

**Correspondence Between  
Staff and Applicant  
Approval Letter**



October 18, 2017

Elaine Mercado  
city of scottsdale  
7447 E Indian School Rd  
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

Re: 8-UP-2017  
Pima Park Municipal Use Master Site Plan

Dear Elaine Mercado,

This is to advise you that the case referenced above was approved at the October 17, 2017 City Council meeting. The 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 480-312-2376.

Sincerely,

Jeff Barnes  
Planner



7/11/2017

Elaine Mercado  
City of Scottsdale  
7447 E Indian School Rd  
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

RE: Development Review Board Packet requirements for the Development Review Board hearing.

Dear Ms. Mercado:

Your case 8-UP-2017, Pima Park Municipal Use Master Site Plan, is scheduled for the 8/17/2017 Development Review Board hearing. Please submit the following directly to me by 1:00 p.m. on 7/27/2017 in order to keep this hearing date:

- 1 copy of this letter (without this letter your packets will not be accepted)
- 

- 11 copies on 11"x17" paper, collated and stapled into packets; and
- 1 copy on 8 ½"x11" paper, not stapled, of the following:

- MUMSP Site Plans
  - Conceptual Building Elevations for TGTF
  - Conceptual Landscape Plans for TGTF
  -
- 

Please contact me at 480-312-2376 or at [jbarnes@ScottsdaleAZ.gov](mailto:jbarnes@ScottsdaleAZ.gov) to make a submittal meeting.

You may be required to make a presentation to the Development Review Board. If you choose to present your application to the Development Review Board utilizing a Power Point presentation, please submit the electronic file to your project coordinator by 1:00 p.m. on Monday 8/14/2017. Please limit your presentation to a maximum of 10 minutes.

Thank you,



Jeff Barnes  
Planner



5/24/2017

Elaine Mercado  
City of Scottsdale  
7447 E Indian School Rd  
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

RE: 8-UP-2017 Pima Park Municipal Use Master Site Plan

Dear Ms. Mercado:

The Planning & Development Services Division has completed the review of the above referenced development application submitted on 5/1/2017. 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:**

1. The landscape area that is located along the north side of the site is labeled as 30 feet wide but appears to only be 20 feet wide between the fence and the perimeter wall. Please revise the site plan to widen the landscape area that is located along the north side of the site so that it will be 30 feet wide, as required by Zoning Ordinance Section 10.602.A.2.
2. Please revise the conceptual landscape plan so that it includes summary data indicating the landscape area (in square feet) of on-site, right-of-way, and parking lot landscaping, in compliance with Zoning Ordinance Section 10.200.

**Fire:**

3. On the conceptual site plan, please demonstrate the existing and proposed fire hydrant spacing (Fire Ord. 4045, 507.5.1.2).
4. A "Key switch/pre-emption sensor" is required for all commercial/Multi-family/Gated communities. Please revise the conceptual site plan to identify that such equipment will be provided. (Fire Ord. 4045, 503.6.1)

**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:

#### Site Design:

5. Please revise the site plan to identify the location where the park refuse enclosure is proposed to be relocated. This is identified with Note 8, but specifics regarding the location are unclear.
6. Please revise the site plan to more clearly identify that Tract B of the adjacent Scottsdale Summit subdivision is not included within the boundaries of the MUMSP.
7. Notes and dimensions on the site plan and the open space plan appear to be 6-point font size, or less. Please revise the notes so that they are 12-point font size (1/6<sup>th</sup> of an inch). Please refer to the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.
8. Please eliminate the landscape symbols from the site plan. Showing the landscape symbols on the site plan results in too much information on the plan, making it difficult to read. Please refer to the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.
9. Note 9 on the Proposed Site Plan Improvements list indicates a 10-foot-tall security wall will be located on the north and east sides of the TGTF building. Please provide additional information and illustration of the proposed wall. Please provide clarification regarding the proposed wall and the existing wall that is on the south and west sides of the existing single family subdivision that is located to the north of the TGTF building. Please refer to the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.
10. Please clarify the location of the proposed 10-foot-tall security wall and the existing 8-foot-tall security wall; several wall segments are unidentified. Please refer to the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.

#### Landscape Design:

11. Notes on the landscape plan appear to be 6-point font size, or less. Please revise the notes so that they are 12-point (1/6 inch) font size. Please refer to the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.
12. Please clarify the common name of *Hesperaloe parviflora*. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 10.200 and the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.

