

April 11, 2023  
Scott Ready  
City of Lee's Summit  
Development Division  
220 SE Green Street  
Lee's Summit, Missouri 64063

**Re: PL2023030 – Comprehensive Plan Amendment Comment Responses**  
**PL2023029 – Commercial Preliminary Development Plan Comment Responses**

Dear Scott Ready:

Below describe the comment responses (in **red**) to the comments provided by city staff based on the Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Commercial Preliminary Development Plan applicant letters dated February 27, 2023:

## **PL2023030 – Comprehensive Plan Amendment**

### ***Planning Review – Shannon McGuire – 816-969-1237***

Comment 1: Please provide a plan sheet showing the property in question and the current and requested land use designation (residential 3 and Commercial).

**Response 1: See new plan sheet C1.1 clarifying the current and requested land use designation for the Residential 3 & Commercial Portions of the property.**

### ***Engineering Review – Gene Williams, P.E. – 816-969-1223***

Comment 1: Please see comments on the Preliminary Development Plan regarding stream buffers and water quality.

**Response 1: Acknowledged.**

### ***Traffic Review – Brad Cooley, P.E., RSPI – 816-969-1223***

Comment 1: No Comments.

**Response 1: Acknowledged.**

### ***Fire Review – Jim Eden – 816-969-1303***

Comment 1: No Comments.

**Response 1: Acknowledged.**

## **PL2023029 – Commercial Preliminary Development Plan**

### ***Planning Review – Shannon McGuire – 816-969-1237***

Comment 1: Please show the location of all oil and gas wells, whether active, inactive, or capped. If none are present, please add a note stating such and cite your source of information.

**Response 1: Acknowledged. The survey provided on sheet SUR1 shows no record of oil/gas wells within the subject property. Note added to C1 for clarification.**

Comment 2: Please provide typical elevations for the proposed garages.

**Response 2: Acknowledged. Typical garage elevations have been included in the resubmittal.**

Comment 3: Please provide a detailed drawing of enclosure and screening methods to be used in connection with trash storage containers on the property.

**Response 3: Acknowledged. Trash enclosure elevations are included in the resubmittal. The facade of the enclosure coupled with the proposed landscape screening shown on L3 is believed to be sufficient screening.**

Comment 4: All parking lots shall be set back a minimum 6 feet from the side or rear property line when not part of shared parking and/or cross access. Will the driveway along the property line separating the apartment from the commercial be covered by a shared access agreement?

**Response 4: Acknowledged. Yes, the drive separating the apartment from the commercial will be covered by a shared access agreement.**

Comment 5: The use of curb blocks in parking areas shall be prohibited, except at the head of accessible parking spaces when they are adjacent to a pedestrian walkway with no raised curb.

**Response 5: Acknowledged. Curb blocks are not proposed at this time.**

Comment 6: CG-1 concrete curbing is required around all parking areas and access drives. Temporary asphalt curbs may be used in areas to be expanded only as shown and approved on the development plan. Please label the proposed curb type and provide standard details.

**Response 6: Acknowledged. Site plan legend revised to call out CG-1 Curb and Gutter and a detail has been provided.**

Comment 7: Accessible spaces shall be located at the nearest point to the front building entry and/or accessible ramp. It is unclear where the leasing office will be located. Are ADA stalls located in a manner that they can serve the office?

**Response 7: Acknowledged. The Leasing Office is located at the west side of Building 8 which will be served by ADA stalls located directly west of Building 8.**

Comment 8: All accessible parking shall comply with the requirements of the federal Americans with Disabilities Act?

**Response 8: Acknowledged.**

Comment 9: All signs must comply with the sign requirements as outlined in the sign section of the ordinance?

**Response 9: Acknowledged. Note added to Sheet C2 for clarity.**

Comment 10: The subject property will require platting prior to the issuance of building permits.

**Response 10: Acknowledged.**

Comment 11: It does not appear there are any sidewalks connecting the parking lot/sidewalks to the entrances of the proposed building.

**Response 11: Acknowledged. Sidewalks have been added to show routing to proposed building entrances.**

**Engineering Review – Gene Williams, P.E. – 816-969-1223**

**Comment 1:** The "Storm Drainage Study" dated Feb. 9, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as "the stormwater study") was missing the required discussion of: 1) the existing stream with a drainage area greater than 40 acres and hence subject to the stream buffer requirements of the City of Lee's Summit, 2) requested waivers to the stream buffer, 3) discussion of any U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) jurisdictional determinations of the existing stream or wetlands and any mitigation needed, 4) exhibits showing the location of the existing stream buffer. Please revise as appropriate, and include a summary of what was done during early February 2023 in terms of clearing and land disturbance within the boundaries of the existing stream buffer.

**Response 1:** **Acknowledged. The stream buffer waiver completed by SM Engineering has been provided in the appendix of the Storm Drainage Study. See revised Storm Study.**

**Comment 2:** The stream study did not include any discussion of the proposed RCB structure to divert the existing stream underground, nor did the report provide any calculations for sizing of the RCB. Please discuss within the stormwater study, and provide calculations for stormwater flow within the box. If a waiver is granted by the City Engineer to the stream buffer requirement, this RCB shall be designed to a standard no less than a 100 year event with a low flow channel.

**Response 2:** **Acknowledged. A copy of the proposed storm main extension completed by SM Engineering has been included in the appendix of the Storm Drainage Study. These plans will be submitted to Public Works for review.**

**Comment 3:** A Design Criteria Modification Request (i.e., waiver) was missing from the submittal package. This waiver request shall be submitted on forms provided by the City, and shall include 1) the completed form, 2) a summary that is signed and sealed by a design professional registered in the State of Missouri, and 3) exhibits showing what is being requested in terms of the waiver. The entirety of the stormwater study should not be submitted for the exhibit and summary, although it can be referenced in the waiver request.

