location on the building.

RESPONSE: Leaders have been added to revised building elevations on A2.01.

27. Has it been determined if metal paneling or EIFS is proposed? Some of the elevations indicate either/or. Also, where metal is proposed, please provide the percentage for each elevation. Staff recommends no more than 30% for a given elevation.

RESPONSE: The potential of both may exist. Any metal panels utilized will not be industrial in nature, or what is commonly used on premanufactured metal building facades. Staff recommendation is noted.

28. Can an axonometric projection be provided showing the viewpoint from the from the SW point of view for the development? Can an architectural street section be provided showing the streetscape corridor looking through Paragon Pkwy?

RESPONSE: An axonometric projection of the development will be provided at a later date.

29. Can floor plans be provided for the buildings? It would assist in understanding proposed projections for the buildings.

RESPONSE: Floor plans are not available at this time. These will vary based on final tenant mix. It is anticipated and desirable to have variety in building plane to help break up the length of the building(s). Paragon Parkway street section indicates a 5' +/- façade relief zone.

30. Provide detail on how proposed Roof mounted units and/or ground mounted units will be screened. Staff is unsure about the proposed screening method for the medical building. Can building material sample be provided? Can a building material sample be provided for all proposed metal materials?

RESPONSE: Any roof mounted equipment will either be screened by a parapet of sufficient size, or a mechanical screen. The screen will be constructed out of one of the approved building materials.

31. Are any signs/monument signs proposed for the site that may require approval through the Governing Body (exceeding our standards)? If so, provide a detail of the sign and it can be reviewed as part of this application.

RESPONSE: It is anticipated that the desired signage for the project will exceed the standards. Specifics for signage are not finalized at this time but a signage modification request will be needed.

32. Provide a trash enclosure detail, or if provided at final development plan stage, the closure shall meet the UDO standards.

RESPONSE: Trash enclosures are anticipated to be within the building footprint as indicated on the plan. If additional stand-alone trash enclosures are required for the development, trash enclosures will be have similar detailing to what is shown on A7.01.

33. On Sheet A1.01, are the labels for the four buildings on either side of Paragon Pkwy accurate for all buildings with respect to the total sq. ftg. and uses or just for the building on which it is labeled?

RESPONSE: Building square footages are accurate as listed.

34. On Sheet A1.01, is the total square footage of the 2-story restaurant 11,070? The other multi-story buildings have the square footages for each floor called out, this one did not. Please clarify.

RESPONSE: The square footage for this building has been modified to accommodate the anticipated second floor area.

35. On Sheet A1.01, the hotel square footage and height is not labeled. Staff suggests shifting the hotels further to the west to allow for a service road behind the hotel.

RESPONSE: Hotelier has not been finalized. Height and specific square footage may vary based on final franchise. Comment regarding shift noted.

36. Can the building footprints (only) be labeled for clarification? The footprint square footage is needed to calculate landscape requirements.

RESPONSE: Building footprint numbers have been added to each building.

37. In the landscape table, the total sq. ftg. used in the landscaping calculations is less than the total sq.ftg. noted on Sheet A1.01. The total square footage is also noted as something different on Sheet C002 when the lot and tract totals are tallied. Can the total sq. ftg. be confirmed? This could require revisions to the landscape table.

RESPONSE: The square footages now match.

38. Discussion is needed for the proposed caliper sizes and heights for the proposed trees. As proposed the landscaping minimums are not met.

RESPONSE: Plans have been revised to meet landscaping minimum standards.

39. It is noted shrubs are not shown, labeled, or identified on the plan. At final development plan stage this will be requested and shall meet the UDO standards.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

40. Where was the parking lot screening calculated? Technically parking lot screening is required along the I-470 frontage and the View High Pkwy frontage. Staff will recommend screening along the View High Corridor, but could support a modification along the I-470 frontage. Can justification be provided along with photos, and perhaps a count of existing tree masses along the river in the north, northwest portion of the site? This would be to show there is adequate screening to adjoining properties that are currently have a residence located on the property?

RESPONSE: Plans have been revised to meet screening requirements along View High Pkwy frontage. The team will ask for a modification along the I-470 frontage. The team would prefer to meet screening requirements in this location but is limited by KCPL Easement. Team will provide photographic/survey information to show adequate screening for adjoining properties to the northwest.

41. Additional review will be required once revised plans have been received to determine if landscaping requirements have been met.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged

42. 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.

RESPONSE: 2.260.B does not seem to be applicable as this section pertains to rezoning applications. In response to 2.260.C, the development meets the 3 listed criteria.

43. Modification requests. Provide a narrative statement that explains the need for all requested modifications. It's been noted modifications could be needed for:

-parking lot setbacks

RESPONSE: We are requesting a modification to the 20' setback requirement between the I-470 off-ramp ROW and the south village parking lot, because the slope within the ROW north of the off-ramp provides screening potential. We believe this slope combined with a minimum of 10' of landscaped buffer along the south edge of the parking lot will meet the intent of the screening

requirement. See Item #6 response.

-landscaping requirements

RESPONSE: The plans have been revised to meet the landscape code requirements, so we are not requesting a modification. See Item #41 response.

-metal panels

RESPONSE: We anticipate metal panel as a building material option within the pallet of allowable materials in the development. Any metal panels utilized will not be industrial in nature (or what is commonly used on pre-manufactured metal building facades.) See Item #27 response. See Item #27 response.

