LEE'S SUMMIT
MISSOURI

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Commercial Final Development Plan
Applicant's Letter

Date: Thursday, May 12, 2022

To:

Property Owner: SUMMIT POINT PHASE II LLC Email:

Applicant: CANYON VIEW PROPERTIES Email: GARY@CANYONVIEWCAPITAL.COM

Engineer: CFS ENGINEERS Email: LSCOTT@CFSE.COM

From: Dawn Bell, Project Manager

Re:

Application Number:	PL2022056
Application Type:	Commercial Final Development Plan
Application Name:	SUMMIT POINT APARTMENTS 2ND PHASE FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
Location:	520 NE ENGLISH MANOR DR, LEES SUMMIT, MO 64086

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 mulit-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:
Required Corrections:

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

1. For the trash enclosure a Portland cement concrete approach 30 feet in length, measured from the enclosure opening is required. The pad and approach shall be improved with a minimum six inches of full depth unreinforced Portland cement concrete constructed on a sub-grade of four inches of granular base course. As show you are only providing an approach of 8'.

Also, to empty these types of trash containers the trucks servicing them need to be able to back straight to them. Given the close proximity of the adjacent parking stalls across from the trash enclosure, will the proposed layout work with the trash truck's turning movements?

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

1. Please refer to comment #28 in the previous applicant letter. A SWPPP was requested and received in the resubmittal package. It was missing key items, however, and is insufficient for this particular site. Please visit https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-10/documents/sw_swppp_guide.pdf for a guide to prepare an adequate SWPPP.

2. The SWPPP did not discuss the temporary sediment basin, and shall be included within same. It shall also discuss the measures to be taken to remove silt as it accumulates, and final restoration of the sediment basin to a permanent stormwater management facility.

3. The SWPPP discussed endangered species without specifically stating what measures would be taken if endangered species (i.e., bats?) are enountered during tree removal. These shall be discussed within the report, including who and when to report the encounter. You will be responsible for determining who and when to report these encounters. For purposes of the City, we are primarily concerned with dislocation of these species to attics or other areas in close proximity to humans and adjacent homeowners, and possible rabies transmission that has occurred in Texas over the past 2 years due to lax enforcement of new developments.

4. A schedule of inspection appeared to be missing from the SWPPP showing dates of inspection, what was done during the inspection, who performed the inspection, and any notes concerning the inspection such as corrective action taken. This shall be required of the SWPPP, and revisions are warranted.

5. The SWPPP includes a list of attachments which were not included. Please include any attachements within the SWPPP.

6. If requested, the City can provide an example of an acceptable SWPPP from a different project with similar scope. Please let me know if this is needed.

7. Please see comment #8 in previous applicant letter. Pavement section for standard parking aisles does not comply with the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Article 8 "Parking" in terms of asphalt thickness, aggregate base, or subgrade stabilization either by chemical treatment or by use of geogrid. For vehicle parking aisles and drive aisles not designed for heavy vehicles, the minimum is 1.5 inch surface course over 4 inch base course, over 6 inch granular

base over geogrid or chemically-stabilized subgrade compacted to 95% proctor. For fire lanes and truck access, the minimum requirements are the same, except the base course asphaltic concrete is 5 inches rather than 4 inches. The City Engineer may consider a different design if it can be shown that your design is equal to or better than the standard design described in the UDO. This is contiingent upon a geotechnical report using parameters established by the City Engineer.

8. The "Geotechnical Exploration and Subgrade Recommendations" Feb. 2021 did not include the parameters needed by the City Engineer to review your request. I had asked whether you wanted to review those parameters in comment #8 within the last applicant letter, but no such request was received. The parameters shall be transmitted to you separately from this applicant letter.

9. Sheet C601: The 4 inch orifice elevaton flowline does not match the stormwater report dated Apr. 21, 2022 pond setup sheet within the appendix. Appendix shows 995.0, but the plans show 994.85. Please re-run the calculations, reconcile, review, and revise as appropriate.

10. Sheet C601: The 33 inch rectangluar weir is easily confused with 38 inches. Please move the 33 inch dimension so it is not obscurred by the centerline.

11. Sheet C601: The open top weir on the outlet structure elevation does not match what is shown in the stormwater report dated Apr. 21, 2022. The plans show 1001.31, but the stormwater report shows 1001.0. Please review and revise as appropriate, including a re-run of any routing calculations and a recalculation of the emergency flow conditions within the emergency spillway.

12. Sheet C601: The rock ditch check detail is being used at the end of the pipe near the discharge to the creek. There are doubts this will be effective in managing the energy from stormwater discharge at this point. Wouldn't a depressed area (i.e., a stilling basin) within the rip rap be more appropriate and more robust? As shown, this feature will likely be washed-away within a year.

