Correspondence Between Staff and Applicant Approval Letter



March 24, 2017

John Berry Berry Riddell, LLC 6750 E Camelback Rd Ste 100 Scottsdale, AZ 85251

Re:

24-ZN-2016 DPMG Hayden

Dear John Berry,

This is to advise you that the case referenced above was approved at the March 21, 2017 City Council meeting. The ordinance and resolution 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 Principal Planner



# Planning and Development Services Division

7447 East Indian School Road Scottsdale, Arizona 85251

12/27/2016

John Berry Berry Riddell, LLC 6750 E Camelback Rd Ste 100 Scottsdale, AZ 85251

RE: Determination of a Planning Commission hearing

Dear Mr. Berry:

Your Development Application 24-ZN-2016, DPMG Hayden, is scheduled on the 2/8/2017 Planning Commission hearing agenda.

You may 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, please submit the electronic file to your project coordinator by 1:00 p.m. on Monday, 2/6/2017. Please limit your presentation 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 Planning and Development Services Division has had this application in review for 30 Staff Review Days.

Thank you,

Brad Carr, AICP, LEED-AP

Principal Planner

C: Case File

12/6/2016

RE: 24-ZN-2016 DPMG Hayden

Dear Mr. Carr:

Below are the applicant responses to City's 1<sup>st</sup> review letter dated 11/22/2016.

#### **Zoning Ordinance and Scottsdale Revise Code Significant Issues**

The following code and ordinance 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:

 Please submit a revised copy of the Citizen Review Report summary to include details, if any, 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: No additional correspondence from the community has been received. A copy of the Citizen Review Report is provided with the resubmittal.

#### **Significant Policy Related Issues**

The following policy related issues have been identified in the first review of this application. Even though some of these issues may not be critical to scheduling the application for public hearing, they may affect the City Staff's recommendation pertaining to the application and should be addressed with the resubmittal of the revised application material. Please address the following:

#### 2001 General Plan / 2010 Greater Airpark Character Area Plan:

2. Page 10 of the first submittal states that "The primary interest in rezoning the property to C-3 is the ability to integrate vehicle sales and automotive related uses into the existing range of permitted uses on site"... the narrative also states that "It is acknowledged that retail and restaurant use would not be feasible under the current building and site configuration due to the limited parking space on site." Please consider the General Commercial (C-4) zoning district instead of the proposed C-3 zoning district, which would achieve the stated primary interest in rezoning while meeting the greatest compatibility to adjacent uses found within the established Employment land use designation and Industrial Park (I-1) zoning category at this location in the city. Further, the existing site configuration and parking availability does not support many of the other land uses allowed in the proposed C-3 zoning district. Please revise the project narrative, site plan and open space plan to account for any changes to requested zoning district classification.

<u>Response</u>: Per City Staff's recommendation, the zoning request has been modified to C-4. The site plan has been modified accordingly.

3. The Greater Airpark Character Area Plan (GACAP) designates the subject site as Type B Development Type, where typically the built environment is associated with "aircraft hangars and warehouse buildings" in terms of size, scale, and character (page 16). Although no stated user for the subject rezoning was identified in the first submittal, please provide a site plan worksheet that demonstrates conformance to the parking requirements to the primary interest of this applications stated use - vehicle sales and automotive related uses. If the calculations for the stated use cannot be satisfied, a site plan change would likely be necessary – for either a single or multi-tenant uses. In this instance, please revise the project narrative to speak to how this rezoning will maintain the development type (Type B) envisioned by GACAP.

Response: There are no change proposed to the building with this rezoning request. Future users will be required to provide adequate parking and will be subject to review and approval by City Staff. Please feel free to add a stipulation regarding conformance to code requirements for any future use changes. Additional language has been added to the Project Narrative regarding Type B buildings (page 8).

#### Circulation:

4. With the application resubmittal, please provide documentation of a shared access agreement for the shared driveway for the subject site and the property located to the north (15010 N. Hayden Road). Please note that if no shared access easement exists, the dedication of such easement/agreement will likely be required.

<u>Response</u>: Per Schedule B, item #10 as shown on the ALTA Survey a copy of 1994-666848 Cross Access Easement between lot 3 (subject property) and lot 4 (to the north) is provided with the resubmittal.

5. Please note that approval of the proposed zoning district map amendment will likely be dependent on the dedication of additional right-of-way to accommodate intersection improvements for the intersection of E. Raintree Drive and N. Hayden Road. There will likely be requirements for a vehicular non-access easement (VNAE) that corresponds with the proposed intersection improvements. Please contact George Williams in the city's Transportation Department for any additional information regarding the intersection improvements.

Response: Acknowledged.

#### Site Design:

6. Please revise the site plan to indicate the location of on-site refuse collection for the property. (DSPM Sec. 2-1.804.)

Response: Site Plan revised to show refuse.

### **Technical Corrections**

The following technical ordinance or policy related 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 a decision on the final plans submittal (construction and improvement documents) 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:

#### Fire:

7. With the application resubmittal, please note whether the existing building on the site currently has fire sprinklers and if so, what type of system is in place (i.e. NFPA 13, NFPA 13R, NFPA 13D). Please note that if building is not currently sprinklered and a change in occupancy occurs, the building will be required to be sprinklered per COS Section 903 Automatic Sprinkler Systems.

<u>Response</u>: The building does have fire sprinklers, however, the current fire sprinkler system is unknown. It is acknowledged that any change in occupancy will require conformance to COS Section 903.

