



December 17, 2024

Daniel Fernandez  
Planning Division  
City of Lee's Summit  
220 SE Green  
Lee's Summit, MO 6463

**Re: PL2024191 - HCA Midwest Lots 1C & 1D**  
**Final Development Plan Comment Response Letter**

Dear Daniel Fernandez,

The following are responses to your comments received on November 8, 2024, for the above-referenced project:

**Engineering Review – Gene Williams, P.E.**

1. Refer to comment #14 in previous applicant letter. I am still not seeing any callout on the plan view (detention basin detail sheet in this case DP-C6.3) for the rip rap. The plan view calls out 8 ft by 9.5 ft rip rap and refers to Sheet C3.3, but when directed to Sheet C3.3, critical design notes are missing, such as the sizing (D50). To make this process simple, why not place all of this information on sheet DP-C6.3? Provide the width, length, depth, D50 sizing, a filter fabric. It does not appear to make sense to locate this detail within the erosion and sediment control plan. Corrections required.  
***Response: The riprap detail is now included on sheet C6.3, which includes the width, length, D50 sizing and filter fabric.***
2. Pedestrian bridge design shall be submitted by a registered professional engineer licensed in the State of Missouri prior to formal approval. Informational comment.  
***Response: The pedestrian bridge design will be submitted and approved with the Building Permit for the project.***
3. Refer to comment #17 in the previous applicant letter. It appears the typical section views of the asphaltic concrete are acceptable, but the KCMMB callout was missing. Correction required to designate KCMMB asphaltic concrete mix.  
***Response: A note has been added to the Asphalt Pavement detail on sheet C8.0, which states that all asphalt pavement shall adhere to KCMBB standards.***

4. Refer to comment #19 in previous applicant letter. A site specific design for the ADA-accessible ramps at the new commercial entrance and the ADA-accessible route across the new commercial entrances was requested, but not provided. A note stating "See GEN-1, GEN-3A, etc." is not going to be adequate. The plan shall include: 1) elevation callouts at corners, 2) running slope callouts, 3) cross-slope callouts, 4) width of sidewalk callouts, 5) width of ADA-accessible route callouts for the new commercial entrance, 6) wingless design, and 7) distance from the truncated dome to the back of curb not to exceed 5 feet. Corrections required.

***Response: Please see the updated sheet C6.1 where an ADA Route inset has been added, which included the appropriate callouts, spot shots, dimensions, and labels.***

5. DP-L1.0 – Landscape Plan: Can you provide a limit of disturbance that minimizes the amount of tree removal to the minimum? As shown, the limit of disturbance is fairly wide, and not certain why. Correction required.

***Response: The Limits of Disturbance revised to match grading plans.***

6. DP-C6.4, DP-C6.1, DP-C6.0, DP-C5.1, and erosion and sediment control plan sheets: Show the extent of tree removal and clearing activities within the stream buffer. Only limited tree removal and limited clearing is allowed without a waiver. Show the extent as clearly as possible. Corrections required.

***Response: The limits of disturbance within the stream buffer have been reduced to the greatest extent possible and now clearly shown on the appropriate sheets. The limits of disturbance has been reduced to 10' outside the pedestrian bridge foundation limits for constructability.***

7. Sheet DP-C3.0: The limit of disturbance shown on this sheet is too wide in relation to the bridge. Please narrow this down to the absolute minimum needed to install the bridge. Correction required.

***Response: The limits of disturbance within the stream buffer has been reduced as much as possible, which is 10' outside the pedestrian bridge foundation limits.***

8. Sheet DP-C6.4: 8 inch water main is shown on profile view near the western bridge pier, but this should be noted as a sanitary sewer line. Correction required.

***Response: The referenced callout on sheet C6.4 has been revised accordingly.***

9. Cost estimate required prior to formal approval. Informational comment.

***Response: A preliminary cost estimate has been included within the resubmittal package.***

**Building Codes Review – Joe Frogge**

1. Inadequate information to complete review. Provide the following:
  - Complete grease trap designs.
    - o 9/20/24 – deferred per request.

***Response: The structural detail for the light pole is provided on sheet DP-S201.***

Please review the above responses together with the revised plans and let me know if you have questions or need additional information.

Regards,

**Catalyst Design Group**

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'W. Blissard', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Wesley Blissard, EI  
Design Engineer