



April 4, 2022

City of Lee's Summit, MO
Development Services
220 SE Green Street
Lee's Summit, MO 64063

**RE: Discovery Park – Phase 1 & 2
Preliminary Development Plan**

We are responding to comments dated February 2023 and are submitting with this letter the revised plans, as well as other required documents. Please find the original comments below; our responses are below in bold italics.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me by phone at (816) 442-6056 or by email at nheiser@olsson.com.

Sincerely,
Olsson

Nicholas D. Heiser, P.E.

Engineering Review – Gene Williams

1. The stream buffers were not discussed within the "Macro and Phase 1 Micro Stormwater Report" dated January 2023. It appears there are at least two (2) separate streams subject to a stream buffer (i.e., with upstream area greater than 40 acres - one in zone 1 and the other in zone 3), and these are not mentioned anywhere in the report. Please discuss stream buffer issues in a general sense within the stormwater report, and provide an analysis of all streams with a drainage area greater than 40 acres. There may be additional streams subject to this rule over and above the two (2) mentioned above, and it will be up to the design engineer to make this determination.

Stream buffer waiver and discussion has been added to Section 4.3 of the stormwater report.

2. The City cannot recommend approval of the waiver requests for the 2 year release rate for stormwater detention. The report states it is infeasible to meet the requirements without any substantiating basis. Please evaluate and revise as appropriate.

Per the city's request, the culvert under Douglas Street has been routed to the proposed detention basin. After looking into different basin outlet configurations, we were able to meet allowable release rates, however 40 hour extended detention was not able to be achieved due to the larger drainage area. BMPs will need to be

constructed when each area is developed; this is explained within the resubmitted stormwater study.

3. The title of the stormwater report is "Macro and Phase 1 Micro Stormwater Report", but the report states it is for the "entire Discovery Park area". Please reconcile, and consider using a different title for the report.

Title of the report has been changed to "Discovery Park Macro Stormwater Report" and sections within the report have been revised and updated to review the development on a macro level. Future micro stormwater studies will be required with subsequent Final Development Plan submittals.

4. At the present time, there is not enough compelling reason to allow the waiver to the stream buffer requirement. In addition, it appears there may be at least one (1) additional stream subject to buffer requirements. Please evaluate and provide an analysis within the text of the stormwater report.

Per discussions with staff, the stream buffer waiver has been updated to reflect design changes and provide additional information. Only one stream buffer waiver is being submitted with this PDP. The future stream buffer to the west will be evaluated when that area is further designed and a PDP is submitted for it.

5. It appears a detention basin (i.e., to the north of Colbern Rd.) is being proposed within a stream buffer which is not allowed. Please evaluate and revise as appropriate.

Stream buffer waiver is being submitted with the plan to allow the detention to remain within the creek channel and remove the buffer.

6. The Preliminary Development Plan shows a "future detention basin" in the southwest corner of the development south of Colbern Rd. Is the intention to construct this basin with this portion of the development? If not, why not?

The future detention basin in the southwest corner of Zone 2 will not be constructed with this development. It is drawn in to show where a detention basin for the south half of Zone 2 could be located to accommodate required flowrate attenuation.

7. Water Utilities is reviewing the sanitary sewer analysis. Any comments concerning downstream improvements shall be transmitted separate from this applicant letter

Acknowledged.

8. Are there any wetland or U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) concerns for the project?

A jurisdictional determination was requested by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The USACE provided a determination letter (included in the waiver request) that states the affected creek channel and attached wetlands are not jurisdictional waters of the US. Review of existing FEMA floodplains was completed, and no regulated floodplains exist within the affected creek channel as shown on the FEMA FIRM panel included with the stormwater study.

Fire Review – Jim Eden

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.

Acknowledged.

2. IFC 503.3 Marking. 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. Fire lanes may be marked in one or a combination of methods as approved by the fire code official. Curbs. All curbs and curb ends shall be painted red with four inch (4") white lettering stating "FIRE LANE—NO PARKING". Wording may not be spaced more than fifteen feet (15') apart. Where no curb exists or a rolled curb is installed, a 6-inch (6") wide painted red stripe applied to the concrete or asphalt with four inch (4") white lettering stating "FIRE LANE—NO PARKING". Signs. In areas where fire lanes are required, but no continuous curb is available, one of the following methods shall be used to indicate the fire lane. Option 1 : A sign twelve inches (12") wide and eighteen inches (18") in height shall be mounted on a metal post set in concrete a minimum of depth of eighteen inches (18") set back one foot (1') in from the edge of the roadway with the bottom of the sign being seven feet (7') from finished grade. Signs shall face oncoming traffic. Spacing of signs shall not exceed fifty feet (50') between signs. Signs shall be reflective material with a white color background with symbols, letters and border in red color. "FIRE LANE—NO PARKING". Option 2 : A sign twelve inches (12") wide and eighteen inches (18") in height shall be mounted on the side of a structure or other permanent fixture approved by the Fire Code Official. The bottom of the sign being seven feet (7') from finished grade. Spacing of signs shall not exceed fifty feet (50') between signs. Signs shall be reflective material with a white color background with symbols, letters and border in red color. "FIRE LANE—NO PARKING". Action required- Fire lanes shall be marked.

