

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

**Commercial Final Development Plan
Applicant's Letter**

Date: Monday, December 18, 2023

To:

Applicant: ENGINEERING SOLUTIONS

Email: MSCHLICHT@ES-KC.COM

Engineer/Surveyor: ENGINEERING SOLUTIONS

Email: MSCHLICHT@ES-KC.COM

Review Contact: MATT SCHLICHT

Email: MSCHLICHT@ES-KC.COM

From: Mike Weisenborn, Project Manager

Re:

Application Number: PL2023214

Application Type: Commercial Final Development Plan

Application Name: Lakewood Business Center on I 470 - 600 NE MAGUIRE BLVD

Location: 600 NE MAGUIRE BLVD, LEES SUMMIT, MO 64064

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 multi-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:

Revisions Required: One or more departments have unresolved issues regarding this development application. See

comments below to determine the required revisions and resubmit to the Development Services Department. Resubmit one (1) digital copy following the electronic plan submittal guides as stated above. Revised plans will be reviewed within five (5) business days of the date received.

Required Corrections:

Planning Review	Dawn Bell (816) 969-1242	Planning Manager Dawn.Bell@cityofls.net	Corrections
------------------------	-----------------------------	--	-------------

1. Provide application and ownership affidavit - response letter indicated it was provided but it is not in our tracking system. Please re-upload.

2. From previous comments:

Lighting - The specs for the luminaires on the are not legible.

Per the specs, it is unclear what the pole base height is. Please clarify.

New information was not provided with the latest submittal.

3. Previous comment - mechanical equipment. It is unclear if this will be rooftop units or ground mounted. Please clarify and show how they will be properly screened.

The response letter indicates it is shown on the architectural set of plans. I do not locate the information on the plans provided.

4. From previous comments. Elevations - Please provide horizontal and vertical projections to break up the long facade.

The north facade still has no projections. You may have some downspouts that could be boxed in and painted a contrasting color.

5. Show that you have turned in a form 7460 to the FAA and provide their approval/comments.

I don't show this was added.

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

1. Please refer to comment #1 in the previous applicant letter. The response to comments states that there are "no field inlets or area inlets detail not necessary" on the project, but comment #1 requested the correct detail for erosion and sediment control for at-grade curb inlets. The incorrect detail is still called-out for at-grade curb inlets on the erosion and sediment control plan. Since the KCAPWA standard detail does not show separate callout, suggest the following: 1) note on the plan view "sump inlet protection" or "on-grade inlet protection" and 2) provide a pictorial representation on the plan view of the on-grade inlet protection with the three (3) upstream filter socks shown at 10 foot intervals. Please revise throughout the entire erosion and sediment control plan to distinguish between sump and on-grade placement of inlet protection.

2. A SWPPPP was requested, but does not appear to be present in the resubmittal despite the response to comments stating it was submitted. Please submit a SWPPP for the project.

3. A 108" public storm line along the east side of the project was not shown anywhere on the Final Development Plan. There appears to be a private curb inlet (i.e., 2-3) and storm line within the 25 foot public easement, which is normally not allowed. Please review, and see if this can be moved outside the limits of the easement.
4. Concerning the 108" storm line, will this conflict with the placement of the private sanitary sewer lateral? As-builts show approximately 5 feet of cover over this line. Please evaluate and revise as appropriate.
5. The gate valve just prior to the backflow vault and the 2 inch meter should be placed within the general utility easement. As shown, they are just outside the limits of the easement. Please revise.
6. The last applicant letter requested the method to drain the backflow vault. The revised plans state "daylight", but it appears it is connected to a curb inlet. Either scenario is acceptable, but please select one or the other. If connecting to the curb inlet, then please state "connect to curb inlet".
7. Sheet C.500: Please revise the note "drain to daylight" on the backflow vault to correspond to the actual method used. Provide a reference to the plan view where the flowline elevations are called-out. Either daylighting or connection to a curb inlet is acceptable, but cannot be both. Please revise.
8. Sheet C.601: Backflow vault detail WAT-12 does not match what is shown on Sheet C.500. Recommend removing this detail on Sheet C.601 since it is already being shown on sheet C.500. Alternatively, update Sheet C.601 WAT-12 detail to match what is shown on Sheet C.500. Please revise.
9. Trees are being shown over the 108 inch storm line on the east side of the project. This is not allowed.
10. Please show the location of the 108 inch storm line on all relevant sheets. Please revise.
11. ADA-accessible parking stall offloading areas do not appear to meet standards in terms of slope. It is my understanding these offloading areas should be no more than 2.00% slope in any direction, with a 1.50% design slope in any direction (maximum). Please evaluate and revise as appropriate.
12. ADA-accessible parking stalls should also include slope callouts in addition to the elevation callouts. It is my understanding these shall also be no more than 1.50% design slope in any direction. Please provide the missing slope callouts.
13. Sheet C.100: A callout for both commercial entrances is shown, but the sheet it references (i.e., Sheet C.101) was not included. Please include Sheet C.101.
14. Will you be sawcutting the PCC pavement? Please provide the pattern to be used when sawcutting.
15. Previous applicant letter requested the sidewalk construction be clarified on the plans as to the extent of construction. As shown on the resubmittal, there is no clear indication of the end of the sidewalk construction. Are you installing sidewalk to the west property line? As shown on Sheet C.100, it appears you are proposing to install beyond the west property line. Please clarify.
16. Sheet C.500: There is a note on the cut-in tee for the fire line which states "by others". Why is this being installed by others? It is my understanding this is to be installed by the developer of this project, not by others. Please revise as appropriate.
17. The grading plan and turf reinforcement plan does not appear to make sense. The plans call for a flat installation along the steep slope. Long term maintenance will be an issue, and the stormwater will create its own swale over

time which will further deteriorate the sidewalls of the detention basin, and likely washout the turf reinforcement mat in a short period of time. A better plan appears warranted, as the short sections of rip rap do not appear adequate, and discharge onto a flat strip without any definition of a drainageway. This plan would appear to create an adverse impact to the sidewalls of the existing detention basin based on the steep slope. Please evaluate, and revise as appropriate.

18. It would appear the stormwater exiting the north side of the development should be collected via underground system and routed to the detention basin near the bottom of the basin rather than continuing the ongoing rilling and erosion seen at the present. This project is going to create a situation where the rilling and erosion seen on the sidewalls of the detention basin will get worse. Please revise the plan.

19. What does the property owner's association have to say about the design you are proposing in relation to the discharge of stormwater over a steep slope into the detention basin? As this appears to be a common area tract subject to the rules of the property owner's association, I would think they would need to provide their approval of any plan.

20. An itemized and sealed cost estimate shall be required prior to formal approval of the plans.

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

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.

Traffic Review	Erin Ralovo	Erin.Ravolo@cityofls.net	No Comments
-----------------------	-------------	--------------------------	-------------

Building Codes Review	Joe Frogge (816) 969-1241	Plans Examiner Joe.Frogge@cityofls.net	Corrections
------------------------------	------------------------------	---	-------------

1. Architectural designs not covered under this review.

Action required: Comment is informational.

12/13/23 - acknowledged in letter.

3. Light pole base detail is incomplete.

Action required: Provide all structural information.

12/13/23 - structural base for light poles not found in submittal.