

**Correspondence Between
Staff and Applicant**



December 3, 2015

Alex Stedman
Lva Urban Design Studio LLC
120 S Ash Ave
Tempe, AZ 85281

Re: 358-PA-2015
3-GP-2015 & 12-ZN-2015
Gallery

Dear Alex Stedman,

This is to advise you that the case referenced above was approved at the December 2, 2015 City Council meeting. Ordinance No. 4230, Resolution No. 10279, Resolution No. 10287, and Resolution No. 10308 may be obtained from the City Clerk's office or city website @ <https://eservices.scottsdaleaz.gov/eServices/ClerkDocs/Default.aspx>. Please remove the red hearing sign as soon as possible. If you have any questions, please contact me at 480-312-7713.

Sincerely,

Brad Carr
Senior Planner



8/14/2015

Alex Stedman
LVA Urban Design Studio, LLC
120 S Ash Ave
Tempe, AZ 85281

RE: 3-GP-2015
Gallery

Dear Mr. Stedman:

The Planning & Development Services Division has completed the review of the above referenced development application submitted on 7/15/2015. The following **1st Review Comments** represent the review performed by our team, and is intended to provide you with guidance for compliance with city codes, policies, and guidelines related to this application.

Zoning Ordinance, Scottsdale Revise Code and General Plan Significant Issues

The following code, ordinance and General Plan related issues have been identified in the first review of this application, and shall be addressed in the resubmittal of the revised application material. Addressing these items is critical to scheduling the application for public hearing, and may affect the City Staff's recommendation. Please address the following:

Zoning:

1. Please submit a revised copy of the Citizen Review Report summary to include details of the most recent public outreach efforts, including any additional public comments that may have been received. (Zoning Ordinance, Sec. 1.305.C.2.b.)

2001 General Plan:

2. Please respond to the Character & Design Goal 1, Bullet 4, noting that the subject property is located within the Urban Character Type.
3. Please respond to Character & Design Goal 4, Bullet 3, noting that the subject property is located within the Suburban streetscape classification and how this classification will affect the street frontage on Earll.
4. Please describe how the request for the Urban Neighborhoods land use designation will create a buffer/transition between the Mixed-Use Neighborhoods east of the subject site and to the existing Urban Neighborhoods west of the subject site.

5. The application's first response to Land Use Goal 3 (page 9) contemplates adjacent uses, but does not note that existing auto repair shops are located adjacent to the subject site – to the east and to the south of the subject site (zoned as C-4). Please respond to how the rezoning to R-5 and related site plan will ensure that future residents of the subject site will be buffered from this more intense use. Furthermore, respond to Land Use Goal 7, bullet 2, noting how the proposal will thoughtfully integrate itself into the existing neighborhood. Finally, revisit the response to Land Use Goal 8 (page 10), contemplating the above requests.
6. Please respond to Neighborhoods Goal 4, Bullet 3. Similar to #5 above, please note how this infill project will be context-appropriate with the existing neighborhood/area.
7. The application's initial response to Community Mobility Goal 7, Bullet 1 (page 11) is not needed, as the subject site is not located within a designated Scenic Corridor.

Southern Scottsdale Character Area Plan (SSCAP):

8. Page 13 of the application's narrative notes that the Southern Scottsdale Community Area Plan was established in 1996. For clarity, please note that it is a Character Area Plan that was adopted by City Council in 2010.
9. Similar to the 2001 General Plan comment #5, please revisit the response to SSCAP Land Use Policy LU1.2 (page 14) in terms of how this new residential project will complement the existing auto repair shops to the east and south of the subject site.
10. Goal LU 7 of the SSCAP contemplates transitions, buffering, and connectivity between the SSCAP and the Downtown Plan boundary. The boundary of the Downtown plan is directly north of the subject site, across Earll Drive. With the next submittal, please discuss this dynamic and how the proposal will create a better transition between the Downtown and existing neighborhoods than what exists today.
11. Page 16 notes that the proposal is consistent with the SSCAP vision, however it does not provide the text of the vision/values statement. For clarity, please provide this text with the next submittal.

Please resubmit the revised application requirements and additional information identified in Attachment A, Resubmittal Checklist, and a written summary response addressing the comments/corrections identified above as soon as possible for further review. The City will then review the revisions to determine if the application is to be scheduled for a hearing date, or if additional modifications, corrections, or additional information is necessary.