Acknowledged. A note has been added to the Fire Truck Access Plan sheets stating these requirements.

3. IFC 507.1 - An approved water supply capable of supplying the required fire flow for fire protection shall be provided to premises upon which facilities, buildings or portions of buildings are hereafter constructed or moved into or within the jurisdiction. Action required- Work with Water Utilities to determine if adequate fire flow is available per IFC Table B105.1(2). A 50% reduction is allowed for an automatic sprinkler system.

Acknowledged.

4. 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- The FDC's for the sprinklered buildings.

FDC locations have been added to the plans. Fire hydrant spacing has been adjusted so the FDCs are within 100 feet of a fire hydrant.

5. IFC 507.5.1 - Where a portion of the facility or building hereafter constructed or moved into or within the jurisdiction is more than 300 feet from a hydrant on a fire apparatus access road, as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the facility or building, on-site fire hydrants and mains shall be provided where required by the fire code official. Action required- 1. The buildings on Lot 9 and Lot 3 do not meet the requirement. Provide hydrants or adjust spacing to meet requirements. Provide hydrants along Discovery Crossing Blvd. 2. Ref. C201 The connection of private fire main and a proposed hydrant at the northeast corner of Colbern Road and Discovery Crossing Blvd are shown being connected to an existing main that is proposed to be abandoned. Please show where the connection will be made and clarify which waterline is going to be abandoned. Any hydrants removed along Colbern Road shall be replaced.

Fire hydrant locations have been verified that they meet the 300 ft hose length requirement. Hydrants have been added along Discovery Crossing Boulevard in Zone 1 at 300 ft max spacing. The existing water main removal/relocation line has been revised to properly show which part of the existing water lines will be removed or relocated. The existing hydrants along the north side of Colbern Road will be relocated to the south side at 300 ft max spacing.

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. All fire apparatus drive lanes shall be capable of supporting a 75,000-pound apparatus.

Acknowledged.

7. Show the turning radius of an aerial apparatus on the interior parking lots of Lots 8 and 9. ***The Fire Truck Access Plan has been updated to show how a fire truck can access the interior parking of Lots 8 and 9. A fire truck will have to pull in then back out of the parking lot. This turning movement has been added to the plan sheet as a darker red and green line.***

Planning Review – Cody Peratt

1. ZONING.

-The application submitted for this application indicates that the area identified as Zone 2 is currently zoned PMIX. Our records indicate that said approximately 19-acre parcel (historically known as 1810 NE Douglas St.) is zoned R-1 (Single-family Residential) and so needs to be included in the request for PMIX zoning.

-Similarly to the comment above, the site data table on Sheet L102 mistakenly labels the Zone 2 property as having existing CP-2 zoning instead of R-1 zoning.

-Provide a rezoning exhibit that shows the existing and proposed zoning for both Zone 1 and Zone 2. Revised the legal description label for Zone 2 on the preliminary development plan cover sheet to include rezoning.

Acknowledged. We have updated accordingly on the cover sheet.

2. FUTURE ZONE 3.

-Is there any intent to provide a conceptual development plan as apart of this application for the 110+ acres located west of Zone 2?

Acknowledged. We had included in the submittal a separate exhibit that shows conceptual future Zones 3 and 4.

3. STREETS.

-Please clarify which, if any, streets will be public versus private. It appears that all streets, including Discovery Crossing Blvd. will be private. Please note that all private streets are required to be designed and constructed to a public street standard.

-Please be advised that street names are limited to 12 characters (including spaces).

Yes, these will all be private streets and they will meet public street standards. We have updated the street names to be within the 12 character limit. (Excluding St. Ave, Blvd., as directed by the City)

4. PARKING LOT DESIGN.

-All parking lots are required to be set back a minimum 20' from the public right-of-way or a minimum 20 from the edge of pavement for a private street.

Plans have been updated to reflect this requirement.

-All two-way driveways and drive aisles with 90-degree paring spaces on either side shall have a minimum pavement width of 24'. All two-way drive aisles with no parking on either side (e.g. the south side of Lot 3 in Zone 2) shall have a minimum pavement width of 20'. Please note that the minimum pavement width requirements EXCLUDE curb and gutter, so these are not back of curb measurements. Also note that these minimum width standards apply to all drive aisle entrances flanked by landscape islands on one or both sides.

Acknowledged and plans have been updated to reflect this requirement.

-Add a general note to the plans indicating that parking lot paving shall meet the design standards under UDO Section 8.620

General Note has been added to Sheet L201

-Lot 11 in Zone 1 has 3 driveway connections onto Discovery Crossing Blvd. The proposed curb cuts do not comply with minimum spacing requirements under the City's Access Management Code.

Acknowledged. There was a follow-up conversation with Hector and it was determined that this would be an acceptable solution.

5. SIDEWALKS

-A minimum 5' sidewalk shall be provided along the NW/NE Colbern Rd frontage of both Zones 1 and 2.

-A minimum 5' sidewalk shall be provided along both sides of Discovery Blvd within both Zones 1 and 2.