13. Sheet C601: Font size is too small to read for top of berm, spillway elevation, peak 100 year WSEL, and spillway elevation. Please enlarge these labels.

14. Sheet C601: Spillway is called-out in upper right hand corner inset view, but this is referring to the emergency spillway. It is not utilized for anything other than clogging of primary outlet works or peak flows in excess of the 100 year event. Please relabel as "Emergency Spillway".

15. Sheet C601: Please refer to previous applicant letter. Comment #12 requested the dimensions from the property lines and buildings to ensure the 20 foot setback is maintained from the respective 100 year water surface elevations. Please review this comment, and revise as appropriate.

16. Sheet C601: Please refer to comment #12 in the previous applicant letter. No design storage volumes were shown on the plans for the 2, 10, or 100 year event or the water quality event. This is needed because prior to occuapancy, there will be a rush to have the as-graded and as-built detention basin approved. Without a clear set of construction plans with this information on Sheet C601, there will be considerable delay in issuing the occupancy permit. Please include this information so the future review of the as-built detention basin plan can be made in a timely fashion.

17. Sheet C601: The entire detention basin shall be shown on the detail, not just the northwest portion of the basin. Please revise as appropriate.

18. Sheet C601: The outlet structure is shown in the plan view as a "Lee's Summit Standard 24 inch Sewer Manhole". This is not a manhole. It is a box. Please revise as appropriate.

19. Sheet C601: No construction details are provided on the outlet structure, other than showing a box. Need steel reinforcement, thickness, frame and lids, internal steps and internal step locations, and any other information necessary to construct or pre-fabricate the box.

20. Rip rap is shown abruptly ending in a skew. It would appear the rip rap needs to be extended to the property line at a minimum

21. Storm line exiting the detention basin appears to be missing a profile view. This shall be required, and shall be laid at a slope appropriate for the energy dissipation method used.

22. Sheet C601: Design allowable release rate and design proposed release rates for the 2, 10, and 100 year events should be placed on this sheet. This is required since it is possible the basin will not be built to plan, and it is possible a re-run of the calculations shall be required prior to issuance of an occupancy permit. Placing this information on Sheet C601 will help facilitate a timely review.

23. Please refer to comment #13 within the previous applicant letter (comment related to the note about submittal and acceptance by the City of an as-graded and as-built detention basin prior to issuance of an occupancy permit, and possible re-run or modification to the basin if release rates and/or storage volumes are not within tolerance). No notation was shown on Sheet C601, despite the response to comments stating that it had been placed on Sheet C601.

24. Sheet C200: Please refer to the previous applicant letter comment #18. Despite the response to comments stating this comment had been addressed on Sheet C200, I am seeing no such update. A clear distinction shall be made on the paving of the parking lot, in particular, fire or truck access paving, versus drive aisle/parking stall paving. Please be aware the City makes no differentiation between parking stalls and drive aisles in terms of pavement design under the UDO. If no such notation is made, the assumption will be all paving meeting the heavier-duty standard for fire truck and heavy truck access.

25. Two (2) 8 inch water meters are being proposed for this project, each near Chipman Rd. at the backflow vaults. These meters are costly, and want to ensure this was taken into account. Meter setup and tap fees are nearly $800,000 for both meters, and require the design and construction of a special 8 inch meter vault at the developer's expense (which has not yet been completed). Although this is acceptable, I wanted to make you aware of the cost and the need for additional engineering to design an 8 inch vault box for the water meter, as this is a special design that is not available off-the-shelf. The other option is to meter each building individually with a public water meter, but this will require payment of meter and setup fees for each meter albeit at a much lower cost. Just for reference, a 1 inch meter is about $10,300 for tap fees and meter setup fees including the pit, and a 2 inch meter is about $42,000 for meter setup and tap fees including the pit. Please consider the ramifications of each decision. If you decide to meter as shown, this will add $800,000+ to the cost for meter setup, tap fees, and special vault. If you decide to meter with public water meters internally, the location of these meters shall be shown internally, and individual tap fees and meter setup fees will apply. Please revise as appropriate.

26. Please refer to the previous applicant letter comment #22. If using ductile iron pipe, it shall be zinc-coated. No such update was included on the plans regarding this requirement. Please revise, or alternatively, remove the ductile iron pipe option.

27. Please refer to the previous applicant letter comment 26. The fire hydrant was moved, but the private water line is still within the easement. Also, the private fire hydrant connection point to the private water line is within the easement. Please revise.

30. Please refer to the previous applicant letter comment #43. Despite the response to comments stating the outlet pipe was included on Sheet C601, no such profile exists for the outlet pipe to the creek. Please provide the profile view for this pipe.

