LEE'S SUMMIT
MISSOURI

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Commercial Final Development Plan
Applicant's Letter

Date: Thursday, April 18, 2019

To:

Property Owner: MIDWEST DIVISION LSH LLC	Email: Fax #: <NO FAX NUMBER>
Applicant: S&ME, Inc.	Email: ghuddleston@smeinc.com Fax #: <NO FAX NUMBER>
Engineer: S&ME, Inc.	Email: ghuddleston@smeinc.com Fax #: <NO FAX NUMBER>

From: Hector Soto Jr., Planning Division Manager

Re:

Application Number:	PL2017190
Application Type:	Commercial Final Development Plan
Application Name:	LEE'S SUMMIT MEDICAL CENTER - HCA MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING
Location:	1980 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 mulit-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:

Planning Review	Hector Soto Jr. (816) 969-1238	Planning Division Manager Hector.Soto@cityofls.net	No Comments

Engineering Review	Gene Williams (816) 969-1223	Senior Staff Engineer Gene.Williams@cityofls.net	Corrections

1. There is concern about the flat slope in the bottom of the detention basin. Even though call-outs of 2% slope are shown, they do not agree with the contour elevation call-outs. Calculations are provided using the "PONDs) software showing this may be feasible (i.e., to allow a flat-bottom detention basin), but please be aware that it will be a condition of approval of this Final Development Plan that all stormwater in the bottom of the detention basin be eliminated within the timeframe specified in the report. If it is shown that it is not eliminated within 72 hours as specified in the report, it is likely the project will not be granted Final Acceptance, and a re-design will be required.

2. As discussed above, 2% call-outs are shown on the grading plan shown on Sheet C6.2. However, this does not agree with the elevation call-outs on the contours for a majority of the basin bottom.

3. The bottom of the retaining wall elevation is shown at 992.0 throughout the entire basin, but this call-out does not agree with the 993 contour call-out shown in the southeast corner of the basin. According to the contour call-outs, the bottom of the wall should be higher than 993?

4. No information other than length and width of the "Bio Retention Area" was provided on Sheet C6.2 or L1.2 or L2.0. A thickness is required. The note "1" gravel 3" depth in lieu of mulch" is not sufficient, and we do not support this substitution. In addition, it is not a "mulch" mix. According to Sheet L2.0, the mixture is not mulch, but rather, a planting soil with a specific mixture of sand, silt, organic matter, etc. It should match what is shown in the stormwater report, which according to Appendix VII is 3.0 feet? Finally, please remove the overstrike error on this note. It is obscured by traffic arrows, and not legible.

5. Sheet C6.4: The outlet control structure has been redesigned. However, it now appears to show two (2) "goosenecks" with no corresponding detail concerning their construction (e.g., length, materials, elevation of the bottom of the gooseneck, etc.). Recommended that a separate detail be provided showing these design details.

6. Sheet C6.4: The outlet structure has now been redesigned. However, The plan view shows what appears to be a grated top, rather than a manhole frame and lid. Please reconcile this discrepancy.

7. Sheet C6.4: The lower gooseneck appears to be placed where it will affect the routing calculations (i.e., it appears to be installed just above the apron shown in the isometric view). However, without any elevation call-outs, or dimensions showing the distance between the bottom of the gooseneck and the top of the apron, it is impossible to determine what, if any, affect this constriction would have on the routing calculations. Please reconcile.

8. Sheet C6.4: The elevation call-out for the apron shown in the isometric view does not agree with the elevation call-out on the contour lines shown on the grading plan shown on Sheet C6.2. According to Sheet C6.2, the elevation is between 992 and 993. Sheet C6.4 calls-out an elevation of 991.0. Please reconcile.

9. Sheet C6.4: Two (2) 4 inch were added to outlet structure K2. However, no profile view was provided. Since this is an integral part of the dam, a profile view is required showing pipe material, slope, length, etc. As shown, there are no dimensions provided anywhere on the plans, nor any slope call-outs.

10. Sheet C6.4 "Pond Cross-Section": The 100 year nominal stage is shown at 999.6. Above this, there is a dashed line with an elevation call-out of 999.6 (i.e., it is exactly the same call-out). This does not make sense (i.e., how can the dashed line shown above the lower line be the same?).

11. Sheet C6.4 "Pond Cross-Section": It appears the top of the dam has been changed, and is now shown at 999.6. However, this does not agree with the grading plan shown on Sheet C6.2. Sheet C6.2 shows the elevation of the top of the dam being at least 1000 feet. In other words, it appears no significant changes were made to the grading plan on Sheet C6.2 since the last submittal.

12. Sheet C6.4: It appears the "Pond Cross-Section" top dimension has been changed. It is now shown extending past the top of the dam (i.e., the 4 foot width at the top of the dam call-out is shown extending past the top of the dam). It appears this is a drafting error?

13. Sheet C6.4 "Pond Cross-Sections": If the top of the dam is planned to be 999.6, why is there additional fill shown at an elevation of 1001.0 on the cross-section above this point? According to your design, it would appear this doesn't make sense. According to your drawings, the retaining wall is set at the higher elevation?

14. The "Drainage Design Summary" dated Apr. 10, 2019 appears to show the 100 year nominal water surface elevation at the top of the dam, which is not allowed. A minimum of 0.5 feet of freeboard is required from this nominal condition, and the top of the dam. It appears no freeboard was provided at all. We will not support any "waiver" or "design exception" to this rule. We had discussed reducing the freeboard requirement to perhaps 0.7 feet for the clogged condition/zero available storage, but not the freeboard between the nominal condition and the top of the dam.

15. Recommend that a thorough review of Sheet C6.4 be conducted. It appears that little effort was conducted to ensure the plans make sense both from a constructability standpoint, but also whether the design is supported by the calculations and statements provided in the stormwater report.

16. Engineer's Estimate of Probable Construction Costs: It appears the following unit prices were low basedd on previous estimates: 1) curb and gutter, 2) 8 inch PVC sanitary line, 3) sanitary manholes, 4) water lines (all). In addition, the estimate appeared to be missing the following items: 1) relocation of the existing backflow vaults, or new backflow vaults, 2) erosion and sediment control devices and measures, 3) final restoration, including seeding, sodding, fertilizer, mulch, and topsoil, 4) detention basin outlet structure, 5) 4 inch HDPE dam drainage line, 6) sand drain, 7) bioretention cell.

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 2018 International Fire Code.

Traffic Review	Michael Park	City Traffic Engineer	Approved with Conditions

	(816) 969-1820	Michael.Park@cityofls.net	
Building Codes Review	Joe Frogge (816) 969-1241	Plans Examiner Joe.Frogge@cityofls.net	No Comments