



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. LOT 8 INTERNAL CIRCULATION. It was discussed in the applicant meeting that the proposed site layout compromises the functionality of the southernmost row of parking abutting the drive-through lane entrance because drive-through queues will block in said spaces. Additionally, the easternmost parking spaces in that same row are effectively forced to exit out of the parking lot during times of higher customer volume by circulating through the abutting drive-through lanes and thereby negatively impacting drive-through operations due to a lack of a by-pass lane.

The issue above was acknowledged during the applicant meeting to be addressed, but the resubmitted plans remain unchanged as it relates to this particular issue. There is also no written response addressing this matter accompanying the resubmittal. **The drive thru lane provide double stack lanes of 5 cars per lane, which is double the required by UDO. Also the 14 parking spaces shown on the south side of the drive thru area will be provided for employee parking.**

2. PLAN BOUNDARIES/LEGAL DESCRIPTION. 1) The plan boundaries include all of the property owned by Abundant Life Church that includes the original church site that now houses their Admin/Education/Counseling facility. The northernmost portion of said property is proposed to house regional detention. What improvements, if any, will take place on the portion of the property that houses the original church site? **The southern portion that includes the church building and house will be retained by ALBC, but shown because they will be part of the plat**

2) Revise the vicinity map to include the Abundant Life Church property and the Leland's Commercial Park property in order to match the plan boundaries. **REVISED VICINITY MAP.**

3) The legal description for the Abundant Life Church property simply reads "Part of Lots 11 and 12, Clearview Acres ... ". This description is too vague to mean anything. A detailed description of the actual boundaries of said property is required for inclusion in any approval ordinance for the subject application. **Updated description has been provided**

3. STREETS/DRIVES (LOT 8). The parking lot drive entrance/exit at the northwest corner of the site scales at 22' width (excluding curb and gutter). A minimum 24' width (excluding curb and gutter) is required. **REVISED.**



4. LOT INFORMATION (PRELIMINARY PLAT). 1) Label the dimension for the east property line for Lot 1. 2) Label the dimensions for the west property lines for Lots 2 and 3. 3) Label the dimension for the shared east-west property line separating Lots 3 and 4. 4) The east property line dimension for Tract A is labeled as 554.01', but scales approximately 798'. **REVISED.**

5. SIDEWALKS.

1) 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.

The only internal private sidewalk shown on the plan is along one side of the "7" street. Pedestrian connectivity shall be provided to all proposed lots. **Sidewalks have been added to provide access throughout the site**

2) The linework on the Sidewalk Plan (Sheet C.104) does not make it apparent that a sidewalk is being provided along the south/west side of SW Oldham Pkwy. **ADDED SIDEWALKS TO WEST SIDE OF OLDHAM PKWY.**

A dimensioned label is provided, but no sidewalk is shown. **Sidewalks shown**

6. STREET NAME LABELING. SW Oldham Pkwy (east-west street) is mistakenly labeled as SW Jefferson St on the plans. **REVISED.**

7. SETBACK TABLE (SHEET C.101). 1) Lots 10 and 8 are proposed to have 10' rear setbacks. However, it doesn't appear that conditions exist that would make it difficult for either lot to be developed to maintain the typical 20' rear setback for a commercial lot. Staff recommends 20' minimum rear setbacks for all buildings in the development. 2) The side yard setback proposed for all commercial lots is 0'. Staff will recommend a minimum 5' setback for all of the commercial lots, subject to compliance with any building and/or fire code requirements for greater separation between the buildings. 3) Lot 4 is listed in the table as having a proposed 20' front setback for the parking lot, but the parking lot scales as having a 15' setback from SW Oldham Pkwy at its closest point. Revise to meet the 20' standard.

4) Lots 8-10 are listed as having proposed 10' parking lot front setbacks. These particular lots front onto the private "7" street. Parking lot setbacks from a private street are measured from the edge of the private street pavement as opposed from the property line. Based on that fact, it appears that the minimum 20' setback from the private street edge is met. Revise the table to read "20'" for the front parking lot setback for these lots. 5) The front parking lot setback for Lot 2 shall read 20' instead of 0'. 6) The building setback from the MoDOT R/W for Lot 5 is listed as a minimum 10', but the building appears to scale as having only a 5' setback from said R/W. Reconcile the setback conflict. **Table has been updated to reflect plans**

8. BUILDING INFORMATION. Dimension the building footprints on all of the pad sites. The comment above was previously made, but not addressed on the resubmittal. **ADDED.**

9. 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.