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. THIS WILL HELP MAKE SURE I'M AVAILABLE TO REVIEW YOUR RESUBMITTAL AND PREVENT ANY UNNECESSARY DELAYS. RESUBMITTAL MATERIAL THAT IS DROPPED OFF MAY NOT BE ACCEPTED AND RETURN TO THE APPLICANT.

The Planning & Development Services Division has had this application in review for 23 Staff Review Days since the application was determined to be administratively complete.

These **1st Review Comments** are valid for a period of 180 days from the date on this letter. The Zoning Administrator may consider an application withdrawn if a revised submittal has not been received within 180 days of the date of this letter (Section 1.305. of the Zoning Ordinance).

If you have any questions, or need further assistance please contact me at 480-312-7713 or at bcarr@ScottsdaleAZ.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brad Carr".

Brad Carr, AICP
Senior Planner

cc: Mockingbird Group, LLC
William Lund
6632 N. 66th Place
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253

Rose Law Group
Jennifer Hall
7144 E. Stetson Drive, Ste 300
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

ATTACHMENT A
Resubmittal Checklist

Case Number: **3-GP-2015**

Please provide the following documents, in the quantities indicated, with the resubmittal:

- ☒ One copy: COVER LETTER – Respond to all the issues identified in the 1st Review Comment letter.
- ☒ Three copies: Revised Narrative for Project



RE: SECOND SUBMITTAL OF THE 3-GP-2015 "GALLERY" APPLICATION ON 8/31/15

APPLICANT RESPONSES TO 1ST REVIEW COMMENTS PROVIDED IN **BOLD** TEXT BELOW.

8/14/2015

Alex Stedman
LVA Urban Design Studio, LLC
120 S Ash Ave
Tempe, AZ 85281

RE: 3-GP-2015
Gallery

Dear Mr. Stedman:

The Planning & Development Services Division has completed the review of the above referenced development application submitted on 7/15/2015. The following **1st Review Comments** represent the review performed by our team, and is intended to provide you with guidance for compliance with city codes, policies, and guidelines related to this application.

Zoning Ordinance, Scottsdale Revise Code and General Plan Significant Issues

The following code, ordinance and General Plan related issues have been identified in the first review of this application, and shall be addressed in the resubmittal of the revised application material. Addressing these items is critical to scheduling the application for public hearing, and may affect the City Staff's recommendation. Please address the following:

Zoning:

1. Please submit a revised copy of the Citizen Review Report summary to include details of the most recent public outreach efforts, including any additional public comments that may have been received. (Zoning Ordinance, Sec. 1.305.C.2.b.)

RESPONSE: An updated copy of the Citizen Review Report has been included with this resubmittal.

2001 General Plan:

3-GP-2015
8/31/15

2. Please respond to the Character & Design Goal 1, Bullet 4, noting that the subject property is located within the Urban Character Type.

RESPONSE: This General Plan item has been addressed within the revised project narrative included with this resubmittal.

3. Please respond to Character & Design Goal 4, Bullet 3, noting that the subject property is located within the Suburban streetscape classification and how this classification will affect the street frontage on Earll.

RESPONSE: This General Plan item has been addressed within the revised project narrative included with this resubmittal.

4. Please describe how the request for the Urban Neighborhoods land use designation will create a buffer/transition between the Mixed-Use Neighborhoods east of the subject site and to the existing Urban Neighborhoods west of the subject site.

RESPONSE: The revised project narrative includes a discussion of the transition between Mixed Use and Urban Neighborhoods.

5. The application's first response to Land Use Goal 3 (page 9) contemplates adjacent uses, but does not note that existing auto repair shops are located adjacent to the subject site – to the east and to the south of the subject site (zoned as C-4). Please respond to how the rezoning to R-5 and related site plan will ensure that future residents of the subject site will be buffered from this more intense use. Furthermore, respond to Land Use Goal 7, bullet 2, noting how the proposal will thoughtfully integrate itself into the existing neighborhood. Finally, revisit the response to Land Use Goal 8 (page 10), contemplating the above requests.