#### Fire:

13. Please revise the conceptual site plan to demonstrate that the commercial turning radii (25' inner/49' Outside /55' Bucket Swing) are being provided by the site design in accordance with DSPM 2-1.802(5).
14. Please revise the conceptual site plan to show where the turn-around for emergency vehicles is provided at end of dead-end over 300 feet in length, in accordance with DSPM 2-1.802(8).
15. Please revise the conceptual site plan to identify that the all proposed fire lane surfaces will support a minimum of 83,000lb GVW, in accordance with DSPM, 2-1.802(3).
16. Please revise the conceptual site plan to maintain a minimum 16 foot wide emergency vehicle access route, on west side of the future storm water basin, for secondary emergency access in accordance with DSPM 2-1.802(B).

#### Circulation:

17. Please identify the use of CL-1 driveway type for the proposed site driveway on Thomas Road, to comply with COS Standard Detail #2256, DSPM 5-3.200, and DSPM Sec. 5-3.205.

Water/Wastewater:

18. Is Note 9 on the north tree line of TGTF correct in proposing a new 10 foot tall acoustic block wall, previous discussions had not included this? If a new 10 foot tall wall is proposed on the north and east, would there still be a need for the proposed wrought iron fence internal to the wall enclosure? Please verify the proposed plan is accounting for these details.
19. The proposed southern TGTF wall is identified to be 10 feet tall, but previous discussions had indicated this would be an 8 foot tall wall. Please verify the proposed wall heights and their impact on the ability to utilize salvaged gates versus new gates on the site.
20. Please clarify on the conceptual site plan where the new wall(s) begin and where the existing wall(s) end.
21. Please revise the conceptual site plan to label the 40 foot pedestrian refuge shown on N. 86<sup>th</sup> Street.
22. Please revise the conceptual site plan to clarify that Note e10, located off of the reservoir, is a slightly above ground overflow vault which will be required to have bollards around it after separate improvements are completed.
23. Please clarify if Note 14, regarding existing walls to remain for sound control, was the final decision based on the Water Works analysis.

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 18 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 480-312-2376 or at [jbarnes@ScottsdaleAZ.gov](mailto:jbarnes@ScottsdaleAZ.gov).

Sincerely,



Jeff Barnes  
Planner

**ATTACHMENT A**  
**Resubmittal Checklist**

Case Number: **8-UP-2017**

Please provide the following documents, in the quantities indicated, with the resubmittal (all plans larger than 8 ½ x11 shall be folded):

4 copies: COVER LETTER – Respond to all the issues identified in the 1st Review Comment Letter

4 copies: Revised Narrative for Project (if modified)

Site Plan:

8 24" x 36"      1 11" x 17"      1 8 ½" x 11"

Landscape Plan:

2 24" x 36"      1 11" x 17"      1 8 ½" x 11"



Planning and Development Services Division

7447 East Indian School Road  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251

Date: 5/11/17  
Contact Name: Elaine Mercado  
Firm Name: COJ  
Address: 7447 E. INDIAN School Rd.  
City, State, Zip: SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85251

RE: Application Accepted for Review.

108 - PA - 2017

Dear MS. Mercado :

It has been determined that your Development Application for Pima + Thomas Groundwater Treatment has been accepted for review.

Upon completion of the Staff's review of the application material, I will inform you in writing or electronically either: 1) the steps necessary to submit additional information or corrections; 2) the date that your Development Application will be scheduled for a public hearing or, 3) City Staff will issue a written or electronic determination pertaining to this application. If you have any questions, or need further assistance please contact me.

Sincerely,

Name: JEFF Barnes  
Title: Planner  
Phone Number: (480) 312 - 2376  
Email Address: Jbarnes @ScottsdaleAZ.gov



**Planning and Development Services Division**

7447 East Indian School Road  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251

Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Contact Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Firm Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
City, State, Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

RE: Minimal Submittal Comments

\_\_\_\_\_ - PA - \_\_\_\_\_

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

It has been determined that your Development Application for \_\_\_\_\_  
Does not contain the minimal information, and has not been accepted for review.

Please refer to the application checklist and the Minimal Information to be Accepted for Review Checklist, and the Plan & Report Requirements pertaining to the minimal information necessary to be accepted for review.

**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.**

These **Minimal Submittal 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).

