

Dawn Bell
City of Lee's Summit
Development Services
220 S64063E Green Street
Lee's Summit, MO

Re: McKeever's – Comment Responses

Dear Ms. Bell,

Below are responses to the City's review comments from June 18th, 2018. Please let us know if you should require anything further or have questions:

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.

Acknowledged

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.

FDC is within 100ft of a proposed hydrant at the southwest corner of the building

3. It is recommended the hydrant be located on the FDC side of the fire lane.

Hydrant is on the same side of the roadway as the FDC

4. 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.

Acknowledged

Planning Review

1. Reduce the architectural plan sheet size to be no larger than 24 inches x 36 inches with one inch border.

Architect sheets have been resized to 24x36 for this submittal

2. Provide the drive aisle dimension between the islands within the parking lot. The drive aisle width shall be a minimum of 24' excluding the curb and gutter.

Drive aisle dimensions have been updated to a full 24ft excluding the curb and gutter

3. Provide the manufacturer's specifications for all exterior lighting.

Cut sheets have been added with this submittal

4. The landscaping calculation for the open yard tree and shrub requirements is in error. The total square footage

of the lot minus the building footprint (only), is the number to use for the landscape formula.

Revise the tree caliper sizes to 3-inch caliper, the Unified Development

Ordinance requires 3-inch. If trees are proposed within easements, revise the tree species to that of an ornamental variety.

Proposed landscape plan matches the approved Preliminary Development Plan under Ordinance #8531

5. The UDO requires some sort of landscaping within the parking lot islands (sod, trees, shrubs, mulch, ground cover, shrubs, etc.), please revise. This affects of few of the proposed islands that have pavers shown within them.

Proposed landscape plan matches the approved Preliminary Development Plan under Ordinance #8531

6. The UDO requires an additional parking lot islands (besides the islands on the end of every row), for every four rows. Please revise to account for a centered island somewhere "in the middle" of the parking lot. Had consideration been given to an internal sidewalk connection within the parking lot leading to the front entrance?

Proposed landscape plan matches the approved Preliminary Development Plan under Ordinance #8531

7. The preliminary development plan elevations had an "architectural detail/design that resembled wheat blowing in the wind" on the exterior of the building. Has consideration been given to include the detail with this plan submittal? Staff thought it was a nice detail as shown in the approved PDP.

Wheat element was deleted as this was more of a reference to Kansas rather than Missouri

8. The proposed pavement details do not meet UDO specifications. Please also refer to Engineering's comment regarding this reference.

Asphalt sections have been updated to match UDO standards

9. Many standard details have been omitted. Please provide details for the following:

- accessible sign
- curbing
- retaining wall (to include height)
- proposed fencing
- method of RTU screening (if something other than the parapet)
- loading dock screening (to include height)
- trash enclosure (if proposed)

Details have been added to the planset as requested

10. On the architectural sheets provide a dashed line to indicate the location of the proposed RTU's. How will these be screened?

RTU's have a premanufactured screen called out on the roof plan

11. Label and dimension all sidewalks. Are sidewalks proposed along the private drives? Staff would encourage this. Is the sidewalk on the north side of the parking lot part of this lot's construction? Please clarify.

Clarified and labeled sidewalk with this plan submittal

12. Clarify the location of the trash enclosure location/screening method. Staff is assuming it's integral to the loading dock area? Provide a detail and description of the proposed loading dock screening method.

Screen wall is shown in elevation and is detailed out in the building sections

13. Provide a CG-1 curbing call out and detail for proposed curbing.

CG-1 curbing has been called out for curb type and a detail added

14. Show all utility easements on the plan sheets.

Utility easements are shown, screened back, on plansheets

15. Provide the surrounding property information.

Surrounding property information has been added to the coversheet

16. All signs are required to be submitted by separate permit and approvals. Prior to the installation of any signs, City approvals are required.

Acknowledged

17. Please reference within the plans the address for this lot of 840 NW Pryor Rd.

Address has been added to this sheet

Engineering Review

1. General:

- a. Submit an Engineer's Estimate of Probable Construction Costs. **An engineer's estimate for the site work has been included with this submittal**
- b. Submit the SWPPP. **The Preliminary SWPPP has been attached as part of this submittal**
- c. Nothing has been constructed yet on the site, and the timing of all construction elements is still unknown. Items labeled "Existing" would be better off labeled "Proposed (By Others)" or similar. **Revised notes accordingly**
- d. Revise the private road/access drive names to match the Final Development Plan that includes their construction. **Revised notes accordingly**
- e. Include all applicable standard details in the plan set. **Details have been added to the planset**

2. Sheet C01:

- a. Revise the Water Utilities address to 1200 SE Hamblen Road in the Utilities contact list. **Added information**
- b. Include the author of the oil/gas well source. **Added information**
- c. The General Notes introduction references a Preliminary Development Plan, but this is a Final Development Plan. Please revise. **Note has been revised**
- d. Revise General Note 8 to reference Development Engineering Inspections. **Note has**

been revised

3. Sheet C02: Why are some storm sewer called out as “Existing” but not all, and no other utilities are labeled that way? Perhaps adding a legend showing line weights/types or adding “Typ” to labels would be more consistent. **Added Typ. To notes to clarify this sheet**
4. Sheet C04: The asphalt pavement sections do not meet the requirements shown in Section 8.620 of the Unified Development Ordinance. Revise details to meet requirements. Please note that the UDO requirements govern over any shown in the referenced geotechnical report unless a waiver is requested and approved by the City Engineer. **Updated pavement sections to match the UDO requirements**
5. Sheet C05:
 - a. Label contour elevations. **Contour labels added**
 - b. All proposed contours must tie back into existing contours. **Added tie outs to existing on the grading sheets**
 - c. Add contour information to the Legend. **Information added**
 - d. Include Top and Bottom Wall elevations. **Wall information has been added**
6. Sheet C07:
 - a. Specify roof drain size, material, and how it connects to the storm structures. **Provided additional design detail on roof drains/structures**
 - b. Specify water line size, material, and what it connects to (tee, cross, etc.) **Added waterline size as well as tie to existing information**
 - c. Label the sanitary sewer service line to be connected to the main with a cut-in tee. **Sewer service information and tie location has been added**
7. Sheets C11 & C12: The proposed contours must tie back into the existing contours. **Grading has been updated to show tie back to existing**

Building Codes Review

1. Water meter not found in design. **Water demand is 98gpm. The city does not appear to have published meter capacities, we believe meter should be 1-1/2” however we need confirmation from City Water Dept.**

Sincerely,



Renaissance Infrastructure Consulting
Dustin Burton, PE