



Application Number: PL2023188
Application Type: Commercial Preliminary Development Plan
Application Name: Oldham Village Phase 1
Location: 1025 SW JEFFERSON ST, LEES SUMMIT, MO 64081
1031 SW JEFFERSON ST, LEES SUMMIT, MO 64081
101 SW OLDHAM PKWY, LEES SUMMIT, MO 64081

Please note our comment responses in bold below.

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

1. PLAN BOUNDARIES/LEGAL DESCRIPTION. There is a lack of clarity as to the plan limits for which the subject application for Oldham Village Phase 1 covers, particularly when compared to the plans provided for the separate but associated Oldham Village Phase 2 application. The legal description for both application plan submittals are identical and cover approximately 45.41 acres, but most of the improvements on the Phase 1 plans cover the area immediately along SW Oldham Pkwy. However, it appears that some improvements on the Phase 1 plans are also shown on the old CK Enterprises and Elite Fence sites plus what looks like a building footprint just north of the CK Enterprises site. Clearly call out the actual boundaries of the Phase 1 application and grey out or hatch out the portion of the area not covered by this plan and revise the legal description accordingly. **Revised.**
2. STORMWATER DETENTION. Show the location of all existing and proposed detention basin(s) serving the proposed development. **Added.**
3. STREETS/DRIVES. Label the widths of all the private streets/drives that will come off SW Oldham Pkwy, SW Jefferson St and the internal private drives and streets. **Added.**
4. VACATION OF EASEMENTS/ROW. 1) Show, label and dimension the location of all proposed easements. 2) The proposed layout will require the vacation of right-of-way and possibly easements as well under separate application prior to the issuance of any building permits. **Updated.**
5. SURROUNDING LAND USES. Label the existing zoning of adjacent development located within 185' of the project site. **Added.**
6. LOT INFORMATION. Show, label and dimension all of the proposed lot lines, including lot numbers. **Added Preliminary Plat.**
7. SIDEWALKS. 1) Label the proposed sidewalk width on the sidewalk plan. 2) There is a segment of sidewalk missing along east side of SW Oldham Pkwy through the S-curve section. 3) Sidewalk connections between the public streets and the individual lots shall be provided to accommodate and encourage pedestrian usage, particularly considering that Phase 2 of Oldham Village includes multi-family development. **Added.**
8. SETBACKS. What setbacks regulations are sought to govern the PMIX-zoned development? Is the intent for standard CP-2 setbacks or some customized version? **Added table.**



9. BUILDING INFORMATION. Dimension the building footprints on all of the pad sites. **Updated.**
10. LIGHTING. No lighting or photometric information has been provided. Provide lighting and photometric information in accordance with the requirements of UDO Article 8, Subdivision 5. **Will provide with FDP submittals**
11. BUILDING ELEVATIONS. 1) Scalable and dimensioned architectural building elevations of all elevations for each building shall be submitted as part of this application. The building elevations shall have callouts of all exterior building materials and colors. Only partial elevations for the north and west elevations of a Popeye's were provided. Renderings of a Panda Express, Smalls Sliders and Q39 were provided in lieu of architectural exterior building elevations. Renderings are helpful artistic representations that convey what a building will look like, but they only serve as a supplement to scalable architectural drawings. 2) Regarding the proposed car wash elevations and the use of clear glass along the length of the tunnel, provide detail as to the maintenance program that the user follows to maintain the integrity (both aesthetic and otherwise) of the glass in a wet environment. **See Architectural. Under separate cover.**
12. SITE DATA TABLE. 1) The site data table information on Sheet C.100 doesn't correlate to the actual plans. For example, the table calls out Lots 1 and 2 being multi-family residential, but the revised Phase 1 plans no longer include any residential. Update and revise all site data table information, including the parking table information, to reflect the most recent plan revisions. 2) Provide impervious coverage percentages and FAR data for each individual lot in the site data table. **Revised.**
13. MODIFICATION REQUEST NARRATIVE -- GENERAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS - ENVISION LS OVERLAY. Because the subject property is located within the EnVision LS overlay area, please review the pertinent development standards that apply to the multi-family and commercial sites found starting with UDO Section 5.640. Provide documentation/response indicating how the development standards of the overlay are being met and provide a modification narrative for all aspects said requirements that are not being met. **Updated.**
14. COMMON AREA NOTE. Revise the common area note on Sheet C.100 to state that the POA (not HOA) shall own and be responsible for maintenance of all common area tracts. **Revised.**
15. LANDSCAPING/SCREEN BUFFER. 1) A high-impact buffer, which includes a 6' fence or wall, is required along the west boundary of the development where it abuts the existing single-family residential subdivision. The landscape plan shows plant materials, but does not appear to include a wall or fence. Revise. 2) Landscaping is shown across the curb cut to the church property to the west and the curb adjacent to the 5,000 sq. ft. building in the northwest area of the development. 3) There are small areas where it does not appear that the 2.5' parking lot screening requirement is being met. At this PDP stage, just add a note to the plans that landscaping will be provided in accordance with the requirements of Article 8. Final details of said requirement and all other landscaping requirements will be reviewed and approved at the FDP stage. **Added Note.**
16. OVERALL SITE PLAN (Sheet C.101). The overall site plan shown on this sheet includes information in a table that doesn't match what is graphically depicted on the sheet and includes lots that are not part of the Phase 1 plans. **Revised table.**
17. MISCELLANEOUS. 1) Please clarify what the intent and scope of activity on the former CK Enterprises and Elite Fence properties are. The Phase 1 plans appear to show improvements on said properties, but they conflict with what is shown on the Phase 2 plans. 2) The Water Utility Plan - South



sheet (Sheet C.501) shows development south of the SW Oldham Pkwy alignment that does not show up anywhere else on the Phase 1 plans, but shows up on the Phase 2 plans. **Revised.**