RESPONSE: In addition to the three items noted above, a Signage Modification Request is being made. It is the developer's intent to develop a dynamic and cohesive environmental graphics/signage guideline document (including wayfinding, placemaking and building identity signage,) that will help reinforce the unique nature and excitement of the development. To help optimize the visual or informational impact, some of the recommendations may fall outside the City's allowable signage criteria. As a result, they may require certain modifications. Once the guideline document is completed, we will present to the City staff for their review.

Engineering Comments:

1. General:

- Show location of all oil/gas wells, or indicate none are present, and cite the source.

RESPONSE: Note added to general layout. No wells per MDNR.

- Show phasing of this project.

RESPONSE: See previous comments regarding phasing.

- The individual lot lines are not clearly shown. Revise a sheet, or add a new sheet, to clearly show lot lines.

RESPONSE: Sheet C002 revised with bolded lot lines.

- The plans show a future parking garage to the south of the medical office building. Given the size of the structure, there will be significant Impact to existing parking when constructed. Consider doing any subgrade work for the future garage possible at this time to help minimize future disruptions.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

- "Public" and "Private" designations included in street name labels is not consistent thru the plan set. Please reconcile.

RESPONSE: Labels revised.

- The Proposed Floodplain boundary runs thru the coffee shop and south hotel. This is not allowed. Please revise.

RESPONSE: Floodplain revised.

2. Sheet C002:

- The "Lot 2" label is used twice. Please revise.

RESPONSE: North Lot revised to Lot 1.

- Please label the base flood elevation.

RESPONSE: Floodplain revised.

3. Sheet C005:

- Include all lines(floodway, stream buffer, etc.) in the Legend and include “proposed” or “existing” as applicable.

RESPONSE: Floodway, floodplain, stream buffer added to legend.

- What is the “Conceptual Layout” included in the Legend? Please clarify or delete.

RESPONSE: Conceptual layout removed.

4. Sheet C006:

- Label the storm structure upstream of Structure 4803 to the south.

RESPONSE: Structure labeled.

- Label multi-use buildings with all uses, not just retail, on this sheet and throughout the plan set as applicable.

RESPONSE: Labels revised/added.

5. Sheet C008: A typical section is not required at this time, but will be required with any Final Development Plan submitted. Remove the typical section shown.

RESPONSE: Sheet removed.

6. Sheet L500: Please note that only ornamental trees are allowed within public easements.

RESPONSE: All non-ornamental trees have been removed from public easements as requested.

Traffic Comments:

1. Add sidewalk along the south side of the proposed RIRO driveway from View High Drive to the development.

RESPONSE: Sidewalk added.

2. Consider moving the proposed sidewalk shown on the north side of Paragon Parkway between the development and River Road to the south side of the street so as to minimize the number of roadway crossings/pedestrian conflicts.

RESPONSE: This comment is understandable, and in fact the original layout included the pedestrian bridge crossing on the south side of Paragon Parkway. It was moved to the North after much deliberation because most of the pedestrian traffic heading to the soccer complex will very likely use the West entrance (the location of the clubhouse and other amenities) which is north-east of the pedestrian bridge crossing, rather than the South entrance to the complex, which is secondary. The design team felt that with a pedestrian bridge crossing south of Paragon Parkway, many pedestrians headed to this West entrance would cross Paragon Parkway heading north-east (shortest path of travel) instead of following the roundabout and staying south of the south parking lot.

3. Sidewalk has been omitted from the west side of River Road and a portion of Paragon Parkway (at river crossings). This will be an exception to the typical design requirements that all commercial streets (including private streets) have sidewalk along both sides. However, the omitted areas make sense given the adjacent

river areas and otherwise available access routes/sidewalk network for pedestrians related to the places of activity and bridges.

RESPONSE: This is true for the Paragon Parkway river crossings. The design team felt it was better to consolidate the available dimension for pedestrians (due to cost efficiency and space constraints) to one side to make a single comfortable pedestrian amenity rather than two narrow sidewalks. The plans do include a sidewalk on the West side of River Road. The line weight was light in the initial submittal, so they have been bolded in the plans to read better, but the intent is to maintain a pedestrian sidewalk on both sides of the River Road, with crossings in strategic locations.

4. The typical section for Paragon Parkway doesn't seem to match the plans.

RESPONSE: The Paragon Parkway section has been updated to match site plans

5. General Parking Comments/Questions: The parking table needs additional information and more clarity for staff review. What is the relationship of individual land uses, buildings and areas of land use proposed within the development corresponding to the parking supply proposed for code, market or shared parking needs? The tabulated aggregate assumes all of the parking is shared without any assignment (e.g. multi-family supply is presumably not entirely shared with other uses) or regard to proximity (e.g. separation of parking supply to parking demand or distance between compatible uses that share parking). Furthermore, could there be a summary of shared parking north and south of Paragon Parkway in addition to the entire site if some of the more detailed information cannot be provided? It appears the "Future Garage" is included in the supply to meet the shared parking model of market demand. Is the "Future Garage" needed or not and when would it be provided if so?

RESPONSE: See revised parking information on Sheet A1.01 as well as Appendix A attached.

Sincerely,

Casey Culbertson, AIA

913.498.1550 x 102

cculbertson@finklewilliams.com

Finkle + Williams Architecture