

The following is a response to Planning Review, Engineering Review, Traffic Review, and Fire Review comments (dated February 27, 2025) concerning:

Hyundai Premier Auto Outlet  
Application Number: PL2025001

### Planning Review

- 1. Please amend photometric plan to show property line limits.**

This has been added, and the updated plan is attached.

- 2. Please confirm that the paved surface connecting the parking lot to the display pad will be curbed.**

Yes, this is called out on Sheet C102, near the bottom right portion of the sheet.

### Engineering Review

- 1. Refer to previous applicant letter requesting details on the ADA-accessible ramps. There are instances where 1.6% cross-slopes are called-out when the City's Design and Construction Manual requires a design slope of no more than 1.5%. There is a callout of 8.3% on the running slope when the City's Design and Construction Manual requires no more than 7.5%. Correction required.**

This has been corrected, with slopes shown on Sheet C202.

- 2. Refer to previous applicant letter. Private sanitary sewer material callouts were requested, but you specified the incorrect pipe type. PVC SDR 26 pipe or better is required. Correction required.**

This has been changed to PVC SR 26, on Sheet C101.

- 3. Refer to previous applicant letter. Slope callouts for the ADA-accessible parking stalls were requested, but was incomplete. A complete depiction of all ADA parking stalls is required, along with slope callouts. No more than 1.5% design slope for the stalls is required as per the Design and Construction Manual to allow for tolerance in construction. Corrections required.**

Slope callouts have been added to Sheet C201.

- 4. Refer to previous applicant letter concerning ADA-accessible parking lot. It would appear you are calling out 5.5% running slope on portions of the ADA-accessible route to the building. Evaluate and correct if appropriate.**

We have reviewed the ADA Guidelines for accessible routes. Our understanding is the running slope of walking surfaces cannot exceed 5%; however, steeper ramps may be included. The language from the Access Board is:

*The running slope of walking surfaces cannot exceed 1:20 (5%), but other components of accessible routes, such as ramps and curb ramps, can be more steeply sloped.*

- 5. Refer to previous applicant letter concerning the lack of typical pavement section. Typical section views were provided, but are incorrect. The Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) requires the use of chemically-stabilized subgrade or geogrid beneath the aggregate base. Correction required.**

The sections have been corrected. The typical sections now give the contractor the option to either use geogrid or chemical subgrade – but one of those is now required.

- 6. Refer to previous applicant letter concerning the typical pavement sections. Fire and truck access lanes throughout the parking shall be constructed with no less than 2 inch surface course KCMMB asphaltic concrete over 4.5 inches of base course KCMMB asphaltic concrete. Correction required.**

Construction Note 24 has been added (and a typical section) to sheet C101, listing this requirement.

- 7. Refer to previous applicant letter concerning typical pavement section. Vehicle parking and drive aisles shall be constructed with a minimum 2 inch surface course KCMMB asphaltic concrete over a minimum 3.5 inch base course. You may wish to lower the thickness requirement for these areas, but are under no obligation to do so. However, you will need to delineate on the plans where the heavy duty pavement is to be constructed, versus the locations where normal duty asphaltic concrete is to be constructed. Informational comment.**

Hatching has been added to the plan to delineate different pavement sections under the fire lane and other parts of the lot, and the thicknesses have been changed to align with city standards.

- 8. If using two (2) separate typical pavement sections, show on the plans where these two (2) sections will be utilized. Correction required if using two (2) separate typical pavement sections.**

This is now shown on the plans, on Sheet C101.

- 9. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be required prior to formal approval. Informational comment.**

Acknowledged.

- 10. Cost estimate to be evaluated after revisions are made to the plans as per these comments. Informational comment.**

Acknowledged.

## Fire Review

- 1. IFC 507.5.1 - Where a portion of the facility or building hereafter constructed or moved into or within the jurisdiction is more than 300 feet from a hydrant on a fire apparatus access road, as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the facility or building, on-site fire hydrants and mains shall be provided where required by the fire code official.**

***The distance from a hydrant to the most exterior portion of the building exceeds 300 feet.***

An additional hydrant has been added near the northwest corner of the proposed building – Shown on Sheet C104. Near the top right of Sheet C104, overlapping 300 ft hose reaches are shown.

- 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 location of the FDC is not shown. Provide an FDC within 100 feet of the fire hydrant.***

The FDC connection location is now shown on Sheet C104. Near the top right of Sheet C104, the hose distance is shown to now be within the 100 feet limit.

- 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.***

***Work with Water Utilities to confirm the 6" water main will provide the required water flow of 1,500 GPM.***

Attached to this response is a report titled WATER SERVICE DEMAND REPORT, City of Lee's Summit, Jackson County, Missouri, Summit Technology Campus, Summit Innovation Center; prepared by Trabue, Hansen & Hinshaw Inc. in 2015.

The report shows "Hydrant flow data from the City of Lee's Summit" in Table 1 on page 3. It lists a hydrant flow of 3,212.70 gpm at Hydrant No. 6242 near the southeast corner of Blue Parkway and Ward Road.

## Traffic Review

- 1. It is unclear how the main drive lines up with Blue Parkway across the intersection. Provide more information on the intersection overall as well as the signal plans to show how everything lines up.***

An overall plan view of the intersection has been attached to this response. The signal design is ongoing and will be provided when complete. We are requesting permission to continue with the site plan review and building permit review without complete signal plans, with the understanding those will be submitted soon and the building could not be occupied without the intersection improvement.

- 2. The left turn lane on Ward should be included with these plans. Please provide plans for this lane.***

The intersection, signal and turn lane design is ongoing and will be provided when complete. We are requesting permission to continue with the site plan review and building permit review without complete signal plans, with the understanding those will be submitted soon and the building could not be occupied without the intersection improvement.

- 3. *Signal plans still have not been received. Infrastructure plans will not be approved without signal plans.***

Again, we are requesting permission for the siter and building plan review to continue without complete intersection plans, which will be completed in the next few weeks and submitted for review.

- 4. *The lanes on the driveway are very narrow. Consider removing the island to allow for wider lanes.***

The width of the lanes is shown on Sheet C101. The total width back to back of the two outbound lanes is 28 feet. Subtracting the 24" wide curbs, each lane is 12 feet wide. The total width of the inbound lane is 16 feet back to back, leaving a 12 feet wide lane. We believe the 12 feet wide lanes are adequate for traffic that does not oppose ongoing traffic.

Submitted,



Steven E. LaCasse, P.E.