

Nelsen Partners, Inc.
Architecture Planning Interiors

Austin · Scottsdale

15210 N. Scottsdale Road, Suite 300
Scottsdale, Arizona 85254
tel 480.949.6800
fax 480.949.6801

www.nelsenpartners.com

Principals

Brad J. Nelsen, AIA, RAIA
Philip J. Crisara, AIA
George A. Melara, AIA
Erston Senger, AIA

Associate Principals

Helen Bowling, AIA
Stan Haas, FAIA
Michael Martin, AIA
Michael W. Milburn, AIA
Andy Neilands, AIA

January 16, 2012

Bryan Cluff
Associate Planner
Planning & Development Services
City of Scottsdale
7447 E. Indian School Road, Suite 105
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

RE: 84-DR-2011
Restoration Hardware

Dear Mr. Cluff:

The following is our response to your 1st review comments. We appreciate the time and effort staff has put into the review. We believe the comments and issues are minor in nature and will be successfully addressed as part of this letter and our re-submittal of the additional requested drawings. Our response follows the comments in red.

Zoning:

1. The proposed building height encroaches into the building height stepback plane required in the PRC zoning district. Please modify the building location and/or height to meet this ordinance provision.

We have added a mechanical screen yard on the west side of the roof and based on the city ordinance 7.102 Permissible height and area regulations, exceptions to height restrictions we are in compliance with the ordinance. The ordinance reads that mechanical screening may extend to a height of 100' as long as the area does not exceed 50% of the roof area. The area of our mechanical screening is 6% of the roof area.

2. The site plan work sheet that was provided with the submittal is for the Restoration Hardware site only. The Scottsdale Quarter project is a single development and all development standards are shared. Please provide an updated master open space plan for the overall project.

Please see the updated overall site plan worksheet.

Airport:

3. The Airport Vicinity Development Guidelines form is not fully completed or signed. Please complete the form (including 100:1 slope height analysis) and provide the applicant signature.

Please see the completed form.

Circulation:

4. Please revise the project narrative to provide more information on the function of the concrete paver circle driveway in front of the building and

84-DR-2011
2nd: 1/20/12

update the site plan to provide dimensions of the circle. Is this intended to be for drop-off? Vehicles only? Is it intended to accommodate the pedestrian?

We will revise the project narrative to provide more information to the intended use of the circle driveway.

5. Please provide clarification on how a pedestrian will access the building entrance from interior to the site. It appears that pedestrians will be required to walk through the circle driveway, where there may be conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians.

An exhibit will be provided to show pedestrian access.

Design:

6. Due to the multiple changes in grade on this site, it is difficult to understand how the building and site walls relate to the street and sidewalks. Please provide a conceptual grading plan, or add grade call outs to the existing site plan. Also call out top of wall heights.

Please see sheet A110 for the requested information.

7. Please provide a sidewalk, with a minimum width of 6 feet, at the edge of the northwest quadrant of the drop circle. Reduce the size of the adjacent landscape area accordingly.

Please see sheet A110 for the sidewalk addition.

Elevation Design:

8. Based on the Scottsdale Guidelines for Commercial Development, please revise the proposed color scheme so that it utilizes muted earth tones instead of gray.

The gray used is a warm gray that reflects earthy tones. Gray is a muted tone that reflects a metropolitan sophistication. The palette includes several different surface treatments (smooth painted steel, Venetian plaster, stone, and fabric awnings) which will give richness and depth to the façade. The shadows from the canopies and the undulations of the façade surface will give a sense of color variation. The simplification of the palette verses the complexity of the building envelope makes for an interesting contrast to the existing buildings on site. The building has an identity of its own which reflects the design intent of the center.

9. Please provide section drawing of the metal window shades. Provide information that describes the shadow/shade that will be accomplished by the proposed shade devices, given the vertical window dimensions. All shade devices should be designed so that the shade material has a density of 75%, or greater, in order to maximize the effectiveness of the shade canopies.

Please the requested information on sheets A501 and A502.

10. Please provide transverse and longitudinal site and building section drawings so that COS staff will be able to understand the relationship between the street, terraces, wall planes, canopies, and roof elements.

Please see sheet A401 for the requested sections.

