

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

**Commercial Final Development Plan
Applicant's Letter**

Date: Friday, December 20, 2019

To:

Applicant: RANDALL DOVER ARCHITECT

Email: RD@RDOVER.NET

Fax #: <NO FAX NUMBER>

Engineer: CATALYST DESIGN GROUP

Email: PPIERCY@CATALYST-DG.COM

Fax #: <NO FAX NUMBER>

Property Owner: PREMIERLIFE REAL ESTATE
HOLDING

Email:

Fax #: <NO FAX NUMBER>

From: Shannon McGuire, Planner

Re:

Application Number: PL2019401

Application Type: Commercial Final Development Plan

Application Name: DCI - LEE'S SUMMIT

Location: 2001 NW SHAMROCK AVE, LEES SUMMIT, MO 64081

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 multi-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:

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.

Planning Review	Shannon McGuire (816) 969-1237	Planner Shannon.McGuire@cityofls.net	Corrections
------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	-------------

1. Please provide an application form signed by both the property owner and the applicant.
2. Please resubmit plan sheets not exceed the maximum size of 24 inches by 36 inches with one inch border.
3. The pilasters on the north side of the proposed building protrude into the sidewalk and appears to reduce the walkable surface significantly, roughly 3'. As proposed a vehicle parking in ADA stalls on the north side of the building would block the sidewalk given the 2' overhand allowance for the shorter stall. A 4' clear path must be maintained for the accessible route from the parking stalls to the facility. The parking stalls may be reduced to 9' wide x 17' deep parking spaces when the parking space abuts a 6' wide sidewalk or when abutting a curbed open green/landscaped space.
4. Are you proposing any wall mounted lighting? If so please provide the location, height, intensity and type of outside lighting fixtures. Please also provide the manufacturer's specification sheets for all proposed exterior lighting to include both parking lot pole mounted and wall mounted fixtures. The specification sheets shall indicate the exact fixture to be used.
5. Is there any ground mounted equipment being proposed? Please provide the location, size, and type of material to be used in all screening of ground mounted mechanical equipment.
6. Please provide the manufacturer's specification sheets for proposed mechanical equipment to be used (roof or ground mounted).
7. Please show the location, size and materials to be used in all screening of rooftop mechanical equipment. A dashed line indicating the roof line and rooftop mechanical equipment.
8. A high Impact landscaping buffer is required along the south property line. This includes the requirement of a fence. During the PDP a modification was granted to place the fence 3' north of the south property line. Please show the fence location on the landscaping plan and provide details of the proposed fencing materials.
9. Please label the proposed materials for the dumpster enclosure gate.
10. Please label the distance the southernmost parking lot light sits back from the south property line.

1. Please refer to page 4 of the "Drainage Design Summary" dated Jul. 25, 2019 (hereinafter referred to as "the stormwater study"). Under "Proposed Condition Analysis", the bypass flow is discussed without any analysis of pre-development versus post-developed flow from this sub-area. Will the post-developed peak flow be less than the pre-development peak flow? How much lower will this peak flow be in relation to the pre-developed condition?
2. There appear to be contradictions within the body of the report concerning this system, including the statement "...the grated casting of the outlet structure is set just above the 100 year storm elevation of 966.20 to serve as an emergency overflow weir." However, the appendix shows the grated top was included in the routing calculations for the primary outlet system. Is this weir combined with the earthen spillway to act in an emergency capacity, to carry the clogged condition/zero available storage flow? If 100% clogged and zero available storage, how will the grated top function in this capacity? Please reconcile these discrepancies.
3. The stormwater study did not discuss (in detail) the specific design of the emergency overflow spillway system. A discussion of the required freeboard between the 100 year (nominal) water surface elevation within the basin, and the crest of the emergency spillway must be discussed. A discussion of the freeboard for the 100% clogged condition/zero available storage 100 year water surface elevation and the top of the dam must also be re-analyzed based on the above comments.
4. There appears to be confusion concerning the design requirements for an emergency overflow system. This system is not intended to be utilized for anything other than the 100% clogged condition/zero available storage event. According to the pond setup sheets within the appendix, it appears the grated outlet structure top is being utilized for the design events.
5. What analysis was performed to determine the effects of the upstream drainage within the underground system, on the performance of the outlet structure? Will there be any effect on the hydraulic characteristics of the outgoing flow from the outlet structure?
6. Sheet C5.0: Plan views are provided for storm lines, but profile views are also required for all storm lines greater than 6 inches in diameter. This would also include the pipe beneath the detention basin.
7. Sheet C5.0: A reference to the sheet number and detail number should be called-out for the outlet structure.
8. Sheet C5.0: Rip rap appears to be shown, with no corresponding instructions concerning sizing, thickness, length, width, geofabric, quantity, etc.
9. Sheet C5.0: As discussed during the Preliminary Development Plan phase of this project, there is concern about drainage to the south, in the vicinity of the earthen emergency spillway. According to your calculations contained within the stormwater study, it would appear the small berm shown on the grading plan will be insufficient to contain an emergency overflow event with sufficient freeboard to protect the property owner to the south. Sufficient grading must be provided, with a minimum 2.0 feet of freeboard to prevent migration of emergency flows towards this property to the south. As shown, it would appear flooding would be likely.
10. Sheet C6.0: Size and type of material must be called-out for the domestic water line from the main to the meter. For the domestic and irrigation water supply lines, these lines must be copper. For the domestic and irrigation lines, they must be either 3/4", 1", or 2". In addition, copper must be specified a minimum of 10 feet beyond the meter.

