

Neighborhood Meeting

Held Oct 1, 2020, 6:30-7:30 pm at Phelps Engineering, Inc offices
1270 N Winchester, Olathe, KS

Project: Southpark II Lots 27 & 28 development, Olathe, KS

In attendance were:

Liz Leek, representing Legato, LLC, owner of property to south of the project property.
Greg Musil, with Rouse Frets representing the land owner of the project property (by phone)
Dan Finn, Judd Claussen with Phelps Engineering, Inc. also representing land owner of project property.

Judd gave a brief presentation of the project drawings that were submitted to the City as a preliminary development plan dated Sept 1, 2020. These included preliminary civil site grading utility drawings, landscape drawings, and building renderings and building elevations.

*No changes from BluScope plans that were originally submitted in the Spring of 2020.
Property owner is going forward on the zoning themselves, without BlueScope

*Shows site plan and orients vicinity

3 buildings (A, B and C)

Single story

Buildings are Flex Space up front for offices and warehouse spaces. Truck docks on rear of the buildings. Layout works to screen truck docks as much as possible from public views.

City wanted docks shielded as much as possible

Street sides are higher architecture.

Screen walls between buildings B&C to screen side view of truck area from south.

Need two ways in and out for each building to meet fire code, and tenant access requirements.

Shows drives, including added turn lane and re-striping Frontier Lane

On Frontier Fountain, sidewalks will be added along on entire frontage

*Aerial

Shows relationship with Legato and other properties around the project

Legato zoned R-3

Trees – majority will not be affected

*Two ponds

Some fill (in red) but more excavation (in green)

3.1 acre feet being filled

5.1 acre feet being added

Total net gain in water storage is nearly 2 acre-feet.

***BMPs required**

Native vegetation (in blue)

Mechanical stormwater treatment facilities (in yellow)

***Views along streets were critical.** City code has 2 options: shrubs and berming. We are choosing to do berming at minimum 3' tall per code but are providing 4-foot berm on average throughout the frontage. The berm is more effective than shrubs. Idea is to screen parking lot areas from street, making views into the property more attractive with landscape and great architecture.

Screens parking lot and lower portions of building

Native grasses and plants with mowed lawn area closer to curb and frontage

Pointed out extensive landscaping along frontage, berm instead of shrubs

***Building elevations**

Showed some perspectives (Building A on west)

Building architecture is very similar to the OPUS project (56 Commerce Center) just to the north and west. Our buildings meet or exceed the City's architectural requirements.

Tilt-up or precast concrete

Windows and awnings for 3-D and shadow

Olathe architectural code is met

We are not asking for any waivers of design elements.

General discussion followed.

***Liz asked about the Army Corps of Engineers letter**

Permit has been issued on 7/22/20 to property owner

Liz said wasn't notified by the Corps of any hearing

John Call of Terra Technologies was the consultant that did this work and obtained permit from Corps, and will check with him on that. (may be because it was nationwide permit, not individual permit).

What's involved in that?

A few wetlands in certain areas that require disruption

Had to mitigate; paid into a wetlands bank

Permit letter was shown, which was issued in July.

Was it a one for one?

Are you mitigating on site?

We did have to mitigate which required that we purchase 0.26 acres of wetlands credit from the wetlands bank

We're adding more native plantings on site and back into the same area where the wetland impacts are taking place. This is a plus for the natural environment there.

***Stormwater Management Plan**

Showed the detention compensatory plan. Red is the area of filling on the existing ponds. Green is the area of expanding ponds. This occurs in the same ponds. Increasing size of the

basins. Table documents that at every stage (elevation) we have provided more storage than what is there now. We are just changing the shape of the basin.

What will happen to the easements?

We will have to amend the easements to change the shapes (or easement area) in the easement document. We are not changing anything else in the easement document.

Went over the change in shape to both ponds #7 and #8.

Add area within the pond and eliminate area to be filled

What is the storage?

Elevation level analysis

1026 is the floor of the basin

Went over storage stage chart.

