

**DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

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

**Date:** Monday, August 12, 2024

**To:**

: CATALYST DESIGN GROUP

Email: PPIERCY@CATALYST-DG.COM

**Applicant:** Wesley Blissard

Email: wblissard@catalyst-dg.com

: <NO CONTACT NAME AVAILABLE>

Email:

**Property Owner:** MIDWEST DIVISION LSH LLC

Email:

**From:** Daniel Fernandez, Project Manager

**Re:**

**Application Number:** PL2024191

**Application Type:** Commercial Final Development Plan

**Application Name:** HCA Midwest Lots 1C & 1D

**Location:** 2100 SE BLUE PKWY, LEES SUMMIT, MO 64063

---

**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:**  
**Required Corrections:**

<b>Planning Review</b>	Claire Byers (816) 969-1242	Claire.Byers@cityofls.net	Corrections
------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------	-------------

1. Please provide lighting elevations

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

1. Jurisdictional determination for the stream shall be evaluated and completed prior to approval of this project. It is our understanding this jurisdictional determination is currently being reviewed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
2. The stormwater report entitled "Drainage Design Summary" dated Jul. 24, 2024 (hereinafter referred to as "the stormwater study") did not appear to meet the Comprehensive Control Strategy adopted by the City of Lee's Summit. The Comprehensive Control Strategy requires release rates for the 2, 10, and 100 year events to be less than or equal to 3.0 cfs, 2.0 cfs, and 0.5 cfs per acre of drainage area respectively. Please evaluate and revise the methodology as appropriate.
3. The stormwater study did not address the emergency spillway in accordance with Section 5600 of the Kansas City APWA, which the City has adopted by reference with modifications. Please review Section 5600 for the emergency spillway design standards, and revise as appropriate.
4. The stormwater study was missing an analysis of the downstream receiving system to ensure the installation of a detention basin meeting the Comprehensive Control Strategy will not create increased peak flows downstream. Recommend an analysis to a downstream point to be identified by the engineer to ensure this does not occur. If it is shown that detention meeting the Comprehensive Control Strategy will create an adverse situation (i.e., see above), water quality measures such as a dry detention basin or other measures listed in Section 5600 to manage the 90% mean annual event will still be required. Please analyze and revise the stormwater report as appropriate.
5. The stormwater report should present definitive statement that the basin meets the Comprehensive Control Strategy within the body of the report. Please revise as appropriate.
6. A waiver to the stream buffer shall be required for the piers supporting the pedestrian bridge. Standard template form shall be forwarded separately from these comments. Staff shall support the waiver, but please be aware the City Engineer is the City representative responsible for granting waivers.
7. Sheet C6.3: Is there a particular reason the emergency spillway is shown with a concrete bottom? Typical installations within the City are grass-lined.
8. Sheet C6.3: A bold note shall be shown on the detention basin sheet stating that "DETENTION BASIN SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION OF THE PARKING LOT", and "AN AS-GRADED AND AS-BUILT DETENTION BASIN PLAN SHALL BE SUBMITTED AND ACCEPTED BY THE CITY OF LEE'S SUMMIT PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A CERTIFICATE OF SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION" or equivalent language.
9. Recommend re-naming Sheet C6.3 to "Detention Basin Detail Sheet" or equivalent language.

10. Detention basin detail sheet shall include the following items as in aid in creating the post construction as-built: 1) Top of dam elevation, 2) Emergency spillway elevation, 3) All weir and orifice elevations that are part of the outlet structure, 4) 100 year nominal (i.e., design) storage volume, 5) Bottom of basin elevation, 6) Bottom of basin slope callouts, which may be less than 2% to achieve water quality objectives (i.e., we have seen as little as 0.5% in some instances to achieve water quality objectives), 7) 100 year nominal (i.e., design) water surface elevation (WSE), 8) 100 year clogged/zero available storage WSE, 9) Graphical limits of the 100 year clogged/zero available storage WSE (i.e., shown on the plan view with callouts), along with dimensional callouts from property lines and buildings to ensure a minimum 20 foot setback, 10) Typical section view of the outlet works and dam, along with elevation callouts for the 100 year nominal and 100 year clogged/zero available storage to ensure there is a minimum 0.5 feet freeboard between the nominal condition and the crest of the emergency spillway, and a minimum 1.0 feet from the clogged condition/zero available storage and the top of dam, 11) Location and callouts showing the emergency spillway, and a clear path that is not directed towards buildings or other other vulnerable features. Please revise as appropriate.

11. A profile view of the outlet pipe serving the detention basin shall be required. Please provide a profile view of this line, along with the 100 year HGL on the profile view in graphic format.

12. The small water quality orifice at the bottom of the outlet structure does not appear to meet standards due to the small diameter. Normally, a perforated riser with small orifices is required when the diameter is small. Please evaluate and revise as appropriate, and ensure there are measures for allowing for future maintenance (e.g., raking the perforated riser to remove debris, accessway to the outlet structure, stairs if appropriate, etc.).

13. It did not appear any proposed grading was shown from the outlet structure rip rap to the receiving creek. Please show how the discharge from the detention basin will be directed towards the creek.

