

REQUESTED MODIFICATIONS

March 11th, 2025

RE: 150 & Ward PDP Application
PL2024319

Dear Mr. Scott Ready,

Per the city's request, this letter shall serve as an official request for modifications for the PDP Application PL 2024319. Requested modifications with justifications are:

1. Modification from minimum parking count requirements
 - a. Justification: An alternate parking plan per Section 8.540 of Lee's Summit UDO was provided to compute total parking stalls required for the proposed development.
2. Modification of 20' Parking setback requirement. Applicant request a modification of the 20' parking setback from 20' to 0' on the North entrance from Arborwalk, near the roundabout
 - a. Justification: The ROW cuts into the site due to the Arborwalk roundabout.
3. Modification from 150 Overlay District requirements for primary entrances and facades to not be oriented towards parking lots, garages or carports. In addition, the requirement to connect each building entrance to the public sidewalk.
 - a. Justification: Feedback from the neighborhood indicates that sidewalk connections from each unit to public sidewalk would not be favorable and would encourage parking on Arborwalk. This site plan has removed the direct connections from the buildings directly to the public sidewalk for this reason.
4. Modification from Sec. 5.510.B.4.a.(2) requirement for one out of every three multi-family buildings to have an ADA approved elevator.
 - a. In lieu of providing one out of every three buildings with elevators, we are proposing to provide a min of $\frac{1}{3}$ the total number of units in a single building with elevator service. There are 272 total units $\times \frac{1}{3} = 91$ units required with elevator service. Building #8 (Type 'C') provides elevator service and will have 92 units to comply with this requirement.
5. Modification from Sec 5.510.B.3.a.(1) requires rooftop equipment to be screened by a parapet or similar feature that is equivalent to the height of the equipment.
 - a. Based on practical sight lines, to obscure the equipment from view the wall does not need to match the equipment height. It is dependent on its position relative to the equipment. We plan on locating rooftop equipment close to the center of the building depth, and the parapet heights shown are sufficient to block the view of

the equipment. The included drawing illustrates a persons view from HWY 150 and from the closest house to the roundabout on Arborwalk. This drawing indicates the 3 parapet height and the sight-line. As indicated the lowest parapet will block the equipment from view from a distance.

6. Modification from Sec 5.510.B.4.c.(6) requirement for at least 20% of all walls facing a public street to contain windows or doorways.
 - a. The Side elevations for building types 'A' & 'B' which face the street have less than 20%. The windows are placed in the locations appropriate to the interior functions and have been arranged with the exterior materials to create a balanced design with appropriate proportions. We believe as designed the side elevations meet the intent of the code; which is to have well-designed and attractive elevations facing the street and not blank spans of wall. To add additional windows is not conducive to the interior building functions and will not improve the exterior look. The main elevations facing the street exceed the minimum percentage which when taken into account with the side elevations will provide an overall percentage that is compliant.

WINDOW & DOOR %	
BUILDING TYPE A	
Front	29%
Rear	25%
Left	17%
Right	17%
BUILDING TYPE B	
Front	28%
Rear	26%
Left	17%
Right	17%
BUILDING TYPE C	
Front	26%
Rear	26%
Left	11%
Right	11%

If additional information is required, contact me at any time.

Sincerely,



Patrick J. Joyce, P.E.

Senior Project Manager | Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Kimley»Horn