



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
1141NW SLOAN ST, LEES SUMMIT, MO 64086

Please find responses to City comments in bold below.

Planning Review

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. *** **NOTED.**

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. **Revised.**

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. **Will meet new R/W. Minor Plat submitted**

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. **SEE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS**

- 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. **SEE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS**



- 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. **SEE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS**

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. **SEE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS**

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. **SEE ARCHITECTURAL PLANS**

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. **NOTED.**

Engineering Review

1. Please refer to comment #1 in the previous applicant letter. No plans were provided for the rehabilitation of the C.203 existing is off-site entitled regional "Grading Plan", detention but no basin. A grading Sheet is C.203 proposed. is presented, Please but evaluate no and work is revise as proposed on appropriate. this sheet. Sheet **REVISED.**

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.

Provided

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.

The backflow drain as been directed to the storm inlet

4. The 24 inch sanitary sewer line cannot be used for lateral connections. Recommend an evaluation of existing 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. **REVISED TO 8" SANITARY SERVICE LINES.**



5. Plans show stubs connecting to manholes, which is not allowed and was not shown on previous version of the p s. 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.

Revised per discussion with Water Utilities

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. **REVISED.**

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. **REVISED.**

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. **The existing basin is being updated with the City projected and connected to our system**

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. **PROVIDED WITH SUBMITTAL.**

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

Fire Review

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. **REVISED.**

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 8105.1(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. **NOTED.**



Response Comment Letter
April 8, 2024
The Haven at Douglas Station
Lee's Summit, MO

Traffic Review

No Comments

Building Codes Review

1. Architectural plans not reviewed during this process.

Action required: Comment is informational.

3/15/24 - acknowledged in letter

NOTED.

2. Water meter size not specified. **WATER SIZE SECIFIED ON C.501.**

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. **NOTED.**
- 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) **NOTED.**

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

Thank You,

Matt Schlicht