### Fire:

8. Please note that this site appears to be in need of contemporary ADA access requirements, including access from a public sidewalk along the public street frontages.

<u>Response</u>: Acknowledged. No changes are proposed to the building and or site design with the rezoning request.

If you have any questions regarding the responses above please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Michele Hammond Principal Planner

While Hammond

# ATTACHMENT A Resubmittal Checklist

Cas	se Number:	24-ZN-2016								
		the following docu x11 shall be folded		uantities indic	ated, with the resu	ubmittal (all plans				
	One copy: COVER LETTER – Respond to all the issues identified in the 1st Review Comment Letter One copy: Revised CD of submittal (PDF format) Four copies: Revised Narrative for Project									
$\boxtimes$	Site Plan:									
	3	24" x 36"	1	11" x 17"	1	8 ½" x 11"				
	1	24" x 36"	1	11" x 17"	1	8 ½" x 11"				



11/22/2016

John Berry / Michele Hammond Berry Riddell, LLC 6750 E Camelback Rd Ste 100 Scottsdale, AZ 85251

RE: 24-ZN-2016 DPMG Hayden

Dear Ms. Hammond:

The Planning & Development Services Division has completed the review of the above referenced development application submitted on 10/21/2016. The following 1<sup>st</sup> 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 and Scottsdale Revise Code Significant Issues**

The following code and ordinance 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:

 Please submit a revised copy of the Citizen Review Report summary to include details, if any, 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.)

#### **Significant Policy Related Issues**

The following policy related issues have been identified in the first review of this application. Even though some of these issues may not be critical to scheduling the application for public hearing, they may affect the City Staff's recommendation pertaining to the application and should be addressed with the resubmittal of the revised application material. Please address the following:

#### 2001 General Plan / 2010 Greater Airpark Character Area Plan:

2. Page 10 of the first submittal states that "The primary interest in rezoning the property to C-3 is the ability to integrate vehicle sales and automotive related uses into the existing range of permitted uses on site"... the narrative also states that "It is acknowledged that retail and restaurant use would not be feasible under the current building and site configuration due to the limited parking space on site." Please consider the General Commercial (C-4) zoning district instead of the proposed C-3 zoning district, which would achieve the stated primary interest in rezoning while meeting the greatest compatibility to adjacent uses found within the

established Employment land use designation and Industrial Park (I-1) zoning category at this location in the city. Further, the existing site configuration and parking availability does not support many of the other land uses allowed in the proposed C-3 zoning district. Please revise the project narrative, site plan and open space plan to account for any changes to requested zoning district classification.

3. The Greater Airpark Character Area Plan (GACAP) designates the subject site as Type B Development Type, where typically the built environment is associated with "aircraft hangars and warehouse buildings" in terms of size, scale, and character (page 16). Although no stated user for the subject rezoning was identified in the first submittal, please provide a site plan worksheet that demonstrates conformance to the parking requirements to the primary interest of this applications stated use - vehicle sales and automotive related uses. If the calculations for the stated use cannot be satisfied, a site plan change would likely be necessary – for either a single or multi-tenant uses. In this instance, please revise the project narrative to speak to how this rezoning will maintain the development type (Type B) envisioned by GACAP.

#### Circulation:

- 4. With the application resubmittal, please provide documentation of a shared access agreement for the shared driveway for the subject site and the property located to the north (15010 N. Hayden Road). Please note that if no shared access easement exists, the dedication of such easement/agreement will likely be required.
- 5. Please note that approval of the proposed zoning district map amendment will likely be dependent on the dedication of additional right-of-way to accommodate intersection improvements for the intersection of E. Raintree Drive and N. Hayden Road. There will likely be requirements for a vehicular non-access easement (VNAE) that corresponds with the proposed intersection improvements. Please contact George Williams in the city's Transportation Department for any additional information regarding the intersection improvements.

#### Site Design:

6. Please revise the site plan to indicate the location of on-site refuse collection for the property. (DSPM Sec. 2-1.804.)

## **Technical Corrections**

The following technical ordinance or policy related 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 a decision on the final plans submittal (construction and improvement documents) 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:

#### Fire:

7. With the application resubmittal, please note whether the existing building on the site currently has fire sprinklers and if so, what type of system is in place (i.e. NFPA 13, NFPA 13R, NFPA 13D). Please note that if building is not currently sprinklered and a change in occupany occurs, the building will be required to be sprinklered per COS Section 903 Automatic Sprinkler Systems.

#### Fire:

8. Please note that this site appears to be in need of contemporary ADA access requirements, including access from a public sidewalk along the public street frontages.

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 RETURNED 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 **1**<sup>st</sup> **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, LEED-AP

Senior Planner

# ATTACHMENT A Resubmittal Checklist

Cas	se Number:	24-ZN-2016								
		the following doc x11 shall be folde		uantities indic	ated, with the res	ubmittal (all plans				
$\boxtimes$	One copy: <u>COVER LETTER</u> – Respond to all the issues identified in the 1st Review Comment Lette. One copy: Revised CD of submittal (PDF format) Four copies: Revised Narrative for Project									
$\boxtimes$	Site Plan:									
	3	24" x 36"	1	_ 11" x 17"	1	8 ½" x 11"				
$\boxtimes$										
	1	24" x 36"	1	11" x 17"	1	8 ½" x 11"				