Sincerely,

Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone Number: (480) 312 - \_\_\_\_\_  
Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_@ScottsdaleAZ.gov

<b>Date</b>	June 2, 2017
<b>For</b>	City of Scottsdale
<b>To</b>	Elaine Mercado
<b>Cc</b>	
<b>From</b>	Water Works Engineers
<b>Prepared By</b>	Victor Khoury, P.E.
<b>Reviewed By</b>	Benjamin Lee, P.E.
<b>Subject</b>	MUMSP Plan Review- Response to Comments

Following are the comments received from the planning department on the application submitted on 5/12/2017. Our responses to these comments are provided below in red.

Comments

The Planning & Development Services Division has completed the review of the above referenced development application submitted on 5/1/2017. 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 Revised 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:

1. The landscape area that is located along the north side of the site is labeled as 30 feet wide but appears to only be 20 feet wide between the fence and the perimeter wall. Please revise the site plan to widen the landscape area that is located along the north side of the site so that it will be 30 feet wide, as required by Zoning Ordinance Section 10.602. A.2.

Response: Site Plan and Note 12 clarify that landscape area is 30 feet wide. The security fence was installed in the landscape setback area. It is our understanding that locating the fence within the 30' setback is acceptable.

2. Please revise the conceptual landscape plan so that it includes summary data indicating the landscape area (in square feet) of on-site, right-of-way, and parking lot landscaping, in compliance with Zoning Ordinance Section 10.200.

Response: The MUMSP landscaping is shown generally on the Overall Site Plan. The enlarged landscaping plans were providing for information only. Updated landscape plans for the TGTF, which will include the summary data, will be included in the DRB submittal.

Fire:

3. On the conceptual site plan, please demonstrate the existing and proposed fire hydrant

spacing (Fire Ord. 4045, 507.5.1.2).

Response: Fire hydrant spacing will comply with the City's requirements and will be shown on the DRB submittal. It is our understanding that this is not required to be shown on the MUMSP. To be discussed.

4. "Key switch/pre-emption sensor" is required for all commercial/Multi-family/Gated communities. Please revise the conceptual site plan to identify that such equipment will be provided. (Fire Ord. 4045, 503.6.1)

Response: Key switch/pre-emption sensor will comply with the City's requirements and will be shown on the DRB submittal. It is our understanding that this is not required to be shown on the MUMSP. To be discussed.

#### 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.

#### Site Design:

5. Please revise the site plan to identify the location where the park refuse enclosure is proposed to be relocated. This is identified with Note 8, but specifics regarding the location are unclear.

Response: The enclosure is shown on the overall site plan. A detail view will be added to the 1" =40' site plan.

6. Please revise the site plan to more clearly identify that Tract B of the adjacent Scottsdale Summit subdivision is not included within the boundaries of the MUMSP.

Response: Correct, Tract B is not included in the MUMSP and will be more clearly delineated. Also, the retention area east of the driveway has been sold by the City and is being removed from the MUMSP.

7. Notes and dimensions on the site plan and the open space plan appear to be 6-point font size, or less. Please revise the notes so that they are 12-point font size (1/6'h of an inch). Please refer to the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 1303.

Response: The font size is 12-point if plotted at full size. See updated drawings.

8. Please eliminate the landscape symbols from the site plan. Showing the landscape symbols on the site plan results in too much information on the plan, making it difficult to read. Please refer to the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.

Response: Site plan landscaping will be removed to simplify the presentation.

9. Note 9 on the Proposed Site Plan Improvements list indicates a 10-foot-tall security wall will be located on the north and east sides of the TGTF building. Please provide additional information and illustration of the proposed wall. Please provide clarification regarding the

proposed wall and the existing wall that is on the south and west sides of the existing single-family subdivision that is located to the north of the TGTF building. Please refer to the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.

Response: Notes will be updated to reflect the current planning. South and west walls will be 8' high CMU security wall. The north wall, adjacent to the subdivision will remain in place. A new 8' security fence will be installed on the north within the 30' landscaping buffer and on the east side.

Additional details will be provided in the DRB submittal.

10. Please clarify the location of the proposed 10-foot-tall security wall and the existing 8-foot-tall security wall; several wall segments are unidentified. Please refer to the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.

Response: See response to number 9 and updated site plan.

Landscape Design:

11. Notes on the landscape plan appear to be 6-point font size, or less. Please revise the notes so that they are 12-point (1/6 inch) font size. Please refer to the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.

Response: The landscape plans were provided within the MUMSP submittal for information only. Updated landscape will be submitted officially with the DRB submittal and will comply with the font size and zoning requirements listed.

12. Please clarify the common name of *Hesperaloe parviflora*. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 10.200 and the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.

