

Residential Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan Applicant's Letter

Date: Thursday, October 10, 2019

To:

Property Owner: SHEEHY JOHN R & KIMBERLY
D-TR

Email:
Fax #: <NO FAX NUMBER>

Property Owner: HUFF CARL E & ALTHEA J

Email:
Fax #: <NO FAX NUMBER>

From: Victoria Nelson, Long Range Planner

Re:

Application Number: PL2019330
Application Type: Residential Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan
Application Name: WOODLAND OAKS
Location: 2601 NE COLBERN RD, LEES SUMMIT, MO 64086
2501 NE COLBERN RD, LEES SUMMIT, MO 64086

Tentative Schedule

To be discussed during applicant's meeting on 10/15/2019 at 11:00 am.

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 300 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.

3. Neighborhood Meeting. One neighborhood meeting is required for each application, which must occur within the initial 10 day review period and prior to re-submission of the application. More than one neighborhood meeting may be held on an application, at the option of the applicant

- **Timing and location:** Within two miles of the project site, Monday through Thursday, excluding holidays, and start between 6:00P.M. and 8:00 P.M. If location for the meeting is not available within [2] miles of the subject property. The applicant shall select a location outside this area that is reasonably close to these boundaries.
- **Notification:** Shall be sent by certified mail or delivered to property owners within 300 feet of the project site. Mailed notices shall be postmarked at least seven days prior to the meeting. Hand deliveries must occur at least five (5) days prior to the meeting.
- **Notes:** The Applicant shall take sufficient notes at the neighborhood meeting to recall issues raised by the participants, in order to report on and discuss them at public hearings before City governmental bodies on the application. The notes shall be turned in with the application re-submittal.

Analysis of Residential Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan:

Fire Review	Jim Eden (816) 969-1303	Assistant Chief Jim.Eden@cityofls.net	Corrections
--------------------	----------------------------	--	-------------

1. Street names need to be changed or added:

Provide another street name for Gull Wing Ct. It is too similar to an existing street.

Lashbrook Drive is labeled incorrectly. Provide names for north the and northwest cul-de-sacs. Lashbrook Ct already exists to the south.

Planning Review	Victoria Nelson (816) 969-1605	Long Range Planner Victoria.Nelson@cityofls.net	Corrections
------------------------	-----------------------------------	--	-------------

1. LEGAL DESCRIPTION. A legal description, including acreage, for the proposed property to be rezoned shall be included on the rezoning map/exhibit.

2. SITE DATA TABLE. Provide a table on the preliminary development plan or preliminary plat sheet that includes the following information:

- Total Land Area (in sq. ft. and acres);
- Number of Lots;
- Number of Common Area Tracts;
- Density

3. SINGLE-FAMILY COMPATIBILITY. Submit a completed Single-family Residential Compatibility form that compares the proposed development to the abutting Woodland Shores subdivision.

4. PHASING. Will the development be phased? If so, show the phasing on the plans.

5. BUILDING ELEVATIONS. Building elevations for the homes are required to be submitted as part of a preliminary development plan application. Elevations shall be submitted for all four sides of the homes, shall label all proposed exterior building materials and colors.

6. STREET TREES. Any landscape proposed within the public right-of-way requires Public Works approval and entering into a license agreement with the City.

7. LOT SIZES.

- Label the lot sizes for Lots 3-13.
- Lot 6 has either a stray or incorrect lot size label of 6.89 acres.

8. COMMON AREA TRACT. Label the tract at the southwest site corner as Tract B. Include Tract B in Note #3 on the preliminary plat sheet assigning ownership and maintenance to the Woodland Oaks HOA.

9. EASEMENTS. Show all proposed easements on all lots as necessary. At a minimum, there are missing easements along Lots 38/39 and Lots 35/36 for stormwater lines.

10. RIGHT-OF-WAY. Label all proposed ROW widths, as well as the existing ROW widths for NE Colbern Rd and NE Blackwell Pkwy.

11. STREETS.

- The segment of Lashbrook adjacent to Lots 1 and 41 shall continue the existing NE Lashbrook Dr name. The cul-de-sac segment containing Lots 17-25 shall be named NE Lashbrook Ct.
- Label the cul-de-sac containing Lots 25-41 NE Gull Wing Cir.
- Provide the curve radius and length information for both NE Gull Wing Ct and Cir.

12. LOT DIMENSIONS.

- Provide the missing front property line dimensions for Lots 4-13.
- Provide the missing north lot line dimension for Tract A.
- Provide the missing south and west lot line dimensions for Tract B.

13. EXISTING LOT CONDITIONS. Label and show the location, massing and pattern of the existing wooded areas on the plan sheets.

14. MISCELLANEOUS. What does the bold line running parallel to the ROW on Lots 34-41 signify? The line appears on the PDP landscape plan and preliminary plat drawings.

