

July 1, 2019

**City of Lee's Summit
Development Center
220 SE Green Street
Lee's Summit, MO 64063**

Re: Application PL2019166, Commercial Final Development Plan Review

Ms. Thompson:

BHC Rhodes has received your comments dated 05/17/2019 and have the following responses:

FIRE REVIEW

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.

-Applicant acknowledges the requirement

2. 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.

Action required: The portions of the parking lot used for fire department access shall support the weight of fire apparatus (75,000-pounds).

-All drive aisles have been updated to have a heavy-duty pavement section

3. 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).

Recommend shortening the the width of the island at the south in of the parking lot to allow turning movement of larger vehicles i.e. firetrucks and trash trucks.

PLANNING REVIEW

1. The driveway and drive aisle widths are not met. The minimum width for driveways and drive aisles is 24 feet and shall only include the pavement and not the curb and gutters.

-Curb and gutters (CG-1) have been replaced with straight curbs (Type C-1) in places where driveway width was not compliant

2. Specify which curbing will be utilized, CG-1 or an integral Portland cement concrete side-walk and curb with a vertical face is required.
-Where sidewalk is provided an integral sidewalk curb will be used. Straight curbs will be used where along medians and areas where drainage is directed away from curb.
3. The approved preliminary development plan has an ordinance requirement that all buildings shall incorporate "prairie style architecture". This will be required for this development. If "prairie style architecture" is not desired, the application would need to go through a preliminary development plan for approval for the desired style of architecture.
-Plan set, including elevations have been submitted and approved by overall development and comply with requirements
4. The asphalt pavement details doesn't meet the UDO requirements. The 6-inch subgrade should note that it's stabilized.
-Pavement sections have been revised to meet UDO requirements
5. Provide a pavement detail for the proposed fire lanes and truck access areas. Also indicate these areas on Sheet C2.0.
-Heavy-Duty pavement section provided with detail 003 on sheet C9.0. Revised C2.0 indicate distinction between pavement section requirements
6. The trash enclosure area is required to have a concrete approach 30 feet in length, measured from the enclosure opening.
-Trash apron revised to be 30' long and dimension given on C2.0.
7. Reference the accessible sign detail of R7-8. This detail has a white background and green border.
-Detail 005 on C9.0 revised to call out sign R7-8.
8. Tree caliper sizes and evergreen tree height doesn't meet UDO standards. Revise the landscape sheet to reflect 3 inch caliper size and 8 foot tree height.
Sheet L1.0 - Tree caliper has been updated to 3 inches and Evergreen height to 8 foot.
9. Eight street trees are required along the Woods Chapel street frontage, the landscape plan reflects the number, but the tree symbols do not reflect that eight trees are proposed.
Sheet L1.0 – 8 trees are shown along Woods Chapel Street Frontage.
10. The street shrubs along I-470 are not shown. The table indicates 9 are required, but they are not labeled on the plan.
Sheet L1.0 – 9 Street Shrubs are shown along I-470 Frontage.

11. On Sheet C0.0, revise the contacts for Planning and Development and Codes Administration. These two departments are now combined into one, which is Development Services. The 969-1200 numbers are accurate.
-Contacts on Cover revised as commented
12. The elevations need to be revised to limit the proposed amount of E.I.F.S. on both the east and west elevations.
-Elevations revised and approved by overall development standards
13. A ratio of 30% E.I.F.S. is supportable for each elevation. Provide stone or brick (in the same dark gray color) replace the dark gray E.I.F.S area on the lower half of the building (on both elevations).
-Elevations revised and approved by overall development standards
14. Staff is requesting the canopy/awning area on the north and east elevations be wrapped around the entire width of the fiber cement paneled area on the north and west elevations. Extending the canopies will meet the requirement for horizontal and vertical features to break up the wall planes.
-Elevations revised as commented
15. It seems the east and west elevations are mislabeled.
-Elevation labels revised to accurately reflect building orientation
16. In order to be compliant with the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), the height of the parapet wall is required to be increased to the height of the proposed Roof Top Units (RTU). Revise sheet A4.0 and A4.1
-Parapet wall revised as commented
17. All signs require a separate sign permit submittal and approval through the Development Services Department.
-Applicant acknowledges the requirement
18. Building elevations were not received for the small drive-thru coffee shop. For the coffee shop to be approved as part of this final development plan, the elevations are required to be submitted for review.
-Building elevations provided for Coffee Shop with this submittal
19. What is the proposed height of the retaining wall?
-Retaining wall profile given on Sheet C10.1. Maximum total height of wall is 9' (not exposed face).
20. Label the utility easements, access easements, and platted build lines on all sheets. Any proposed trees within the easements will need to be revised to an ornamental species.

