



Application Number: PL2024250
Application Type: Final Plat
Application Name: Oldham Village – First Plat

Please note our comment responses in bold below.

Planning Review:

1. APPLICATION. Submit a completed and signed application and Ownership Authorization form. Additionally, the application fee has not yet been paid. **Noted.**
2. LEGAL DESCRIPTION. 1) In the third line of the metes and bounds description, the listed bearing distance of 371.44' does not match the labeled distance of 371.41' on the drawing. **Updated.** 2) Provide a copy of the legal description in word format. Added.
3. SIDEWALKS. Darken the linework and text showing and calling out the proposed 5' and 10' sidewalks along the proposed roadways. **Updated.**
4. UTILITY EASEMENTS. 1) Show, label and dimension all proposed easements. None are shown on the drawing. 2) / The plat includes a Sanitary Sewer Easement dedication paragraph, but no sanitary sewer easement (S.E) is shown on the drawing. Remove the dedication paragraph if no specific sanitary sewer easement will be dedicated as part of the subject plat. **Updated.**
5. ACCESS EASEMENTS. Show and dedicate all cross-access easements needed to serve the development on the subject plat. **To be addressed with CC&R's**
6. ERRANT LINEWORK. What do the dashed lines at the southeast corner of Lot 13 represent? **Updated.**
7. BUILDING LINES. Show, label and dimension all proposed building lines on the proposed lots. **Updated.**
8. COMMON AREA - CC&RS. Submit a copy of the CC&Rs for the proposed development for review that includes the quired common property language from UDO Section 4.290. The plat shall not be released for recording until such time as the CC&Rs have been submitted and reviewed by staff for compliance. **Noted.**
9. CITY SIGNATURE BLOCK. Change the name of Josh Johnson to Aimee Nassif, AICP, and the listed title to Deputy Director of Development Services. **Updated.**
10. EXISTING RIGHT-OF-WAY. Show, label and dimension the existing SW Jefferson St and SW Oldham Pkwy Right-of-way boundaries that are proposed to be vacated and label them as "to be vacated". **Noted.**

Engineering Review:

1. Minimum ten (10) foot general utility easement required along all street frontage, unless greater width necessary to accommodate utilities. Correction required. **Added.**
2. Tract A is for detention of stormwater, and as such, shall include the standard language for stormwater detention tract. It should "stand out" from the other tracts due to this special designation. Corrections required. **Added.**
3. Easements for the sanitary sewer line appear to be missing in several locations. Exclusive easement required in these instances. Correction required. **Added..**
4. Easements shall be shown along private streets where public utilities are shown on the plans. General utility easements are required. Correction required. **Added**
5. Easements for stormwater shall be dedicated where needed. See stormwater plans for placement of these /easements. Please dedicate a general utility easement for these. Correction required. **Added**

GIS Plat Review:

1. Calls with issues:
The very first call after POB is inconsistent between description and drawing(length).**Updated.**
The call between coord 8 and 9 is inconsistent (missing length). **Updated.**
Missing a call in description between coord 4 and 3. **Updated.**
Call after ctl pt 3 is inconsistent dwg vs description(NWvNE). **Updated.**
2. Plat does not close. It is about 10ft off. The line along reconfigured Oldham Pkwy appears short, although I can't tell if it is the curve length between ctl pt 2 and POB, the straight distance N43-39-15W(484.93), or the N44-17-15W(122.21). Updated.
3. Curve on SW Oldham is wrong. Either the radius is wrong on the tangent curve, or it is not a tangent curve. **Checked.**
4. Please mark the dimensions on each side of the centerline of Jefferson St {near ctl pt 5). **Added**
5. Radius missing from dwg on Jefferson St, the part within lot 13 (221.32) Updated.
6. Please provide 1TB on SW Oldham curves:
R=393.42 (after N70-42-39E, 1TB probably NW) **Added**
R=377.95 (after N70-42-39E, but 1TB probably SE) **Added**
R=600.00 west side of road after S68-55-47W, 1TB probably SE) **Added**
R=631.51 east side of road after S68-55-47W, 1TB probably SE) ?
7. Lot 2 missing correct dimension at NE corner. Cannot be 559 ft. Updated. **Updated.**
8. Lot 10 missing a lot dimension along south lot line **Updated.**



9. Lot 17 east line dimension is incorrect; 245.03 is the total length of the line that includes tract B West line is also wrong 310.54 is total length includes tract b. **Updated.**
10. Lot 5: the curve near Oldham and Tract C seems off. It seems like it needs a larger radius like 24.00 to follow the georeferenced drawing. **Noted.**
11. Lot 1 missing a dimension in the NE corner near POB **Updated.**
12. Please double check the line between tract A and lot 11: The dimension seems more like 240.81. **Checked.**
13. Please use hashmarks to indicate where dimensions stop and start, particularly on curves. It's very hard to verify dimensions without them. **Added.**
14. . A lot of this plat is in current ROW, whilst dedicating ROW for reconfig Oldham and Jefferson. Are there recorded documents vacating this ROW? I am not sure where MoDot owns ROW and where we own ROW based on ours or JaCo's maps, so any vacations would have to be based on ownership: JaCo/LSMO vacation and any MoDot vacations. **To be updated with CC&R's.**

Please contact me directly with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Matthew Schlicht