15. MODIFICATIONS.

- A modification is required to allow 100% of the development's lots be cul-de-sac lots. The UDO allows a maximum of 10%.
- A modification is required to allow cul-de-sacs over 500' in length. Both NE Gull Wing Ct and Cir are over 600' in length.
- A written narrative shall be submitted that provides justification for the two modification requests. The UDO makes an allowance for a cul-de-sac length up to 1,000 feet if clear and convincing evidence is provided that certain conditions exist. See Section 7.270.B.4 to see the conditions that must be addressed.

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

1. The "Preliminary Storm Water Report" dated Sep. 11, 2019 (hereinafter referred to as the stormwater report) does not discuss the methodology used to size the basin. It appears the outdated standard of "pre-development versus post-development" was utilized. The City of Lee's Summit has adopted the Comprehensive Control Strategy discussed in Section 5600 of the Design and Construction Manual.

2. The stormwater report does not discuss the emergency spillway location, whether the primary outlet works will be combined with the emergency spillway, or whether the emergency spillway will be a separate component such as an earthen weir. Freeboard requirements were not discussed for the nominal 100 year water surface elevation in relation to the emergency spillway crest elevation and adjacent property lines, nor the 100% clogged/zero available storage freeboard in relation to the top of the dam and adjacent property lines.

3. Two (2) detention basins are discussed within the body of the stormwater report, appendices of the stormwater report, but only one (1) is shown on the actual Preliminary Development Plan.

4. The majority of existing contour elevations are missing elevations call-outs, making it impossible to review.

5. The drainage area shown on the Preliminary Drainage Map is not correct in terms of the drainage area to the southwest detention basin. We are showing a much greater drainage area than shown. It is worth mentioning that a 42 inch pipe discharges immediately upstream of the southwest detention basin, and it is unclear how this drainage will be managed. Please be aware that we will not support routing this drainage around the basin, since this would likely impact adjacent property owners within Woodland Shores subdivision.

6. The incoming hydrograph to the southwest detention basin (i.e., described as the west basin in the report) appears to be in error. There appears to be considerably more drainage area than shown.

7. The existing condition drainage area map was missing the points of interest (POIs), where sheet flow converges to concentrated flow condition. According to our review of the LIDAR data from GIS, there would appear to be a minimum of five (5) points of interest for the existing condition.

8. The report or appendix did not include a post-developed drainage area map, with the aforementioned POIs, or any additional POIs to be evaluated after re-grading of the site.

9. Without the aforementioned POIs, how were allowables calculated? Standard procedure is to determine the drainage area to a particular POI, including any off-site (i.e., either upstream or downstream) contributors to the drainage area, followed by the allowable "per acre" drainage area to be assigned to the on-site portion, and adding a credit to the existing peak flow conditions for the off-site portions. None of these procedures appear to have been followed.

10. Pond setup sheets (i.e., showing the sizing of the orifices, weirs, and associated elevations, etc.) were not included within the body of the stormwater report, or the appendices.

11. It appears the maximum water surface elevation within the southwest basin (listed as the west basin in the report) is too close to the south property line near Woodland Shores subdivision. A minimum of 20 feet is required between the maximum water surface elevation, and any property line. Finally, the same issue appears evident for the north central detention basin.

12. A grading plan was missing from the Preliminary Development Plan, or the stormwater report. Without this information, the application is impossible to review.

13. The aforementioned grading plan must make sense from the standpoint of showing how proposed contours will "tie-into" existing contours. As shown on the Landscape Plan, only the existing contours are shown, with what appears to be proposed contours for the north central detention basin. These contours do not make sense, nor are the elevations labeled. The landscape plan shows no such information for the southwest detention basin, only a vague outline.

14. It is our opinion that the southwest detention basin will not have sufficient area and volume to meet the design criteria listed in the Design and Construction Manual. Incoming drainage upstream of Woodland Oaks (i.e., from Woodland Shores to the south) contains a very significant amount of stormwater, and the allotted space for this new detention basin does not appear sized correctly to manage the off-site flows from Woodland Shores.

15. The body of the report, including the cover sheet, contains numerous misspellings, sentences that do not make sense, and lack of a clear methodology and a clear sense of what is being proposed. For instance, within the "West side detention" section of the report, it states "...the designed pond satisfies the release requirement without using the extended detention area for standard detention". What does this mean? Also, an "8 inch orifice at elevation 913, and a 24 inch orifice at 916.3" are discussed, but we doubt this combination will meet the City of Lee's Summit design standards for Comprehensive Control.

16. For the reasons listed above, the stormwater report is considered incomplete. Any revisions may include additional comments due to the lack of essential information that is necessary to review the stormwater report. Due to site constraints (i.e., lack of available real estate for placement of detention basins), it will be necessary to complete a detailed study rather than rely on an estimate of the sizing. Without the detailed stormwater report, the final

stormwater study may impact lot placement, or possibly eliminate certain lots due to the real estate needed for the detention basins.

Traffic Review

Michael Park
(816) 969-1820

City Traffic Engineer
Michael.Park@cityofls.net

No Comments
