



Application Number: PL2023214
Application Type: Commercial Final Development Plan
Application Name: Lakewood Business Center on 1470 - 600 NE MAGUIRE BLVD
Location: 600 NE MAGUIRE BLVD, LEES SUMMIT, MO 64064

Please find responses to City comments in bold below.

Planning Review

Corrections

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

2. From previous comments:

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

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. **Rooftop. Shielded by parapets.**

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. **See Arch. Under separate cover.**

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 FM and provide their approval/comments.

I don't show this was added. **Noted and once approved will provide the FAA Approval**



Engineering Review

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. **REVISED.**
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 SWPPPP for the project. **PROVIDED WITH SUBMITTAL.**
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. **Removed inlet. Area graded to drain.**
4. Concerning the 108" storm line, will this conflict with the placement of the private sanitary sewer lateral? As-built shows approximately 5 feet of cover over this line. Please evaluate and revise as appropriate. **No conflict. New sanitary lateral will connect on the west side of storm.**
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. **REVISED.**
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". **REVISED.**
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. **REVISED.**
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. **REVISED.**
9. Trees are being shown over the 108 inch storm line on the east side of the project. This is not allowed. **Removed trees over 108" storm line.**
10. Please show the location of the 108 inch storm line on all relevant sheets. Please revise. **Added.**



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. **REVISED.**
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. **REVISED.**
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. **ADDED C.101.**
14. Will you be sawcutting the PCC pavement? Please provide the pattern to be used when sawcutting. **Sawcut per specification at contractor discretion.**
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. **REVISED.**
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. **REMOVED BY OTHER LABEL.**
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. **Curb cuts, riprap apron, and TRM are provided in design per discussion.**
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. **Curb cuts, riprap apron, and TRM are provided in design per discussion.**
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. **Discussed with HOA. HOA allowed.**
20. An itemized and sealed cost estimate shall be required prior to formal approval of the plans. **PROVIDED WITH SUBMITTAL.**



Response Comment Letter
December 18, 2023
Lakewood Business Center on 1470 - 600 NE Maguire Blvd
Lee's Summit, MO

Fire Review

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. **NOTED.**

Building Codes Review

1. Architectural designs not covered under this review.

Action required: Comment is informational. 12/13/23 - acknowledged in letter. **NOTED.**

3. Light pole base detail is incomplete. **Under separate cover.**

Action required: Provide all structural information.

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

Feel free to contact me should you have any additional questions regarding this project.

Thank You,

Matt Schlicht