

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

**Residential Preliminary Development Plan
Applicant's Letter**

Date: Monday, March 29, 2021

To:

Property Owner: SUMMIT POINT PHASE II LLC **Email:**

Property Owner: SUMMIT POINT PROPERTY **Email:**
INVESTORS LLC

From: Shannon McGuire, Planner

Re:

Application Number: PL2021059
Application Type: Residential Preliminary Development Plan
Application Name: Summit Point Apartments Phase 2
Location: 510 NE CHIPMAN RD, LEES SUMMIT, MO 64063

Tentative Schedule

Submit revised plans by noon on Tuesday, April 20, 2021

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:

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

1. The standard parking space dimensions shall not be less than nine feet wide by 19 feet long. Where the head of the parking space abuts a six-foot wide sidewalk or curbed landscaped area, the length of the parking space may be reduced by two feet to allow for vehicle overhang. Such overhang shall be measured from the face of the curb. As proposed the parking stall are 17' & 17.5'. To ensure compliance with the UDO requirements please label the depth of adjacent sidewalks where the parking stalls are less than 19'.

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

1. The requested discussion and analysis of the ordinary high water mark (OHWM) and stream buffer delineation was incomplete. The preliminary stormwater study mentioned the stream buffer, but did not discuss the rationale behind the selection of the OHWM along stream channel. A note was provided on the PDP plan stating the OHWM locations were established "by field survey", with no explanation given within the preliminary stormwater study concerning the criteria used to establish the OHWM locations along the stream channel.

2. The Public Works - Environmental Group conducted a review of the proposed stream buffer in relation to the OHWM. According to their field investigation, it appears the stream buffer should be located further away from the alignment of the stream than shown.

3. The requested floodplain delineation appeared to be incomplete. The northeast corner of the site appeared to lack a CFS-calculated BFE line. It would appear the line will be located in a portion of the northeast detention basin dam. Any fill within the flood zone calculated by CFS would require a Floodplain Development Permit, and any fill would require compensatory storage to be provided elsewhere within the flood zone. It is not clear how compensatory storage could be provided for this site, therefore, the floodplain delineation using the CFS-calculated BFEs shall be better-defined in the northeast portion of the project prior to approval of the PDP.

4. The latest submittal shows Apartment building A2-2 with rear access walks at 3:1 slope. A retaining wall is likely needed, similar to that shown for C1-2.

5. The requested HEC-RAS base flood study included within the preliminary stormwater study shall be considered "preliminary" at this time. We are concerned, however, that no analysis of the frequent storm event was presented within the report, which might help establish the location of the OHWM.

6. The preliminary stormwater study states that "detention basins are allowed within stream buffers". While this statement may be partially correct, detention basins may be allowed on a case-by-case basis. Previous submittal of northwest detention basin included a proposal which would de-stabilize an existing channel, and would likely create a new fork in the channel. Therefore, this basin location was rejected. Please revise the report to reflect the case-by-case allowance of detention basins within stream buffers, which this particular detention basin would qualify based on the fact that fill for the dam will encroach into the buffer rather than the entire basin.

7. Final review and approval of the calculated BFEs within the unnumbered A zone shall be performed by the Floodplain Administrator for the City of Lee's Summit, (i.e., the City Engineer). As previously discussed in this

comment letter, the HEC-RAS analysis is considered preliminary, pending submittal of a final standalone report. We would recommend this report be submitted well in advance of the Final Development Plan.

8. Alternatively, the applicant may request a formal review of the BFE study prior to approval of the PDP.

9. Any formal review by the City Floodplain Administrator of the BFEs within this unnumbered A zone shall require the preparation of a separate standalone document, including HEC-RAS report, appendices, and an upload of digital HEC-RAS model files. Final report shall include recommendations for the proposed BFEs along selected cross-sections of the stream.

10. Fill is shown in within the stream buffer behind building C1-2 and A2-2. This is not allowed.

11. Grading Plan: It appears the CFS-calculated BFE layer was turned-off on this drawing. It is difficult to determine whether fill is shown within the floodplain. Please turn this layer on.