For elevation for elevation at each foot we are providing more storage

Cumulative it's also more storage

*Discussion turned to the basins on Legato's property. Comments from Liz included:

Are they big enough to support 400 acres of watershed

304 acres going through Lot 16 to Lot 27

Legato owns Lot 24

All of Lot 24 water was to go into the two South Park basins

Are those facilities going to contain and treat the regional fully developed detention, including Lot 24?

Yes, the basins were based on full build out within the approved model and the modifications we are doing will provide more storage capacity

*But the ones on Lot 15 are not sufficient per what she's been told. In analysis, did PEI look at whether the existing ponds are adequate?

No, we didn't analyze upstream because we knew we had to accept that water from upstream as it is based on the approved floodplain model and we are downstream.

Show different storage levels based on B&V initial study of different nodes

We had to study as part of the fill and excavation effort we intended

Discussed the modelling results as stated in the drainage study:

"Duplicate effect" is basically a copy of the approved model out there now

100-year storm elevations stay the same as before or will be lower. (went over the table in the report).

The results table in the report is apples to apples comparison of pre-vs post- by providing more storage at full development of the watershed

Original studies assumed full development in the model

(No changes to stormwater report)

Liz mentioned that they have had their engineer review, but "not finished with that process"

We're in two sub-basins within the B&V model

*What's the land use assumed to be?

Judd pulled up the report where the existing watershed hydrology is discussed. For these two sub-basins, level of impervious surface is measured by the CN (Curve Number #) that is assigned for that sub-basin.

CN = 91 in model

We're at CN = 89.2

Other basin is CN 89.8 in model v. CN 87.2 with our development. We are less impervious so less runoff coming off our developed site. We are saying with confidence that when Legato development occurs the plan will work because our site is :

1. Less impervious
2. More detention capacity

Dan: any development will have to meet assumed curb numbers within the B&V model
Overall map of each sub-basin

Assumed developed curve number CN

Tabular format

Little Cedar Creek Study done by B&V

Liz can't recall seeing that

Dan: B&V did a hydrological model using run-offs

J-2 did it on a stream model

PEI used both

These ponds assume a certain amount of impervious on each parcel (again CN)

J-2 report reanalyzed the B&V study which created a modified (lower) flood plain line that the City accepted and recognizes today.

None of the CN values were ever changed between the studies...all is based on full development.

Liz is not sure of what the assumption were for her development in those earlier studies (i.e. B&V study). Liz would like to understand this.

Judd: We are making it better with less impervious site and more water storage capacity

Judd: Who is your engineer?

Now working with a local engineer (were using an out of state engineer pre-Covid)

Liz: Need to understand together the detention requirements on each property.

There are multiple lots owned by Legato

We want to be sure how much detention is going to be needed and what's been included in this plan

Nothing has been changed by land use or curb number in this stormwater study

J-2's study analysis was more detailed and advanced modeling than B&V

*One more question, regarding the 100-year-flood plain (referring back to the site plan). What is the floodplain on your property? Judd showed site plan.

Blue line is the proposed 100-year flood plain

Black dot line is current floodplain

Judd explains and shows

Building must be 2 feet about the floodplain.

Liz asked about how high the building sits up from the street?

It won't be obvious to someone driving by

Judd shows grading plan

Liz: Because we want to build 3-4 story apartments

Judd: Our Building is 3 feet higher than the street

Liz: How tall are the buildings?

Judd: At top of cornice is 42-feet

Apartments are typically 55 feet (at 4-story)

Will have rooftop units screened from the street

Usually penthouse screening is built around them

Liz had some concern about our project (M-1) across from multi-family

Buildings are like OPUS 56 Commerce Center.

Liz could tell effort was made with site plan and landscape to locate docks inside and screen.

Adjacent from their property is an entrance

Bigger concern is stormwater understanding

Judd: Any bites from apartment developers?

Liz: Until the Great Mall issues are resolved, we really can't get it offered

Judd: Offers additional meeting

Confirms that PEI owes her curve numbers from B&V study and plotted on a map.

Sign posting will happen this weekend

Announcing public hearing on October 26 at 7:00 p.m.

Council would be November 17 at 7:00 p.m.

Meeting adjourned about 7:30pm.