11. Sheet C6.0: Street restoration for an arterial street was omitted from the plans. The note "remove and repair as per City standards" is not sufficient. Is this a concrete street? If so, full panel removal and replacement shall be required. The replacement must either match the existing design, or be designed to a higher standard. Please contact our Records Technician in Public Works at 969-1800, and obtain the as-built Record Drawings for this street section, and ensure the full-panel removal and replacement matches the existing design, or is a better design.
12. A temporary traffic control permit must be obtained from Public Works prior to approval of the Final Development Plan. This permit includes a requirement that a temporary traffic control plan be developed. No work within the Pryor Rd. right of way shall be allowed until this permit has been issued by Public Works.
13. A cut-in tee must be specified for the fire line. A wet tap shall not be allowed.
14. A sanitary sewer cleanout is shown in what appears to be the middle of the existing sidewalk?
15. Sheet C7.0: The asphalt pavement sections do not follow the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) in terms of pavement thickness, and chemically-stabilized subgrade or geogrid. Please review the UDO for specific requirements. In general, 1.5 inches of surface course over 4 inches of base course asphaltic concrete is required for normal pavement, with either chemically-stabilized subgrade or geogrid beneath a layer of 6 inch aggregate. Add one (1) inch of asphaltic concrete base course for heavy duty pavement, with all other design parameters the same.
16. Sheet C7.0: The curb and gutter section is not quite correct. The aggregate base and chemically-stabilized subgrade or geogrid must be extended a minimum of one (1) foot beyond the back of curb.
17. Sheet C7.1: A post-indicator valve is shown on the plans, but does not appear to be a part of this project. Please remove.
18. Sheet C7.2: What design is being provided to drain the backflow vault sump? There are several methods that can be used to drain the sump, either by daylighting if available, tying to a storm structure, or construction of an infiltration trench if no other option is available.
19. Sheet C7.2: An air-release assembly is shown, but does not appear to be a part of this project. Please remove.
20. A prominent note must be provided stating that the detention basin and outlet structure shall be constructed first.
21. The concrete sidewalk detail shown on Sheet C7.0 is missing the 4 inch aggregate leveling course layer.
22. There are no notes concerning the restoration of the sidewalk in the southeast corner of the project (i.e., where the new sanitary sewer lateral is being constructed).
23. The 100 year water surface elevation must be shown graphically and numerically in some fashion. This can be done on the grading plan or other appropriate sheet.
24. A note must be provided stating that an as-graded and as-built drawing shall be submitted to the City and reviewed by the City for the detention basin. This shall be required prior to issuance of a Certificate of Substantial Completion.
25. It does not appear that an analysis was performed on the receiving storm system. We are showing a 24 inch pipe at the receiving end, with upstream contributions to that point. An analysis shall be required.

26. An Engineer's Estimate of Probable Construction Costs is required prior to formal approval of the Final Development Plan. This estimate is used to determine the Engineering Plan Review and Inspection Fee. This estimate should include all sitework necessary to complete the project.

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