14. Rip rap calculations and sizing were not shown. Please provide calculations of rip rap, and please include the sizing of the rip rap, depth of rip rap, width of rip rap, length of rip rap, and notation concerning the use of geofabric under the rip rap. Please analyze and revise as appropriate.

15. It would appear that discharging stormwater from the parking lot towards "curb cuts" (i.e., flumes) is not an appropriate method for stormwater management in this particular instance. Recommend curb inlet(s) and pipe(s) directed to the bottom of the detention basin. Discharging this volume of stormwater at a 3:1 slope will create backcutting issues over time. Please revise as appropriate.

16. Bridge general layout references "structural plans". It does not appear we have these "structural plans". Are you intending to submit these after approval of the Final Development Plan in the form of a material submittal similar to retaining walls? If so, bridge shall be designed and sealed by a registered design professional registered in the State of Missouri. No portion of the bridge shall be allowed to be constructed prior to this submittal (i.e., the final design signed and sealed by a design professional registered in the State of Missouri).

17. Asphaltic concrete pavement sections do not meet the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) requirements in terms of pavement thickness, base, or subgrade stabilization/geogrid. The typical sections shown in the plans reference the geotechnical report, but the geotechnical report states the pavement design is beyond the scope of the geotechnical report. Therefore, the City standard UDO is considered a minimum requirement unless a new geotechnical report is submitted with actual field sampling. If this is desired, there are criteria that will need to be submitted to you to use in your design. If not, the UDO standard design shall be acceptable. The UDO standard design for asphaltic concrete pavement is 1) heavy duty where emergency vehicles and trash trucks will have access is 6.5 inches of KCMMB asphaltic concrete over a minimum 6 inches aggregate over a chemically-stabilized subgrade base or geogrid, and 2) normal duty asphaltic concrete shall consist of 5.5 inches KCMMB asphaltic concrete mix over

the same items described for subgrade and base for heavy duty asphaltic concrete (see above). Please review and revise as appropriate.

18. A site-specific plan for the PUBLIC ADA-accessible ramps on Cumberland Dr. is required. This plan shall provide elevation callouts, slope callouts for the longitudinal and transverse directions, and truncated dome callouts with dimensions from the truncated domes to the ADA-accessible entrance. No more than 7.5% running slope (i.e., longitudinal) is allowed, and no more than 1.5% cross-slope (i.e., transverse slope) is allowed, with construction allowance up to and including 8.33% and 2.00% respectively. No more than 5.00 feet shall be allowed between the end of the truncated domes and the "travelled-way". Please update plans as appropriate.

19. Sidewalk that is part of the public sidewalk system in the right of way shall not include reinforcement. Please do not use welded wire fabric. In addition, the note on the sidewalk standard detail says "2% max, 1% minimum" is not correct. The City has adopted more stringent design standards that go above and beyond PROWAG. The maximum design cross-slope is 1.5%, and 7.5% for running slope. If the as-built condition shows less than 8.33% and less than 2.00%, they will be accepted. Please revise the plans as appropriate.

20. Why is there a minimum cross slope of sidewalk of 1%? We have seen instances where the cross slope is 0% with a running slope of 1%+/- to manage stormwater flows. There is no reason to include a "minimum cross slope" unless the sidewalk will not drain. Please revise as appropriate.

21. Parking lot plan is incomplete. Please provide a plan that includes ADA-accessibility. This shall include elevation callouts, slope callouts, dimensional callouts, and all other information necessary to perform a review of the ADA-accessibility of the parking lot. ADA-accessible spaces shall be clearly shown with details. Please review, revise, and update as appropriate, and ensure there is an ADA-accessible route from the parking lot to the final destination.

22. Landscape Plan: It is difficult to determine where the City sanitary sewer line is located in relation to trees, as well as City water main. Please show the location of City-owned utilities on the project including sanitary sewer, water lines, and storm lines. Ensure there is a minimum of 5.0 feet from the outside of the mature tree trunk to the outside of any storm line, sanitary sewer line, and water line or sanitary sewer structure or storm structure. Please be aware this does not apply to small ornamental shrubs. Please evaluate, revise, and update as appropriate.

23. Prior to formal approval, an itemized and sealed Engineer's Estimate of Probable Construction Costs is required. Please do not include the cost of buildings used in the hospital campus, lighting, or landscaping.

<b>Traffic Review</b>	Erin Ralovo	Erin.Ravolo@cityofls.net	Corrections
-----------------------	-------------	--------------------------	-------------

---

1. Sheet DP-C5.1 - The ADA on the east side of the bridge is not marked.
2. There are 2 signs at the crosswalk across the driveway are not labled.
3. Please remove the painted crosswalk at Cumberland Dr.
4. Signs should installed in the new lot directing drivers to ADA spaces in the main lot.

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

---

1. Provide and post a SE Cumberland address, or something different from the existing address for the hospital parking lot.

**Building Codes Review** Joe Frogge  
(816) 969-1241

Plans Examiner  
Joe.Frogge@cityofls.net

Corrections

---

1. Inadequate information to complete review.

Provide the following:

- Light pole base detail.
- Water/DWV pipe sizes and materials.
- Specify type of connection at sanitary main.
- Complete grease trap designs.