Sheet L1.0 – Trees have been moved outside of easements or converted to ornamental varieties.

21. Is there concern of the Missouri Public service easement as noted on the plat? Does this need to be vacated?

-This was vacated as a part of the land transaction of ownership to FSD Woods Chapel LLC.

22. Provide the manufacturer's specifications for all proposed exterior lighting.

-Specifications provided

23. Is the parking lot pole height of 25 feet inclusive of a base? Please clarify.

24. Label the property lines.

-Bearing and distances provided on all applicable sheets

25. Provide a note and reference to whether there are any active or abandoned wells on the premises.

-Note Added to Cover.

ENGINEERING REVIEW

1. The public water main along the west side of the project will likely need to be relocated vertically, due to the cut activity in this area. We are assuming no potholing was conducted to determine the depth of the water main. A minimum of 42 inches of cover over the top of the pipe is required, with no greater than 7 feet.

-Potholing results determined water main has approximately 45 inches of cover at existing grades. Area of greatest cut along main is approximately 3 feet, thus waterline must be lowered. Public Improvement plans provided with submittal.

2. The asphalt paving does not follow the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) in terms of pavement thickness, base, and chemically-stabilized subgrade or geogrid. Please see the UDO for specific design requirements for asphalt paving. If using the results of a geotechnical study, then specific design criteria must be followed, which did not appear to be utilized within the geotechnical study. It appeared the design presented within this geotechnical report was based on generic assumptions.

-Asphalt section revised to meet UDO standards.

3. Private off-site drainage easements shall be required prior to formal approval of the Final Development Plan.

-Drainage route has been agreed upon by owners of Price Chopper and easement documentation is being prepared.

4. It appears there may be structural elements of the retaining wall within utility easements. Please verify and remove these structural elements from the utility easement.

-A portion of the easement is being vacated. The proposed easement Vacation is being submitted concurrently with this submittal

5. All Sheets: Please label all private access roads. The north/south private road is labeled,
-Additional access road labeled on all sheets.

6. It is likely that separate public water line relocation plans will be required, due to the cut activity over the top of the existing public water main.
-Potholing confirmed this situation. Public improvement plans provided with submittal.

7. the grading plan was lacking the elevations of existing contours in key locations (i.e., near the existing public water main). It appears, however, that the water main is going to be impacted by cut activities along the west side of the project, as well as the northwest portion of the project.
-Additional contour labels added

8. Temporary grading easements called-out on the plans will need to be obtained and executed prior to formal approval of the Final Development Plan.
-Agreement under review with Price Chopper owner.

9. It appears that a substantial amount of stormwater is going to bypass the interior curb inlets and discharge directly onto adjoining property.
-"Vane Drain" added to capture runoff from existing the property at the entrance to the site.

10. Utility Plan: If there is any desire in the future to dedicate the 8 inch sanitary sewer as public, it cannot be extended as shown. It should be placed along the property line and along the private drive.
-Per discussions with staff, if the proposed private main is to be dedicated public then an easement will be granted. Site features have been revised to allow for a 10' sanitary easement to be granted without encroachment.

