

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

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

Date: Friday, September 27, 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:

Traffic Review	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.

Planning Review	Claire Byers (816) 969-1242	Claire.Byers@cityofls.net	No Comments
------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------	-------------

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

1. Excessive slope greater than 3:1 on west side of detention basin, east side of detention basin, and north side of detention basin. Correction required unless accompanied by geotechnical report with field sampling.
2. There are numerous instances of excessive slope greater than 3:1. Correction required unless supported by geotechnical report with field sampling.
3. Refer to comment #3 in previous applicant letter dated Aug. 12, 2024 (hereinafter referred to as the "applicant letter"). The stormwater study did not discuss the emergency spillway. Correction to the text of the stormwater study required.
4. Refer to comment #4 in the previous applicant letter. No analysis of the downstream receiving system to a point(s) as identified by the engineer were provided in the text of the report. Typically, we have seen other engineers use the 10% rule. Regardless of how this is analyzed, the engineer of record shall provide the point(s) of interest to analyze to ensure detention is not creating an adverse effect to downstream peak flows. Correction required.
5. Jurisdictional determination for "Waters of the United States" shall be submitted prior to formal approval of the plans. It is understood this is in progress in accordance with the report entitled "Waters of the United States Delineation Report - Proposed Pedestrian Bridge Lee's Summit Medical Center" dated May 2, 2024. If the findings of the jurisdictional determination require modification to the plans, then the Final Development Plan shall be modified accordingly.
6. Sheet 6.3: The grading within the detention basin has now changed from the previous submittal in terms of geometry. You were showing curvilinear grading, but are now showing abrupt intersection lines where grading is to take place, and this does not appear practical. Correction required to a more curvilinear grading.
7. In reference to the above comment, routing calculations and the stage/storage relationship shall be updated to reflect the decrease in storage when using the curvilinear grading. Correction and revision to the stormwater study and routing required.

8. Are you certain an 8 inch discharge pipe is sufficient to carry the 100 year flow from the primary spillway? It appears this pipe is not large enough. In accordance with Section 5608.4(E)2, the discharge from the detention facility when inflow is equal to or less than the maximum design storm under the required strategy shall be via the primary outlet system which includes the discharge pipe. If appropriate, correction required.
9. Refer to comment #10 of the previous applicant letter. The 100 year nominal and 100 year clogged/zero available storage elevation were not shown or called-out on the plan view in graphical format. Dimensions from the graphical callouts of these elevations were not shown to property lines (i.e., a minimum of 20 feet is required from the clogged/zero available storage condition). Correction required.
10. Refer to comment #11 in the previous applicant letter. Are you certain the hydraulic grade line for the 8 inch line is correct? According to my cursory calculations, this line is not large enough. If appropriate, correction required to upsize the pipe.
11. Pond setup table appears to show a circular riser, but plans show a rectangular riser. Correction required.
12. Pond setup table in the stormwater study shows an elevation for the 6 inch wide rectangular weir which is significantly different than what is shown in the plan. Correction required.
13. Pond setup table shows an elevation of the emergency spillway which is significantly different than what is shown on the plans. Correction required.
14. Refer to comment #14 in previous applicant letter. Response to comments stated the calculations are included on Sheet 8.0. No such details were provided on the sizing and dimensions of rip rap on Sheet 8.0. Rip rap sizing shall be shown on the plan view where appropriate. It shall callout the size of rip rap, the length, width, and depth, and callout the use of geofabric beneath the rip rap. It shall be based on calculations you have provided elsewhere in the plans. City inspector or contractor shall not be required to look up the sizing based on a table. Corrections required.
15. Pedestrian bridge shall not be approved until a separate plan is provided signed and sealed by a design professional registered in the State of Missouri. Informational comment only.
16. General Comment on Bridge: Wouldn't it be better to place the bridge piers closest to the stream bank at an angle to the stream, more in line with the stream? Correction required if appropriate.
17. Refer to comment #17 in the previous applicant letter. KCMMB asphaltic concrete mix is required for all projects, whether public or private. It should be noted that KCMMB mix requires a minimum of 2 inch lift, so the surface course should be called-out as 2 inches rather than 1.5 inches, and the base course thickness of KCMMB mix called-out as 4.5 inches or 3.5 inches if heavy duty pavement or light duty pavement. Correction required.
18. Refer to comment #17 in the previous applicant letter. Geogrid or chemically-stabilized subgrade is required beneath the 6 inch aggregate base layer. Correction required.
19. Refer to comment #18 in the previous applicant letter. A site-specific plan for the ADA-accessible ramps was requested, but was not provided. A site-specific plan for the ADA-accessible ramps shall be provided that addresses all aspects of comment #18 in the previous applicant letter, including the ADA-accessible route across the commercial entrance. Correction required.
20. In regard to above comment, do not include "wings" or "flares" on the ADA-accessible ramps. ADA-accessible ramps shall be constructed so "wings" or "flares" are not required and not desired at this location, and grading to the ramp will be sufficient. Informational comment for use in preparation of the site-specific ADA-accessible ramp plan.