RESPONSE: The applicant has addressed this subject with the revised narrative. While noting that the proposed residential use and the existing commercial uses will require adequate appropriate buffering, the applicant has incorporated

6. Please respond to Neighborhoods Goal 4, Bullet 3. Similar to #5 above, please note how this infill project will be context-appropriate with the existing neighborhood/area.

RESPONSE: This General Plan item has been addressed within the revised project narrative included with this resubmittal.

7. The application's initial response to Community Mobility Goal 7, Bullet 1 (page 11) is not needed, as the subject site is not located within a designated Scenic Corridor.

RESPONSE: This section has been removed from the project narrative

Southern Scottsdale Character Area Plan (SSCAP):

8. Page 13 of the application's narrative notes that the Southern Scottsdale Community Area Plan was established in 1996. For clarity, please note that it is a Character Area Plan that was adopted by City Council in 2010.

RESPONSE: The project narrative has been updated to reflect this adoption date.

9. Similar to the 2001 General Plan comment #5, please revisit the response to SSCAP Land Use Policy LU1.2 (page 14) in terms of how this new residential project will complement the existing auto repair shops to the east and south of the subject site.

RESPONSE: The project narrative has been updated to include a discussion of adjacent existing uses.

10. Goal LU 7 of the SSCAP contemplates transitions, buffering, and connectivity between the SSCAP and the Downtown Plan boundary. The boundary of the Downtown plan is directly north of the subject site, across Earll Drive. With the next submittal, please discuss this dynamic and how the proposal will create a better transition between the Downtown and existing neighborhoods than what exists today.

RESPONSE: A discussion of the project's proximity to the Downtown Plan boundary has been included within the revised project narrative.

11. Page 16 notes that the proposal is consistent with the SSCAP vision, however it does not provide the text of the vision/values statement. For clarity, please provide this text with the next submittal.

RESPONSE: The revised project narrative now includes a text excerpt from the SSCAP vision.

Please resubmit the revised application requirements and additional information identified in Attachment A, Resubmittal Checklist, and a written summary response addressing the comments/corrections identified above as soon as possible for further review. The City will then review the revisions to determine if the application is to be scheduled for a hearing date, or if additional modifications, corrections, or additional information is necessary.

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. THIS WILL HELP MAKE SURE I'M AVAILABLE TO REVIEW YOUR RESUBMITTAL AND PREVENT ANY UNNECESSARY DELAYS. RESUBMITTAL MATERIAL THAT IS DROPPED OFF MAY NOT BE ACCEPTED AND RETURN TO THE APPLICANT.

The Planning & Development Services Division has had this application in review for 23 Staff Review Days since the application was determined to be administratively complete.

These **1st Review Comments** are valid for a period of 180 days from the date on this letter. The Zoning Administrator may consider an application withdrawn if a revised submittal has not been received within 180 days of the date of this letter (Section 1.305. of the Zoning Ordinance).

If you have any questions, or need further assistance please contact me at 480-312-7713 or at bcarr@ScottsdaleAZ.gov.

Sincerely,

Brad Carr, AICP
Senior Planner

ATTACHMENT A
Resubmittal Checklist

Case Number: **3-GP-2015**

Please provide the following documents, in the quantities indicated, with the resubmittal:

- ☒ One copy: COVER LETTER – Respond to all the issues identified in the 1st Review Comment letter.
- ☒ Three copies: Revised Narrative for Project



Planning and Development Services Division

7447 East Indian School Road
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251

9/28/2015

Alex Stedman
LVA Urban Design Studio, LLC
120 S Ash Ave
Tempe, AZ 85281

RE: Determination of a Planning Commission hearing.

Dear Mr. Stedman:

Your Development Application 3-GP-2015, Gallery is scheduled on the October 28, 2015 Planning Commission hearing agenda.

You will likely be required to make a presentation to the Planning Commission. If you choose to present your application to the Planning Commission utilizing a Power Point presentation, I will need to have the electronic file by 1:00 p.m. on Monday, October 26th. Your presentation is limited to a maximum of 10 minutes.

A subsequent letter with your site post requirements will be sent shortly after the required text has been verified. Typically, this is approximately twenty-one (21) days before a hearing date.

The Community & Economic Development Division has had this application in review for 36 Staff Review Days.

Thank you,

Brad Carr, AICP
Senior Planner

C: Case File