
January 15, 2020

Mike Weisenborn
Project Manager, City of Lee's Summit, MO
220 SE Green Street
Lee's Summit, MO 64063

Re: **Sequoia – Residential Preliminary Development Plan (PL2019412)**

Mike:

Please find our responses to your comments below regarding the Sequoia Preliminary Development Plans (PDPs) submitted to you for review in December 2019. The revised PDPs are also enclosed. The supporting documents have been updated to address the comments we received as follows:

Planning Review

Shannon McGuire
(816) 969-1237

Planner
Shannon.McGuire@cityofls.net

Corrections

1) Please provide a copy of the legal description in a Word format.

RIC Response: A legal description in Word format has been provided.

2) Please label the width of the proposed sidewalk.

RIC Response: Proposed sidewalk typical dimension has been added to Sheet C03 – General Layout.

3) Please label the building setback lines from streets with dimensions.

RIC Response: Building setback dimension from street right-of-way added to Sheet C03 – General Layout.

4) In considering a preliminary development plan application, the Planning Commission and City Council will give consideration to certain criteria. Specifically, the extent to which the proposed use will negatively affect the aesthetics of the neighboring property and the character of the neighborhood. Please articulate how the proposed development fits with the existing neighborhood character. Additionally, please provide insight as to how this particular architectural style was selected given staff's previous guidance to ensure the proposed homes fit with the historical nature of the area.

RIC Response: See revised architectural plans.

5) The proposed footprints on sheet C03 don't seem to be consistent with the footprints shown on the architectural sheet. Please update all sheets so that they are consistent and accurate.

RIC Response: Sheets updated with consistent footprint to match architectural elevations.

6) As shown, buildings 4, 7, and 12 are violating the 20' front yard setback. The modification request letter dated December 11, 2019 states only one building is proposed to not meet the required setback. Staff is unlikely to support this request.

RIC Response: Buildings realigned to meeting min. 20' set back requirement. See Sheet C03 – General Layout for new building footprint locations

- 7) The proposed elevations show the 2nd floor overhanging into the side yards significantly. Please dash in this overhang on the site plan.

RIC Response: Building footprint overhangs have been dashed. See Sheet C03 – General Layout for updated building footprints.

- 8) In the site data table please include the total number of proposed units, and list the dwelling units per acre, with and without common area.

RIC Response: Total number of proposed units and dwelling units per acre added to Site Data Table on Sheet C03 – General Layout.

- 9) Is the existing home at 502 NW Orchard remaining? If it is, it must be included in the units/acre calculations.

RIC Response: The existing home at 502 NW Orchard will not remain. The site plan has been updated to reflect this. See Sheet C03 – General Layout for revised site plan.

- 10) The total number of cul-de-sac lots in a subdivision shall be no more than ten percent of the total number of lots in the subdivision. As proposed the total number of cul-de-sac lots in the development is 100%. This will require a modification. Cul-de-sacs shall be no longer than 500 feet and the maximum number of dwelling units on a cul-de-sac shall be 20. As proposed, you will have 26 units. This will require a modification as well.

RIC Response: The total number of units has been decreased to 24. See Sequoia - Request for Modification of Zoning Regulations letter, dated January 15, 2020, for modification request.

- 11) On Sheet L01, it is unclear where the proposed buffer fence will be located. Additionally, if you wish to locate the fence on or near the property line a modification will be required.

RIC Response: The north buffer fence will be located on the property line. See Sequoia – Request for Modification of Zoning Regulations for more information.

- 12) FYI, an approved plat will be required prior to the issuance of building permits.

RIC Response: Acknowledged.

Fire Review

Jim Eden
(816) 969-1303

Assistant Chief
Jim.Eden@cityofls.net

Approved with Comments

- 1) All issues pertaining to life safety and property protection from the hazards of fire, explosions 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.

RIC Response: Acknowledged.

- 2) Provide a street name.

RIC Response: Proposed street name NW Orchard Circle has been added to Sheet C03 – General Layout.

Engineering Review

Gene Williams
(816) 969-1223

Senior Staff Engineer
Gene.Williams@cityofls.net

Corrections

- 1) The street network is shown as public. As shown, water lines should be shown as public. No backflow vault should be shown if this is a public street.

RIC Response: Backflow vault removed from Sheet C05 – Utility Plan.

- 2) The grading plan does not address drainage to the south of buildings 12 and 13. Please show the proposed and finish grading, and ensure there is no adverse impact to adjacent property owners.

RIC Response: The ProSE subbasin drainage has been addressed in the Micro Storm Study revised January 15, 2020. Drainage from buildings 11 and 12 will decrease from existing conditions based on drainage improvement within the proposed site.

- 3) The grading plan shown in Burton Townhomes application does not match the grading plan shown in this most recent proposal. In particular, the grading to the north of Building 1, 2, and 3 originally shows a swale on the Burton townhomes application, whereas this application shows no such swale. Is the existing home at 502 NW Olive St. going to remain "as-is"? if so, why is it being shown as part of the development? It appears to be included within the limits of the project.

RIC Response: The drainage swale along the N property line has been extended to capture buildings 1, 2, and 3.

- 4) A public sanitary sewer extension is shown between Building 3 and 4 with too little distance between them. Minimum distance between any portion of the buildings, and the outside of a sanitary sewer line, is fifteen (15) feet. This would include any overhangs on the buildings, footings, etc.

RIC Response: The public sanitary main between building 3 and building 4 has been realigned to accommodate the min. 15' distance requirement from building overhangs. See Sheet C05 – Utility Plan for public Sanitary Sewer alignment.

- 5) Public sanitary sewer manholes are shown terminating in the middle of cul-de-sac bulbs, which is not allowed under the current Design and Construction Manual.

RIC Response: Sanitary Sewer Manholes relocated out of cul-de-sac bulb pavements. See Sheet C05 – Utility Plan for revised sanitary sewer manhole locations.

- 6) The public sanitary sewer is too close to building 5. In addition, it is also too close to the northwest corner of building 4.

RIC Response: Public Sanitary Sewer has been realigned. See Sheet C05 – Utility Plan for revised Public Sanitary Sewer Location.

- 7) A monument sign is shown in what appears to be an easement. In addition, it is too close to a public water main. Minimum distance is ten (10) feet, as measured from the outside of the pipe, and any portion of the monument sign, including footings.

RIC Response: Monument side relocated a minimum of 10 feet from the public water main. See Sheet C03 – General Layout for revised monument sign location and dimension.

- 8) Where is the proposed right of way and proposed easements for the public street? A minimum of ten (10) feet of general utility easement is required adjacent to all public right of way.

RIC Response: Proposed right of way and min. 10' general utility easement adjacent to right of way added to Sheet C03 – General Layout.

- 9) Please shown in graphic format, the maximum water surface elevation within the two detention basins. This would include the 100% clogged/zero storage event. A minimum of 20 feet is required between this level, and any building or property line.

RIC Response: 100-yr and 100% clogged event WSE plan location have been added to Sheet C03 – General Layout. Dimension have also been added to show compliance with min. 20 distance to any structure or property line.

10) If the home at 502 NW Olive St. is a part of this project, please show the existing street access to Olive St. As shown, it does not appear to have any access. Our records indicate an existing driveway.

RIC Response: The existing home at 502 NW Olive St will be demolished with the proposed project. See Sheet C03 – General Layout for proposed site plan.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions or additional comments.

Thank you,



Mick Slutter P.E.


Jonathan Daldalian, EI

RENAISSANCE INFRASTRUCTURE CONSULTING