The previously made comments above were not addressed in the resubmittal. **Updated**

10. SITE DATA AND PARKING TABLES. 1) Both the Site Data Table and Parking Table list Lot 1 as having 17,900 sq. ft. of building area, but that lot is shown as all parking lot and no building. Revise. 2) The Lot Areas in acres and sq. ft. for Lots 3-10 do not match the information listed on the accompanying preliminary plat drawing. Revise and recalculate the FAR and impervious coverage percentages based on the corrected lot area information. 3) Both tables list Lots 9 and 10 as "N/A" for building area, but the site plans show buildings on each of those buildings. Review and revise all data table information to match the information depicted on the plans. 4) Provide the impervious coverage information for each lot in addition to the overall coverage listed for the development. 5) Add Lot 11 and Tract B information to the Site Data Table. **REVISED.**

11. 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.

Regarding the previously made comment above, staff didn't do a good job explaining the UDO requirement for the applicant to address it on the resubmittal. The UDO calls for a continuous 10'-wide landscape island to be provided across the entire width of every 4th parking row so as to create "pods" of parking areas broken up by the linear landscape areas. **Islands have been provided along the north side of the field house. The east side only has 4 rows so we request it not be required**

12. 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. The response to the previously made comment above is that the information shall be provided at the time of FDP. Add a note to the plans indicating that the proposed development will comply with the lighting standards under UDO Article 8. **ADDED LIGHTING NOTE.**

Engineering Review

1. Stream buffer determination appears to be based on incorrect drainage area calculations. Sheet C.200 shows the drainage area immediately upstream of the upstream end of the proposed detention basin, but it appears there are additional areas draining to the stream beyond this point. In this case, it would appear the point to be measured would be the outlet end of the detention basin. Please evaluate and provide a determination of the existing condition drainage area to the outlet of the proposed detention basin.

Updated drainage basin has been provided

2. Preliminary determinations based on the City's GIS shows the drainage area to the point described above is very close to 40 acres. If greater than 40 acres, please be advised this would require moving the stormwater detention basin outside the limits of the stream buffer, or alternatively, a waiver from the City Engineer would be required. **Updated drainage area and the drainage area is less than 40 acres**

3. Sheet C.200 and Sheet C.202: The proposed detention basin shows contours without any elevations, labels for emergency spillway, labels for outlet structure, or other preliminary information needed for the Preliminary Development Plan. Please provide elevations for the contours, and labels for the emergency spillway and outlet structure, and ensure the emergency spillway is located in an appropriate area for emergency discharge. **ADDED ELEVATIONS.**

4. It would appear the proposed detention basin shall be subject to the more stringent requirements of TR-60, including wider flat top, increased freeboard between the clogged condition and the top of dam, and other criteria listed in TR-60. Please review TR-60 and ensure the preliminary design will fit within the footprint shown on the Preliminary Development Plan. **The basin final design will be evaluated but at this time the depth from the flowline of the existing creek to the top of the basin spillway is less than 10 feet.**

Fire Review

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.

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.

ACKNOWLEDGED.

3. Provide a drawing showing turning movements on the fire lanes for a 44' straight fire truck.
Provided as C.800

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. **FIRE HYDRANTS WITH 300' RADII SHOWN.**

Provide a complete hydrant plan showing public and private hydrants. Hydrant distances are measured around the buildings and not through them. Public hydrants shall be located and spaced per design standards Who will be responsible for the maintenance of private hydrants on the access roads?

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.

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



Traffic Review

3. There is a lack of pedestrian connectivity with this plan. There should be a pedestrian connection to the park to the west as well as pedestrian ways connecting each pad site to the sidewalks on the street. Additionally, there should be sidewalks on the private "7 Street" and along Jefferson. **Sidewalks have been added**

4. The new Jefferson Street connection should be constructed with Phase 1. Not constructing this will limit access to the Jefferson Street businesses and force more traffic to Percels. **Jefferson realignment has been added to Phase 1**

5. The E5-WB movements at the full access does not show a through movement. Please show which lane this would be assigned to. **ADDED ARROWS C.100's**

6. The SB Left turn does not appear to meet the minimum storage and taper requirements. **Updated**

7. The TIS indicates that you plan to have a signal at the full access intersection, however the signal does not meet signal warrants and is not shown on the PDP Plan. If you can properly demonstrate the signal meets warrants, please indicate signals on the plan. **Updated TIS provided**

8. Please show any improvements required by MoDOT on the plan, i.e. turn lanes, sidewalk, improvements to MO 291. MoDOT approval will need to be documented before PDP approval. **Email provided to MoDOT and City of LS included**

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

Thank You,

Matt Schlicht