13. Grading Plan: Bldg. A2-2 proposes fill within the stream buffer, especially within the side channel buffer. This is not allowed. The bigger question is whether a buffer is needed on the side channel. Drainage area is less than 40 acres for the side channel?

14. As previously requested, the emergency spillway location was not shown. Only the detail was provided.

15. Previous submittal included general location of interior storm lines, field inlets, junction boxes and curb inlets to properly drain the project. Latest submittal does not appear to show all of these features. In particular, where are the proposed discharge points to the basin? What inlets will direct stormwater to this basin? Although this is a preliminary plan, a preliminary concept for the storm system is required.

16. Previously-requested emergency spillway detail on Sheet C8 Details in the PDP shows the clogged condition will overtop the dam. The preliminary stormwater study appears to contradict this drawing, however. A minimum of 1 foot freeboard is required. It would appear the freeboard is achieved as per the preliminary stormwater study, but drawing on Sheet C8 contradicts the report.

17. Previously-requested location of detention basin outlet structure and discharge method was not shown on the grading plan. General location is shown on the utility plan, but omitted from the grading plan. It is difficult to determine whether this layout will work with the proposed grading, but it appears the pipe will be aerial toward the creek, which is not allowed. It would appear the outlet might be better suited to placement within the dam fill, similar to a culvert being installed within a roadway embankment, with appropriate energy dissipation measures installed at the end of pipe.

18. Previously-requested energy dissipation at the end of the discharge pipe was not shown.

19. Water quality orifice was shown within the baffle wall of the outlet structure detail. We have seen designs where the water quality orifices are installed outside the outlet structure or with a perforated riser concept, with anti-clogging measures designed. As shown, this outlet structure would likely be a high-maintenance item within a confined space, with frequent unclogging necessary to drain the pond after frequent storm events.

20. The preliminary stormwater study was missing the PondPack output for the 10 and 100 year events. Only a summary was provided within the text of the report, but the associated appendices (as were provided for the 2 year event) were missing.

21. The elevations of the water quality orifice and the 34 inch orifice on Sheet C8 Details do not match what is shown in the preliminary stormwater report.

22. Sheet C8: The outlet structure configuration does not appear to be designed for the 100 year event. A 34 inch orifice is shown within what appears to be a baffle wall, which is connected to a 42 inch outlet pipe. It is our understanding the 42 inch discharge pipe is designed for the 100 year event, but the 34 inch orifice will limit the outflow to that of a 34 inch equivalent pipe (plus the minor effects of adding the 2.25 inch water quality orifice).

23. Emergency Spillway: Emergency spillways do not necessarily need to be installed along the dam fill. They may be incorporated into the primary outlet works. If this option is desired, the primary outlet works for the clogged condition/zero available storage would include the weir/orifice combinations prior to the 42 inch exit pipe. The top of the outlet structure could be left open, as long as stormwater can enter the top without clogging of the primary outlet works. A domed grate or other anti-clogging measure would be required on the top of this open structure. Regardless of the method for providing emergency release of stormwater, this emergency spillway shall be designed to only function in the event of primary outlet structure (i.e., the weir/orifii combination within the outlet structure) clogging. It should not be designed to manage the 100 year "unclogged" event, which appears this was the case for the proposed geometry of the outlet structure.

24. Elevation Certificates shall be required for each habitable structure constructed with this project (to be submitted prior to building permits and post-construction). These certificates shall be based on the BFEs established for the unnumbered A zone.

25. As requested in the previous applicant letter, please provide elevations at selected intervals on the grading plan. It is difficult to ascertain the contour interval and elevations without making assumptions. We assumed a one foot contour interval, and made some assumptions based on what appeared to be correct. However, it would be beneficial to provide key elevations to ensure there are no misunderstandings.

26. As previously discussed, the downstream triple culvert at Swann Cir. is acting as the outlet structure for a detention basin and should have been discussed within the preliminary stormwater study in the context of a detention basin.

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

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.

Several of the buildings do not meet this requirement and will need to be corrected on the Final Development Plan.

Traffic Review	Michael Park (816) 969-1820	City Traffic Engineer Michael.Park@cityofls.net	No Comments
-----------------------	--------------------------------	--	-------------