-A minimum 5' sidewalk shall be provided along both sides of the street labeled Tract A and Discover Park Court within Zone 2.

-A minimum 5' sidewalk shall be provided along the NE Douglas St. frontage of Zone 2.

-Sidewalk connections shall be provided for all pad sites in Zone 2 from the NW/NE Colbern Rd, Trac A private street and/or Discovery Park Court as appropriate.

Acknowledged. All sidewalks have been added along Colbern frontage, Discovery Blvd., Discovery Park Court, and NE Douglas St. Frontage. We had a follow-up call with Hector and we have provided accessible routes along Tract A up to Colbern Rd. from Discovery Ave. and Crossing Blvd. in Zone 2.

6. MECHANICAL SCREENING

-To comply with City ordinances, all roof-top mechanical units shall be fully screened from view on all sides by extending parapet heights to at least equal the height of the units being screened. All ground-mounted mechanical units shall be fully screened from view on all sides with masonry walls or evergreen shrubs at least equal to the height of the units being screened. A general note can be added to the plans stating that mechanical screening shall be provided in accordance with UDO Section 8.180.E and 8.180.F.

Acknowledged, this has been provided as General Note 19, on Sheet L300

7. PROPOSED LAND USES.

-How much flexibility is sought as it relates to the mix of land uses identified for the various lots on the plans?

We have requested as much flexibility as possible as we have included development Zone 2 in this PDP submittal and individual tenants are not fully determined.

8. POOL AREA.

-Provide a layout and typical elevations for the pool area at the north end of Lot 8.

These are now provided on Sheet A112

9. PARKING

-Staff will continue to evaluate the proposed shared parking model.

-It appears that shared parking will be employed for Zone 2. No Shared Parking Model Data table for Zone 2 has been provided on Sheet L103. Provide the shared parking data table for Zone 2 as was provided for Zone 1 for evaluation.

We are not planning on utilizing a shared parking model for Zone 2. The drawings have been revised.

-How were the numbers of required parking spaces under the shared model determined for each lot and land use? Provide documentation as to how these figures were derived for staff review.

The shared parking model spreadsheet has been updated to reflect information based on the ULI (Urban Land Institute) Shared Parking "Third Edition"

-Please double-check the figures provided under the "Building SF" column on the Zone 1 Shared Parking Model Data table for each land use type. It doesn't appear that all the

square footage from the “Total Gross Floor Area” column in the Development Data table on the same sheet (Sheet L102) is accounted for.

Acknowledged and updated.

10. RESIDENTIAL UNITS

-Provide a breakdown of the residential dwelling units by the number of bedrooms provided per unit (i.e. # of studio units; # of 1 or 2 bedroom units, etc.).

Information has been added on Sheet L102

11. GROSS FLOOR AREA.

-There appears to be some discrepancies on the Development Data Table on Sheet L102 for Zone 1 as it relates to proposed building square footage. More specifically, the building square footage information for Lot 4, Lot 7 and Lot 11 do not appear to be correct.

-Lot 4 lists 23,300 sq. ft. under the “Building Coverage” column; 8,600 sq. ft. under the “Floor Size” column for each of the 3 stories, and 69,900 sq. ft. under the “Total Gross Floor Area” column. Multiplying the Building Coverage figure by 3 stories equals the Total Gross Floor Area figure, but the breakdown of per floor area doesn’t correspond to the other two columns. Please reconcile the inconsistency.

-Lot 7 has the identical issue as above, plus the table lists the building on this lot as 4 stories, but only provides information for a 3-story building. Please reconcile the inconsistency and confirm the number of building floors.

-Lot 11 Lists 31,625 sq. ft. under the “Building Coverage” column; 19,267 sq. ft. under the “Floor Size” column for each of the 4 and 126,500 sq. ft. under the “Total Gross Floor Area” column. Multiplying the Building Coverage figure by 4 stores equals the Total Gross Floor Area figure, but the breakdown of per floor area doesn’t correspond to the other two columns. Please reconcile the inconsistency.

-Correct the listed FAR for each line item and Total Gross Floor Area for all Zone 1 Buildings listed at the bottom of the total as needed based on the comments above.

Acknowledged – these errors have been rectified in the updated drawings

12. LANDSCAPE PLAN.

-the calculation performed to determine the open yard tree and shrub requirements schools, churches or other large public/institutional uses may exclude hardscape areas from the open yard and tree calculation requirements. Please revise the calculation.

Acknowledged. These errors have been corrected and updated on current plans.

13. SIGNAGE.

-The signage section of the design guidebook speaks to the maximum allowable height of the monument signs, but it doesn’t speak to the allowable structure area (sq. ft.), nor does it speak to tenant signage. Please refer to the UDO’s regulations for attached and freestanding signage in the PMIX Zoning district under Section 9.260, Table 9-1. Save for the monument sign height allowance of 12’ (the design guidebook calls for a 10’ height maximum), will the monument sign square footage allowances and attached signage allowances be agreeable for the proposed development, or will different standards be proposed?

Noted - Additional language has been added to the design guidelines to address this comment.