



January 13, 2012

Gwen Jarick
Nelsen Partners, Inc.
15210 N Scottsdale Rd
Scottsdale, AZ 85254

RE: 84-DR-2011
Restoration Hardware

Dear Mrs. Jarick:

The Community & Economic Development Division has completed the review of the above referenced submittal dated 12/23/11. The following **1st Review Comments** represent the review performed on the project by our team, and are intended to provide you with guidance for compliance with city codes, policies, and guidelines related to this application type.

Significant Ordinance Related Issues

The following ordinance related issues have been identified in this first review of the project and will need to be addressed in a re-submittal prior to scheduling a hearing. Please address the following:

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. *- ORDINANCE ALLOWS FOR MECHANICAL SCREENING. ↳ BUILDING ENVELOPE - DEFINITION OF MECA.*
2. The site plan worksheet 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. *↳ UPDATE OVERALL.*

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. *↳ BRIAN TESKE SIGN.*

Significant Policy Related Issues

The following policy related issues have been identified in the first review of the project. While these issues are not as critical to scheduling the case for public hearing, they may affect the City Staff's recommendation for support of this project and should be addressed as soon as possible. Please address the following:

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 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? *→*

*- GLIMCHER - BRIAN TESKE
- RESTORATION HARDWARE - 9-12 TUES.
- RESPONSE LETTER.*

*2200' - 6-800' - CMU
Re. Com. 10,000' -
height 7.102 permits
regulation, intercepts
to height restrictions*

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

PEDESTRIAN EXHIBIT.

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.

Site 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. → ANDREW.
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.

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. → Muted ^{WARM EARTH-TONE}
9. Please provide section drawings 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. OK
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. OK.

Technical Corrections

The following technical corrections have been identified in the first review of the project. While these items are not as critical to scheduling the case for public hearing, they will likely affect the final plans submittal (construction set) and should be addressed as soon as possible. Correcting these items before the hearing may also help clarify questions regarding these plans. Please address the following:

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. → CHANTEL
12. Please provide a perspective view from the northeast including the circle drive and building entrance. → CHANTEL
- OK 13. Please identify on the site plan or on a separate reference plan the location of the building, building wall, and site wall sections that are on sheets A401 and A501.
- OK 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 appears to be enclosed all the way up the building. On the elevation, it appears that above the SES and Riser is open to above all the way to the roof.
- OR 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.
16. In order to improve readability of the building elevations, please add number notations (0.0, +1.5, -0.5, etc.) that indicate the differences between planer surfaces. ^{for number}

17. Please provide more information on the function of the south terrace rotunda. Is this space accessible from the second level?
NO to shaded south exposed terrace, the main purpose of this rotunda is for the facing

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 'Trees' so that they match the Tree Selections that are in the Scottsdale Road Streetscape Design Guidelines, which can be found on the Scottsdale website at:

<http://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/Construction/ScottsdaleRd/SRstreetscape>. →

OK 19. Based 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. —

OK 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.

Lighting:

21. Regarding Sheet A/EL Site Lighting Plan, please provide information related to light fixture 'D1'. → *spec sheet? We will revise the plans + cut sheets*

22. Regarding the light fixture cut sheet information, please eliminate the fixture cut sheets that will not be included in this proposal. *so they correspond.*

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. — *Steve.*

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

→ 25. Please revise the building height variation exhibit to identify the height that was previously approved for Dominick's. *3 → OK.*

Please resubmit the revised plans, and a written summary response addressing the comments/corrections identified above as soon as possible for further review (**Please see Attachment A, Resubmittal Checklist, for a consolidated list of information to be resubmitted**). The City will then review the revisions to determine if it is ready to be scheduled for a hearing date.

In an effort to get this development request to a Development Review Board hearing, City staff has identified the following potential schedules (read schedule left to right):

Track	Response/resubmittal by applicant (complete set of revisions)	City to provide status update	Potential DRB Hearing Date
4-12 custom	No later than 1/20/2012	2/3/2012	2/16/2012
5-12 custom	No later than 2/3/2012	2/16/2012	3/1/2012
6-12 custom	No later than 2/16/2012	3/1/2012	3/15/2012

PLEASE CALL 480-312-7000 TO SCHEDULE A RESUBMITTAL MEETING WITH ME PRIOR TO YOUR PLANNED RESUBMITTAL DATE. DO NOT DROP OFF ANY RESUBMITTAL MATERIAL WITHOUT A SCHEDULED MEETING OR THE ABOVE MEETING SCHEDULE MAY BE AFFECTED. THIS WILL HELP MAKE SURE I'M AVAILABLE TO REVIEW YOUR RESUBMITTAL AND PREVENT ANY UNNECESSARY DELAYS.

This schedule is based on the original submittal track and relies on a timely, complete and accurate response/resubmittal to the items addressed in this letter. Please be advised that the 1st **Review Comments** are valid for a period of 45 days from the date on this letter. While the case will remain active, failure to resubmit within the 45 days will require the project to begin a new "First Review" track to refresh the review. Failure to resubmit within 190 days may cause the project to be considered inactive.

If you have any questions, or need further assistance please contact me at 480-312-2258 or at bcluff@ScottsdaleAZ.gov.

Sincerely,

Bryan Cluff, LEED AP
Planner

ATTACHMENT A
Resubmittal Checklist

Case Number: 84-DR-2011

Please provide the following documents, in the quantities indicated, with the first submittal (all plans larger than 8 1/2 x 11 shall be folded):

- ☒ One copy: COVER LETTER- Respond to all the issues identified in the first review comment letter.
- ☒ One copy: Revised CD of submittal (DWG or DWF format only)
- ☒ One copy: Revised Narrative for Project

☒ Revised Open Space Plan: (site plan worksheet)

1 24" x 36" 1 11" x 17" 1 8 1/2" x 11"

☒ Revised Site Plan:

6 24" x 36" 1 11" x 17" 1 8 1/2" x 11"

☒ Revised Building Setback Plan:

1 24" x 36" 1 11" x 17" 1 8 1/2" x 11"

☒ Revised Building Height Variation Exhibit:

1 24" x 36" 1 11" x 17" 1 8 1/2" x 11"

☒ Master Open Space Plan:

1 24" x 36" 1 11" x 17" 1 8 1/2" x 11"

☒ Revised Elevations:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Color	1	24" x 36"	1	11" x 17"	1	8 1/2" x 11"
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B/W	1	24" x 36"	1	11" x 17"	1	8 1/2" x 11"

☒ Revised Landscape Plan:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Color	1	24" x 36"	1	11" x 17"	1	8 1/2" x 11"
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B/W	1	24" x 36"	1	11" x 17"	1	8 1/2" x 11"

☒ Other Supplemental Materials:

Pedestrian Access Plan
Photometrics Update
Building Section
Wall sections
Third level floor plan