18. DRIVE-THROUGH QUEUING. Show that adequate queuing spaces are provided for all drive-through facilities in the form of a minimum 5-car stacking from the order box and 4-car stacking from the pickup window without backing out into the parking lot drive aisles. **Added note.**

19. PARKING LOT LANDSCAPING. The area to the east and north of the fitness tenant has large unbroken spans of pavement for the parking lot. To comply with parking lot landscape requirements, every four rows of parking shall include a landscape island of at least ten feet in width to break up the large expanses of hardscape. **Revised.**

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

1. Stream buffer was not addressed along the south portion of the project. The detention basin appears to be proposed within the limits of this stream buffer, which is not allowed. Preliminary calculations show this stream is subject to a 60 foot stream buffer on either side of the stream's ordinary high water mark, and the City will not support a waiver to this requirement. Considerable revision to the plan and stormwater report is therefore required. Please evaluate and revise as appropriate. **The watershed is less than 30 acres**

2. If applicable, any detention basin where the dam is greater than 10 feet in height shall meet the requirements of TR-60, including minimum widths at the top of dam, spillway and emergency spillway design with greater freeboard requirements, dam construction requirements, etc. Please review TR-60, and ensure any preliminary design of a detention basin dam meets the minimum requirements. **Noted**

3. Setbacks from adjacent property lines were less than 20 feet from the 100 year clogged condition/zero available storage condition within the detention basin. Please ensure any detention basins proposed for the development meet the 20 foot setback requirement. **Noted**

4. No further review of the stormwater study was conducted due to the issues related to the comments above. **Noted**

5. Please refer to previous applicant letter. Only those public storm lines and inlets along Oldham Pkwy. will be considered public. All others will be considered private. Please revise the plans as appropriate. **Noted**

6. Please refer to previous applicant letter. Only those public water mains along Oldham Pkwy. will be considered public. All others will be considered private. Please revise the plans as appropriate. **Noted**

7. A suitable development agreement shall be executed for improvements to the sanitary sewer system. Details concerning these improvements shall be forthcoming. **Noted**



8. Informational Comment: Site plan did not show the detention basin. North site plan did not show detention basin. South site plan did not show detention basin. It was not shown until Sheet C.201 on the grading plan. Please show the detention basin on the site plan(s) as this shall be required as part of Phase 1. **Noted**

9. Stormwater Study Comment: No analysis was conducted along several points of interest downstream of the project to ensure detention isn't causing a rise in the HGL along Cedar Creek. Please provide a detailed analysis (i.e., HEC-RAS?) of the downstream system along several points of interest to ascertain the detention system is not creating a worse situation in terms of peak flows and increased HGLs downstream of the project. Please be aware this analysis should be more in-depth, as there are residences and/or businesses downstream of the project that might be impacted. For purposes of rationale, detention shall be considered the default mitigation strategy, unless it can be proved that detention is creating a rise in the downstream floodplain. A HEC-RAS analysis is likely required in this instance rather than simple calculations. Please review, evaluate, and revise the stormwater report as required. **Updated.**

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

2. 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. **Acknowledged.**

Consult with Water Utilities to determine if there is adequate fire flow for the proposed buildings per IFC Table B105.1(2). A 50% reduction is allowed for having an automatic sprinkler system.

3. Provide a drawing showing turning movements on the fire lanes for a 44' straight fire truck.

4. 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. **Added 300' radii and fire hydrants.**

Provide a complete hydrant plan showing public and private hydrants. **Added.**

Provide a complete hydrant plan of public and private hydrants. The Water Utility Plan -South does not match the other plans (blue building). **Revised.**

5. 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. **Noted.**

FDC's not shown. Additional hydrants may be needed to meet this requirement. **Added fire hydrants.**



Traffic Review Erin Ralovo Corrections
Erin.Ravolo@cityofls.net

1. The site plan should be more clearly labeled and the usage for each lot should be specified, i.e. Fast Food, Sit Down Restaurant, Retail, etc (even if it is just an assumed use). Please also label the access points as they are described in the report. **Updated.**
2. The Intensity/Units do not seem to match up to the most recently submitted site layout. It is difficult to check the trip generations without a proper site plan. If the site plan you used for your study is not the most current, but is more conservative, a statement could be made to that effect. **Updated.**
3. Pass-by trips were calculated at 15% of the volumes on MO 291 from the counts you collected in 2022? If it is from the interchange study in 2015 more updated information is needed. Please clarify. **Will provide.**
4. It was stated that the signal warrants for 4 hours were not met, were the peak hour warrants considered? **Will provide.**
5. Since a traffic signal is not warranted for any other reason than LOS calculations, has any consideration been given to an alternate intersection configuration such as a roundabout at this location? Could the site configuration be changed to increase the trips as needed to meet the warrant. **Updated.**
6. All curb return radii should be a minimum of 35 FT to meet city design guidelines. If not able to make these adjustments please provide and engineering reason why. **Will provide revision or discussion.**
7. The access location to Lot 5 is noted as being too close to the 4 way intersection to the south. This prohibits the construction of a left turn lane necessary for the development. Please adjust the entrance further to the north in order to meet the city's access guidelines and allow for the warranted turn lane. **Revised.**

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

Thank You,

Matt Schlicht