

Residential Preliminary Development Plan Applicant's Letter

Date: Friday, October 25, 2019

To:

Property Owner: CHAPEL RIDGE DEVELOPMENT Email: matcheson@ceahrealtors.com
Fax #: <NO FAX NUMBER>

Engineer: ENGINEERING SOLUTIONS Email: MSCHLICHT@ES-KC.COM
Fax #: (816) 623-9849

Property Owner: CHAPEL RIDGE RESIDENTIAL LLC Email:
Fax #: <NO FAX NUMBER>

From: Victoria Nelson, Long Range Planner

Re:

Application Number: PL2019352
Application Type: Residential Preliminary Development Plan
Application Name: CHAPEL RIDGE, 2ND PLAT
Location: 4060 NE RALPH POWELL RD, LEES SUMMIT, MO 64064

Tentative Schedule

Submit revised plans by noon on Monday, November 11, 2019 (4 full size paper copies, 1 reduced 8 ½" x 11" copy, and 4 copies of the comment response letter).

Applicant Meeting: October 29, 2019 at 09:00 AM

If the revised submittal deadline is not met or plans are deficient, the item will be moved to a later meeting and a new deadline will be set. Future deadlines and meeting dates can be found on the "Planning Commission Meeting Dates" handout. Dates are subject to change; we will keep you informed throughout the process.

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 Preliminary Development Plan:

Traffic Review	Michael Park (816) 969-1820	City Traffic Engineer Michael.Park@cityofls.net	Pending
Fire Review	Jim Eden (816) 969-1303	Assistant Chief Jim.Eden@cityofls.net	Corrections

1. Provide a name for the street in front of Lots 10-17.

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

1. Please label and show all utility easements
2. Please show all proposed utilities in legend
3. The zoning area labeled as RP-1 is incorrect. Please change the zoning from RP-1 to R-1.
4. The east to west middle street does not have a name listed. Please give this street a name.
5. The common acre area on the north side of NE Sundown Drive is labeled at lot 18. Please change this to TRACT C.
6. Please submit a Vacation of Right of Way application ASAP. So you will only have to go through the public hearing process once instead of twice.

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

1. The "Macro Storm Water Drainage Study" dated Oct. 11, 2019 (hereinafter referred to the stormwater report) contains Exhibit B - "Pre-Development Drainage Map". This exhibit shows "Existing Drainage Areas" which reference Exhibit A, but it is not clear why this information (i.e., Exhibit A) is being presented. The City is interested in the current conditions (i.e., existing conditions), along with the respective points of interest.
2. Page 3 of the stormwater report states that Exhibit B is color-coded in blue, but no such color-coding is evident from the document.
3. Page 3 of the report states that Rational Method hydrographs were used. However, it appears the SCS method was used. Please reconcile.
4. Page 3 of the stormwater report states that the "...Proposed and Future Conditions discharge data will be compared." What does Future Conditions mean? No other reference to this condition is contained anywhere within the report.

5. Exhibit B shows Drainage Area 3. We do not believe point of interest #3 accurately depicts Drainage Area #3. Portions of Drainage Area 3 converge at different points. It would appear that additional points of interest exist, notably, along the swale within MoDOT right of way to the east of Drainage Area 3. In order to perform an adequate analysis, the drainage areas, and respective points of interest, must accurately reflect reality.
6. There are several references within the stormwater report which discuss allowable peak flow rates to points of interest which eventually drain toward the existing retention basin. It was our understanding that the criteria for the portion of the project draining to the existing detention basin to the west, would be based on the old criteria of pre-development versus post-development peak flow rates. This will affect the narrative of the report, along with Table 4.3, "APWA Allowable Release Rates", which appear to be based on the flat release rates.
7. Page 4 of the stormwater report state that "drainage areas D, E, and F will be allowed to free release from the site, as they are outside the areas of the storm sewer system, however, the flow rates from these areas will be reduced to not cause an impact to the adjacent downstream area." What basis, besides "not cause an impact" was utilized to make this conclusion? Standard practice is to perform an analysis at each point of interest, rather than make a subjective statement. As presented, no such objective conclusion can be reached.
8. Page 4 of the stormwater report states that "...Area D will be added to the release rate from the proposed detention facility to be compared to the APWA allowable release rates, to calculate the total release rate from that area." What "area" is being referred?
9. Page 4 of the stormwater report states that "...Areas E and F will be shown in comparison to the APWA allowable release rates to provide a comparison, however per previous discussion the release rates are not subject to the requirements..." . Please see previous comments related to these drainage areas.
10. Page 6 of the stormwater report requests a waiver to the 2 year release rate to point of interest #3. We do not support such a waiver.
11. Page 6 of the stormwater report presents Table 5.5, 5.6, and 5.7. A "Subarea" column is shown, but the column header is blank on all tables. Please correct.
12. Exhibit B of the stormwater report appears to be showing Point of Interest #2 which is not reflective of reality. Portions of Drainage Area 2 bypass Point of Interest #2. Please be aware that when setting up the existing condition model of the project, there will likely be off-site points of interest (i.e., where sheet flow transitions to concentrated flow). No such off-site points of interest were shown.
13. The Table of Contents shows a "Best Management Practices" section, but this does not appear to exist. Is 40 hour extended detention for the 90% mean annual event being proposed? If so, please discuss within the report.
14. Exhibit A within the stormwater report shows what appears to be a swale along the north side of the development. This swale appears to be shown extending along the majority of the north side of the development, and stormwater appears to be directed towards the west where it ultimately is conveyed to the existing detention basin. The Preliminary Grading Plan shown on Sheet C.200 does not show this swale.
15. The stormwater report lacked any discussion of the emergency spillway location, type, etc.
16. It appears the 100 year water surface elevation for the nominal condition was not shown on the Preliminary Development Plan. This should be shown graphically on the Preliminary Development Plan, along with dimensions from the nearest property line. Twenty (20) feet minimum is required.

17. Sheet C.200: It would appear that an underground stormwater conveyance system should be installed along the northern lots (i.e., rear yard of the lots). A long east/west swale does not appear appropriate for this distance.
18. Utility Plan: Please add a note to the existing water main along the north side of the project, "to be abandoned".
19. Utility Plan: Are the locations of sanitary sewer and water lines based on surveyed information? An existing sanitary sewer line is shown surrounding the existing home, south of Lot 11. Should this sanitary sewer line/manholes be removed?
20. The sanitary sewer along Sundown Dr. appears to be bucking the grade. It will likely be too deep, based on the grading plan. Was the existing manhole located near the northwest corner of the detention tract not considered? It would appear a portion of the project was intended to drain to this manhole.
21. Please label the sizing information for all existing water lines.
22. Sheet C.200: The grading plan in the vicinity of Lots 25 through 28 appear to show the construction of a rear yard underground storm drainage system, but it is shown on top of a berm rather than a swale.
23. Vacation of right of way will be required for the portion of Ralph Powell Rd. that is being incorporated into Lot 9.
24. Why is the storm line that exists to the north of Lot 23 not shown? Will this storm line be utilized for drainage of any portion of this subdivision? Is this line of sufficient size to handle the 100 year storm event?
25. An existing storm line is shown along the south side of Lots 10 through 13. Is this an error?