

**DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

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

**Date:** Monday, March 18, 2024

**To:**

**Property Owner:** DOUGLAS STATION LLC      Email:

**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:** PL2023213

**Application Type:** Residential Final Development Plan

**Application Name:** THE HAVEN AT DOUGLAS STATION

**Location:** 3 NE SYCAMORE ST, LEES SUMMIT, MO 64086  
1141 NW SLOAN ST, 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 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:**

---

<b>Planning Review</b>	Hector Soto Jr. (816) 969-1238	Senior Planner Hector.Soto@cityofls.net	Corrections
------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	-------------

---

1. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL. A condition of approval for the development of this property from the previously approved preliminary development plan is that an application for a Comprehensive Plan amendment for a change in land use category from Industrial to Residential 3 be submitted and considered by the Planning Commission prior to the issuance of any building permits.

\*\*\*The City will include the required Comp Plan Land Use designation amendment as part of our own separate effort to update said plan.\*\*\*

2. SITE DATA TABLE. The listed density of 20.53 units/acre is incorrect based off of the listed 154 dwelling units on 6.44 acres. Using the listed number of units and site acreage, the density calculates at 23.9 units/acre. Revise.

3. BUILDING SETBACKS.

- The apartment building closest to the intersection of NW Sycamore St and NW Sloan St encroaches into the 20' building line, but staff can administratively approve up to a 1' encroachment into said setback line.

- The two garage buildings along NW Sloan St don't meet the minimum 20' setback from the current west property line. The plan calls out additional property that is currently ROW with a note indicating that said ROW will be added to the subject project site, which once absorbed into the subject project site will bring the two garage setbacks into compliance. However, staff cannot approve the final development plan with the garage setbacks as currently shown until such time as the abutting ROW is actually vacated and platted to bring the ROW into the project site. No application for vacation of ROW has been submitted to date.

4. BUILDING ELEVATIONS. The previously made comments below were not addressed as part of the resubmittal.

- Provide additional detail as to the exterior building materials. Is the board and batten and lap siding cement fiberboard or some other material? Provide specifications for said material.

- In order to comply with ordinance requirements, the back elevation for the garages require some vertical projecting or offset features to provide some relief for the long flat walls.

- Provide a material legend for the garage elevations. It appears that the same lap siding and brick from the apartment is being used, but it isn't made clear.

5. BUILDING FLOOR PLANS. To comply with ordinance requirements label the dimensions and areas of all units and floors within the proposed buildings.

The previously made comment above was not addressed. Also, no drawing scale is provided for the floor plan.

6. TRASH ENCLOSURE DETAIL. Label the gate material. The gates shall be a solid steel opaque gate painted to be compatible with the color of the masonry or steel walls and building it is to serve or a steel framed semi-opaque gate with a screen mesh material approved by the Director that provides an appropriate visual barrier.

7. PLATTING. The property will need to be re-platted prior to the issuance of building permits. The northernmost east-west building crosses the existing eastern boundary of the existing Lot 10A.

---

<b>Engineering Review</b>	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. No plans were provided for the rehabilitation of the existing off-site regional detention basin. A Sheet C.203 is presented, but no work is proposed on this sheet. Sheet C.203 is entitled "Grading Plan", but no grading is proposed. Please evaluate and revise as appropriate.
2. Please refer to comment #1 in the previous applicant letter. A short memorandum was requested memorializing the decision concerning stormwater detention on the site. This memorandum was missing. This memorandum should be signed and sealed. Please submit a short stormwater memorandum.
3. Please refer to comment #5 in the previous applicant letter. Labels were added to Sheet C.501 to daylight the drain for the backflow vault, but it does not appear feasible based on the grades. Please evaluate and revise as appropriate. Please be aware that the City no longer allows the installation of infiltration galleries beneath the backflow vault as a means to drain the vault, as these infiltration galleries are not effective.
4. The 24 inch sanitary sewer line cannot be used for lateral connections. Recommend an evaluation of existing sanitary sewer lines less than 18 inches. There appear to be alternatives available to the north and to the southeast (both 8 inch lines appear available for connection, without the preparation of separate engineering plans for a sanitary sewer extension with an 8 inch trunk extension. Please evaluate and revise as appropriate.
5. Plans show stubs connecting to manholes, which is not allowed and was not shown on previous version of the plans. Please revise as appropriate with wyes a minimum of 4 feet from the outside of manholes, as measured to the outside of the wye to the outside of the manhole.
6. Sheet C.501 and Sheet C.502: You are showing an 8 inch line connected to the public system without a backflow device. This is not allowed. The fire line shall be connected after the backflow device and backflow vault, not before the backflow device and vault. The location of this line is the line that serves the building to the northwest. Please revise, as this configuration is not allowed.
7. Sheet C.501 and Sheet C.502: The connection point on the north side of Sloan does not meet standard drafting practice. There is a bold line shown to the north of the existing water main, and the leader line and notes are pointing to this area which is not accurate. The gate valve requested in previous applicant letter is also not shown. Please clean this up to avoid confusion by the inspector and the contractor.
8. Please see previous comment #20 in the previous applicant letter. I had requested plans for what is to be done with the existing detention basin outflow from the Police Station, and a note was provided. If I were a contractor

reading the plans, I would not know what to do to "rehabilitate the outfall". Please provide detailed plans for this work. Please revise as appropriate.

9. The Engineer's Estimate of Probable Construction Costs was unsealed. Please provide a sealed estimate. Further review of the estimate shall take place after the plans are approvable, since there may be revisions to the plans.

10. A SWPPP is required for this project prior to formal approval.

---

<b>Fire Review</b>	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.

The FDC's are not all within 100 feet of a fire hydrant.

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.

Provide information to Water Utilities to complete a water model and confirm available fire flow per IFC Table B105.1(1) with a 50% reduction for an automatic sprinkler system.

What is the result of the water model completed for this project. Provide the square footage used and construction type.

---

<b>Traffic Review</b>	Erin Ralovo	Erin.Ravolo@cityofls.net	No Comments
-----------------------	-------------	--------------------------	-------------

---

---

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

---

1. Architectural plans not reviewed during this process.

Action required: Comment is informational.  
3/15/24 - acknowledged in letter

2. Water meter size not specified.

Action required: Specify meter size.  
Some things to consider:

- Detail WAT-11 on sheets DC.503 & C.602 is for maximum 2" meter. Anything larger requires a custom engineered pit.

- Consider multiple meters as the larger ones are very expensive. (2" = >\$57,000.00 3" = >\$113,000.00 4" = >\$180,000.00 6" = >\$386,000.00)

3/15/24 - Provide water flow calculations to justify use of a single 2" water meter serving multiple buildings.