21. Will the retaining wall along the parking lot require a fence? It appears the height of the fence and proximity to the pedestrian walking surface will require the installation of a fence. Correction required.
22. If not designed by your firm, retaining wall shall be designed and sealed by a design professional registered in the State of Missouri. This shall be a condition of approval of the plans. Informational comment.
23. Refer to comment #19 in the previous applicant letter. Sheet C5.1 calls out a note which refers the reader to standard detail for sidewalk construction. No such detail was included in the plan. Recommend City detail on this sheet to make it easy to distinguish between that which is shown internal to the project with woven wire fabric, and that which is required by the City. Correction required.
24. Refer to comment #21 in the previous applicant letter. Specific slope callouts, dimensional callouts, elevation callouts, and ADA-accessible routes across drive aisles are required within the parking lot, and the ADA-accessible route to the building(s). Maximum slope within a parking lot in any direction is 5.00%, and the ADA-accessible route to the buildings include requirements for cross-slope maximum being 1.50% and a maximum 5.00% running grade. Corrections required.
25. Refer to comment #22 in the previous applicant letter. Water main is not shown on the landscape plan, but it appears trees are located directly on top of the water mains. A minimum of 5 feet distance is required from trees to the outside of the water main, as measured from the mature tree trunk to the outside of the water main. Water main shall be shown on the landscape plan based on survey, and trees located as per above requirements. Correction required.
26. Pedestrian bridge is proposed over an existing sanitary sewer line with inadequate space above the grade to perform maintenance. Bridge abutment appears to be located within the easement. The location of the bridge at this location appears to prevent any maintenance to the sanitary sewer line and bridge abutment is encroaching within easement. Recommend a re-design in terms of geometry to eliminate the conflict at the west end of the bridge where the height prevents future maintenance to the sanitary sewer line, and all structures such as bridge abutments are outside limits of easement. This could be managed by extending the fill towards the stream, contingent upon the depth of the sanitary sewer line being less than 20 feet of depth to the flowline after fill.
27. In regard to above comment, the sanitary sewer line was missing on the profile view. Show the sanitary sewer on the profile view in relation to the bridge.
28. In lieu of reconfiguring the bridge as per the above comment, it is possible Water Utilities may grant a waiver to the encroachment. It is recommended, however, to raise the bridge at the west end as high as possible to create a more accessible area beneath the bridge to perform maintenance on the sanitary sewer line. Informational comment.
29. A SWPPP is required due to the disturbed area being greater than 1 acre. Provide a SWPPP for the project.
30. A cost estimate prepared by a design professional licensed in the State of Missouri, or a signed and itemized contract for the work shall be required prior to formal approval of the Final Development Plan. The plan shall include all sitework necessary to construct the project, including retaining walls, bridge, parking lot, sidewalk, grading, detention basin, stormwater, sanitary sewer, water lines, etc. Please do not include the cost of any buildings, lighting, or landscaping.
31. Development Services is awaiting a response from Water Utilities on their desired strategy in regard to the bridge encroachment. Antipated schedule for decision is Sep. 27, 2024.

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

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

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

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.

9/20/24 - Detail provided is incomplete. Structural information required.

-

-

- Complete grease trap designs.

9/20/24 - Deferred per request.