Technical Corrections:

Design:

11. The building perspective that was provided of the southwest corner of the site is not representative of the character of the busy intersection of Scottsdale Road and Butherus. Please consider a perspective from a view further back so the context of the intersection can be included.

Please see the requested updates to the perspective.

12. Please provide a perspective view from the northeast including the circle drive and building entrance.

Please see the requested perspective.

13. Please identify on the site plan or on a separate reference plan the location of the building, building wall, and site wall section that are on sheets A401 and A501.

We have added reference tags to sheet A110.

14. There appears to be some inconsistencies between the 2nd and 3rd level floor plan and the north building elevation. According to the floor plans, the area above the SES and Riser is open to above all the way to the roof.

Please see sheets A301 and A302 for the requested clarifications.

15. Please clarify the building massing of the mezzanine as viewed from the north elevation. The stairwell tower appears to be stepped back from the north face of the mezzanine wall when viewed on the east and west elevations, but appears to be on the same plane as the north face of the mezzanine wall when viewed from the north elevation.

Please see sheets A301 and A302 for the requested clarifications.

16. In order to improve readability of the building elevation, please add number notations (0.0, +1.5, -0.5, etc) that indicate the differences between planer surfaces.

Please see sheets A301 and A302 for the requested clarifications.

17. Please provide more information on the function of the south terrace rotunda. Is this space accessible from the second level?

This space is not accessible from the second level. The function of the south terrace rotunda is to provide shade to the southern exposed terrace.

Landscaping:

18. Related to the street tree that is proposed for the Scottsdale Road frontage of this site, please modify the plant species that are listed under the heading

"Tree" so that they match the tree selections that are in the Scottsdale Road Streetscape Design Guidelines, which can be found on the Scottsdale website.

The streetscape trees, those trees which are directly adjacent to the sidewalks along Scottsdale Road and Butherus and located on the outside of any screen wall will be Pithecellobium as appear on the guidelines. The other two trees are not streetscape trees, but do reside on the ADWR low water use plan list which is a requirement for any tree within the city limits. As these trees are not located with the R.O.W. they do not interfere with the defined character of Scottsdale Road Segment 4.

19. Base on the mature size of the proposed plants, the planting density and layout should be representative of the mature size of the proposed species, relative to the planting area. Please locate the plants in order to avoid overcrowding of plants and so that there will be no need to trim excessively or shear the plants, resulting in sustainable landscape improvements.

Plant symbols on plan are drawn to $\frac{3}{4}$ maturity. We agree that overcrowding is a concern and issue to avoid. All efforts will be made to strike a balance between appearing full and allowing for plan growth. The landscape aims to be aesthetically pleasing on day one and day ten thousand. The design intent of the myrtle in the drop-off circle is to have one continuous hedge, so we intend to design so that normal growth will have these plants begin to touch each other during year three, and be a contiguous hedge in year five. The regal mist will be planted at 5'-0" on center, such that they will remain distinct individual plants. When viewed from a distance the mass will be contiguous however.

20. Please reduce the size of the landscape area that is adjacent to the edge of the northwest quadrant of the drop circle, in order to allow enough site area for a 6 foot wide sidewalk. Modify the planting layout plan accordingly.

We will revise to provide for the suggested pedestrian circulation.

Lighting:

21. Regarding sheet A/EL Site Lighting Plan, please provide information related to light fixture "D1".

We will revise the plans and cut sheets so they correspond to one another.

22. Regarding the light fixture cut sheet information; please eliminate the fixture cut sheets that will not be included in this proposal.

We will eliminate any fixtures from our cutsheets that will not be used.

Other:

23. On the building setback plan, the red setback area jogs down to a small sliver at the southwest end of the site. Please clarify the reason for this boundary.

The reason for this sliver is because of the average setback line caused by the dormer on the rooftop garden roof which has now been removed. This line will now be set further north. Please see sheet A110.

24. Please revise the building setback plan on the Butherus Road side so that the red boundary does not extend between building D and J beyond the main building line of building D.

Please see sheet A110 for revised set back line.

25. Please revise the building height variation exhibit to identify the height that was previously approved for Dominick's.

Please the revised height exhibit.

Thank you for your comments. We will submit the corrected Master Sign Program to you, and we anticipate a successful hearing and staff's support at Planning Commission.

Sincerely,
Nelsen Partners, Inc.

Gwen Jarick, Architect