11. Sheet C5.1: Please label the profile as "PRIVATE SANITARY".
-Profile revised as commented

12. According to the stormwater memorandum dated May 2, 2019, it is stated that "...the pipe has a capacity of 40.05 cfs." What is meant by "capacity"? Is this the capacity flowing full? According to your hydraulic grade line depictions, it would appear the table is incorrect because the 100 year design flows are well above the crown of the pipe. The 10 year event is contained within the pipe, and this is acceptable, but it does not appear the table is valid, unless these figures represent the pipe at a certain elevation. Please review and revise as appropriate.
-Pipe capacity was calculated using Manning's Equation assuming full flow. The HGLs

shown on the profile were incorrect and have been revised with this submittal

13. A detail is needed that shows curb and gutter to be installed with the required aggregate layer and chemically-stabilized subgrade or geogrid, a minimum of one (1) foot beyond the back of curb. GEN-4 is provided, but this is a curb replacement detail, as well as a curb geometry detail. A separate detail is required showing the one (1) foot extension beyond the back of curb.

14. Utility Plan: Please clarify that a cut-in wye is required for the existing sanitary sewer service.

-Note 14 on Sheet C5.0 revised to call for a cut-in wye at connection point

15. Notes must be provided concerning any adjustment to grade to the existing sanitary sewer manhole.

-Note 16 added to C5.0 indicating a 4" adjustment ring to be added to existing manhole

16. Are there any downspouts serving the buildings? What is their general location, and where are they draining?

-Underground roof drain system added and necessary callouts for construction.

17. Sheet C7.0: Several junction boxes are called-out on the adjoining Price Chopper property. Wouldn't it be better to call-out curb inlets?

-Offsite system revised per conversations with Price Chopper.

18. Sheet C7.0: Several call-outs to junction boxes, standard curb inlets, and Neenah curb inlets are shown. However, there are no clear indications of where these are located. Standard practice is to provide the sheet number and detail number. When glancing through the standard details provided, there is no such "standard curb inlet" shown, nor a "Neenah curb inlet", nor a "junction box". It might be inferred that the detail shown on Sheet C9.2 is a Neenah curb inlet, but it is not clear because it is not called-out as such. The "standard curb inlet" might also be inferred from Sheet C9.3, but again, it is not clear. Shouldn't this be referred to as a curb inlet as denoted by STM-1 on Sheet C9.3? Finally, there is no detail shown for a junction box anywhere in the plan set.

-Call outs revised to reference appropriate detail number and sheet. Junction Box detail added.

19. Sheet L.1: Trees are shown too close to the existing public water main. Trees must be no closer than 5 feet as measured from the outside of the pipe, to the outside of the mature tree trunk.

Sheet L1.0 – Trees will be moved outside of the 5-foot range of the existing water main.

20. If calling out standard curb inlets that follow the City standard detail STM-1, the plan view does not portray them correctly. These curb inlets are offset from the back of curb.

-Curb inlet callout revised to be non-setback curb inlet as shown on plans. Added detail 014 on sheet C9.2

21. A parking lot/island/private access drive repair and restoration plan was missing from the plans. This plan should include a plan view of the anticipated scope of work, including pavement repair, pavement repair details, median and island repair, including final restoration, parking lot re-stripping, and all other information needed to show what is proposed.

-Sheet C11.0 Offsite Restoration Plan added to include items commented.

22. An itemized and sealed Engineer's Estimate of Probable Construction Costs is required prior to formal approval of the plans. The Engineering Plan review and inspection fee is based on this estimate, and calculated at 3% of the total, plus a nominal water test observation per trip fee, and water meter fee. Items to include on the estimate include: 1) water lines, 2) storm lines and structures greater than 6 inches in diameter, 3) sanitary sewer lines and connections,

4) site grading, 5) parking lot construction, 6) curb and gutter, 7) subgrade construction, including the area one (1) foot beyond the back of curb, 8) sanitary sewer adjustment to grade, 9) manholes, 10) junction boxes, 11) inlets, 12) retaining walls, 13) connection to existing storm inlet, 14) parking lot pavement repair, 15) parking lot landscaping repair, 16) parking lot island repair, including curb and gutter, 17) erosion and sediment control devices and measures, 18) final restoration, including sodding, seeding, fertilizer, mulch, and topsoil.

-Cost Estimate provided.

If you have any further questions, feel free to contact me at 913-663-1900 or by email at jay.odell@lbhc.com

Sincerely,



Jay O'Dell, PE
Project Engineer
BHC Rhodes
7101 College Blvd, Suite 400
Overland Park, KS 66210