31. Please see previous applicant letter. Despite the response to comments stating otherwise, the plans did not appear to show how the backflow vaults will be drained. How will the backflow vaults be drained? A method of draining the two (2) backflow vaults shall be shown on the plan view for the fire line, and shall specify how this will be achieved (i.e., daylighting, sump pump, connection to a storm box, or construction of an infliltration gallery). Please revise as appropriate.

32. Several private sanitary sewer callouts show tees rather than wyes. The City does not allow tees for private sanitary sewer connections. Please revise.

33. Please see previous applicant letter comment #57. A trenching and backfill detail was requested, but was not included. Please ensure the new standard of 12 inch aggregate over top of pipe is shown.

34. Please refer to previous applicant letter comment #58. Notes were added, but no details were provided anywhere in the plan set. Please provide details in the plan set for these drainage structures, and please show callouts on the plan view with sufficient notation specifying where they are located within the plan set.

35. Please refer to previous applicant letter comment #60. It did not appear that a toe wall detail was included in the plans. Please provide a toe wall detail as requested.

36. Sheet 200: The 100 year water surface elevation within the detention basin contradicts what is shown elsewhere within the plans and the stormwater report. Please reconcile.

37. Please refer to previous applicant letter comment #64. I did not see anywhere within the plans where the backflow vault method of draining was shown on Sheet C400, or anywhere else in the plans. Please show how the backflow vaults will drain using either of the methods discussed previously.

38. Stormwater Report dated Apr. 12, 2022: The appendix is missing key items, such as the: 1) inflow hydrographs for all design storms, 2) routing curves for all design storms with time plotted as the abscissa and the cumultive inflow volume, cumulative discharge, stage elevation, and cumulative storage plotted as the ordinate.

39. Sheet C400: Please provide callouts on the private domestic service lines from the private main to the individual buildings. If metering each building internally, show the location of the internal "public" water meter on Sheet C400. The location of all internal public water meters (if choosing to go with this method) shall be accessible to Water Utilities personnel and not within parking stalls, drive aisles, or fire lanes.

40. Elevation certificate shall be required for all habitable structures, and is currently in review.

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

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.

Action required- Show the location of the FDC's on all of the buildings and the hydrant within 100-feet.

3. IFC 503.3 - Where required by the fire code official, approved signs or other approved notices or markings that include the words NO PARKING—FIRE LANE shall be provided for fire apparatus access roads to identify such roads or prohibit the obstruction thereof. The means by which fire lanes are designated shall be maintained in a clean and legible condition at all times and be replaced or repaired when necessary to provide adequate visibility.

Action required- The cul-de-sac shall be posted "Fire Lane- No Parking" .

4. IFC 506.1 - Where access to or within a structure or an area is restricted because of secured openings or where immediate access is necessary for life-saving or fire-fighting purposes, the fire code official is authorized to require a key box to be installed in an approved location. The key box shall be of an approved type listed in accordance with UL 1037, and shall contain keys to gain necessary access as required by the fire code official. 506.1.1 Locks. An approved lock shall be installed on gates or similar barriers when required by the fire code official.

Action required- A Knox padlock shall be provided on the gate and a Knox box on each of the buildings.

5. D105.1 Where required. Where the vertical distance
between the grade plane and the highest roof surface exceeds 30 feet (9144 mm), approved aerial fire apparatus access roads shall be provided. For purposes of this section, the highest roof surface shall be determined by measurement to the eave of a pitched roof, the intersection of the roof to the
exterior wall, or the top of parapet walls, whichever is
greater.

D105.2 Width. Aerial fire apparatus access roads shall have a minimum unobstructed width of 26 feet (7925 mm), exclusive of shoulders, in the immediate vicinity of the building or portion thereof.

D105.3 Proximity to building. One or more of the required access routes meeting this condition shall be located not less than 15 feet (4572 mm) and not greater than 30 feet (9144 mm) from the building, and shall be positioned parallel to one entire side of the building. The side of the building on which the aerial fire apparatus access road is positioned shall be
approved by the fire code official.

Action required- Fire access lanes for buildings greater than 30 feet in height shall be 26 feet wide (drivable surface).

6. IFC 503.2.3 - Fire apparatus access roads shall be designed and maintained to support the imposed loads of fire apparatus and shall be surfaced so as to provide all-weather driving capabilities.

Action required- Fire lanes shall be capable of carrying the weight of fire apparatus (75,000-pounds). Provide a pavement detail.

Traffic Review	Brad Cooley, P.E., RSPI	Brad.Cooley@cityofls.net	No Comments
Building Codes Review	Joe Frogge (816) 969-1241	Plans Examiner Joe.Frogge@cityofls.net	Corrections

1. Inadequate information to complete review.

Provide the following:
- Water pipe sizes and materials
- Size of water meter(s)
5/5/22 - Pipe materials not found. Each building must be metered separately. Provide flow calculations to justify any meter over 2". Also, any meter over 2" must be coordinated and approved by Water Department.