**Response 3:** **Acknowledged. As previously stated, a copy of the stream buffer waiver, completed by SM Engineers, has been provided in the appendix of the stormwater drainage report.**

**Comment 4:** Plan and profile view of the preliminary sizing and preliminary location of the proposed RCB was missing, and shall be submitted to evaluate the proposal to route the existing stream underground.

**Response 4:** **Acknowledged. As previously stated, a copy of the Storm Main Extension Plans completed by SM Engineers, has been provided in the appendix of the stormwater drainage report.**

**Comment 5:** The public sanitary sewer relocation along the east side of the project appears to show the 10 inch line too close to a building in certain instances. The minimum distance between the outside of the pipe or structure related to a sanitary sewer and any portion of the footing or overhang is 15 feet.

**Response 5:** **Acknowledged. Sanitary sewer relocation routing has been revised to maintain 15' from building footings and overhangs to outside of proposed pipe.**

Comment 6: The private water line appears to be a fire line, and the meter placement and sizing is not practical. For purposes of this project, it is acceptable to place the fire line and backflow vaults as shown, but meters are not practical as you are showing several 6 inch meters which will increase your cost by approximately \$375,000 per meter (including the sanitary sewer impact fee which is based on the meter sizing). Recommend you shown smaller meters interior to the project that are connected to the fire line (perhaps one meter per building?). The location of these smaller meters should be shown outside of paved areas and in areas that are accessible to Water Utilities staff. Please evaluate and review, and revise as appropriate.

**Response 6: Acknowledged. Design team will continue to evaluate different metering options with the developer as design progresses.**

Comment 7: There is not convincing evidence that the hydrodynamic separators will achieve the objectives of treating on-site stormwater runoff, and address the issue of removing the stream and routing underground.

**Response 7: Hydrodynamic separators are widely known to be one of the premier devices for the removal of oil and floatables. The proposed separators are designed to remove at least 80% of the suspended solids on an annual aggregate removal basis (110 Microns). The removal of these suspended solids would protect Raintree Lake from pollutants of concern, including sediment, exiting the proposed development. Section 8.12 of the MARC BMP Manual recognizes hydrodynamic separators as an approved treatment method. The separators will be maintained per manufacturer recommendations to ensure the units function properly. See hydrodynamic separator cut sheet attached to appendix of stormwater report.**

Comment 8: To further address water quality and the elimination of the stream buffer, it is recommended the applicant explore the possibility of purchasing the existing pond at the southeast corner of Ward Rd. and M-150. This pond has been problem to Raintree Lake Property Owners Association, the owner of Tract A - Raintree Lake Village Lots 1 through 6 and Tract "A", and the City of Lee's Summit. The acquisition of this pond and periodic maintenance by the applicant would mitigate 1) water quality concerns from the new development, and 2) delegation of maintenance in the future (i.e., silt removal, etc.).

**Response 8: This has been discussed in multiple meetings with Lee's Summit Planning and Public Works. It has been agreed upon that this is not a feasible solution.**

Comment 9: The RCB proposed to route the existing stream underground did not appear to be labeled in terms of public or private ownership. What is the proposed ownership of this RCB?

**Response 9: Acknowledged. The stormwater pipe that is being proposed is intended to be public. A copy of these plans have been included in the appendix of the Stormwater Study. These will be submitted to public works by SM Engineering for review.**

Comment 10: The relocated sanitary sewer cannot be more than 20 feet in depth as measured to the flowline of the pipe in any portion of the line, nor can it be less than 3.5 feet of cover over the top of pipe. Was this checked during the preliminary design process? Is a profile view of the proposed relocated line appropriate for this project? Please evaluate and provide a preliminary plan and profile if appropriate.

**Response 10: Acknowledged. The proposed sanitary sewer relocation has been review/analyzed for compliance with information listed above. Public sewer relocation plans with plan and profile sheets will be provided along with permit plans.**

***Traffic Review – Brad Cooley, P.E., RSPI – 816-969-1223***

Comment 1: Please confirm MoDOT has reviewed the TIS.

**Response 1: Acknowledged. TIS has been submitted to MoDOT for review. Confirmation of approval will be provided upon receipt.**

***Fire Review – Jim Eden – 816-969-1303***

Comment 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.

**Response 1: Acknowledged.**

Comment 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.

Show the locations of the FDC's.

**Response 2: Acknowledged. FDC's have been scaled up and now plot red for clarity on sheet C3. Note added that all FDC's shall be located within 100 feet of a fire hydrant. Note added that all FDC's shall be a 4" Storz Type Fitting.**

Comment 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.

Confirm with LS Water Utilities there will be adequate fire flow with the proposed system per IFC Table B105.1(2). A 50% reduction is allowed due to the buildings having automatic fire sprinklers.

**Response 3: Acknowledged. Our largest building will be approximately 102,000sf . Per IFC Table B105.1(2) for type VA construction, 5,750 gpm \* 50% reduction = 2,875 gpm required for 4-hour Duration. Kimley-Horn has provided the fire flow test along with the resubmittal to allow LS Water Utilities to confirm.**

Comment 4: 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.

Drive lanes shall be capable of supporting 75,000-pounds..

**Response 4: Acknowledged. Pavement section will be confirmed with Geotech Report Recommendations.**

Comment 5: 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".

Fire lanes shall be posted.

**Response 5: Acknowledged. A note has been added to C2 that fire lanes shall be marked and posted where required by the fire code official.**

Please feel free to call me at 816-652-0138 if there are any questions.

Respectfully,

KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.



Tyler Wysong, P.E.