Response: The landscape plans were provided within the MUMSP submittal for information only. Updated landscape will with the updated common names will be provided officially with the DRB submittal.

Fire:

13. Please revise the conceptual site plan to demonstrate that the commercial turning radii (25' inner/49' Outside /55' Bucket Swing) are being provided by the site design in accordance with DSPM 2-1.802(5).

Response: The revised site plan will more clearly delineate the required turning radii.

14. Please revise the conceptual site plan to show where the turn-around for emergency vehicles is provided at end of dead-end over 300 feet in length, in accordance with DSPM 2-1.802(8).

Response: The revised site plan will more clearly show where the turn-around is being provided.

15. Please revise the conceptual site plan to identify that the all proposed fire lane surfaces will support a minimum of 83,000lb GVW, in accordance with DSPM, 2-1.802(3).

Response: A note will be added to the site plan to indicate fire lane surfaces. Actual surfacing will be included as part of the DRB submittal.

16. Please revise the conceptual site plan to maintain a minimum 16-foot-wide emergency vehicle

access route, on west side of the future storm water basin, for secondary emergency access in accordance with DSPM 2-1.802(B).

Response: To be discussed. West access is ancillary access point to allow water operations to maintain the reservoirs. It was not intended for emergency vehicle access.

Circulation:

17. Please identify the use of CL-1 driveway type for the proposed site driveway on Thomas Road, to comply with COS Standard Detail #2256, DSPM 5-3.200, and DSPM Sec. 5-3.205.

Response: Use of type CL-1 will be indicated in the DRB submittal. The MUMSP site plan is for concept approval only.

Water/Wastewater:

18. Is Note 9 on the north tree line of TGTF correct in proposing a new 10-foot-tall acoustic block wall, previous discussions had not included this? If a new 10-foot-tall wall is proposed on the north and east, would there still be a need for the proposed wrought iron fence internal to the wall enclosure? Please verify the proposed plan is accounting for these details.

Response: See response to Item 9.

19. The proposed southern TGTF wall is identified to be 10 feet tall, but previous discussions had indicated this would be an 8-foot-tall wall. Please verify the proposed wall heights and their impact on the ability to utilize salvaged gates versus new gates on the site.

Response: See response to Item 9.

20. Please clarify on the conceptual site plan where the new wall(s) begin and where the existing wall(s) end.

Response: New versus existing walls will be more clearly delineated.

21. Please revise the conceptual site plan to label the 40-foot pedestrian refuge shown on N. 86th Street.

Response: Pedestrian refuge will be labeled.

22. Please revise the conceptual site plan to clarify that Note e10, located *off* of the reservoir, is a slightly above ground overflow vault which will be required to have bollards around it after separate improvements are completed.

Response: To be discussed. Bollard indication will be provided on the DRB submittal, not in the MUMSP submittal.

23. Please clarify if Note 14, regarding existing walls to remain for sound control, was the final decision based on the Water Works analysis.

Response: To be discussed. Final wall indication will be provided on the DRB submittal, not in the MUMSP 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 RETURNED TO THE APPLICANT.**

The Planning & Development Services Division has had this application in review for 18 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 480-312-2376 or at [jbarnes@ScottsdaleAZ.gov](mailto:jbarnes@ScottsdaleAZ.gov).

<b>Date</b>	June 21, 2017
<b>For</b>	City of Scottsdale
<b>To</b>	Mr. Jeff Barnes, Planning Department
<b>Cc</b>	Elaine Mercado
<b>From</b>	Water Works Engineers
<b>Prepared By</b>	Victor Khoury, P.E.
<b>Reviewed By</b>	Benjamin Lee, P.E.
<b>Subject</b>	MUMSP Plan Review-Response to Comments

The following comments were received from the Planning department on 5/24/2017 re: 8-UP-2017 Pima Park Municipal Use Master Site Plan, on the development Application submitted on 5/12/2017. Our responses to the comments are provided below in red in conformance with the requested resubmittal information. In addition to comment responses, the application resubmittal includes the following requested documents:

1. (4) copies of Cover Letter with a response to comments.
2. (8) copies of 24" x 36" revised Site Plan, plus (1) copy 11" x17", plus (1 )copy 8 ½"x 11".

#### Comments and Responses

The Planning & Development Services Division has completed the review of the above referenced development application submitted on 5/1/2017. The following 1" 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 Revised 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:

1. The landscape area that is located along the north side of the site is labeled as 30 feet wide but appears to only be 20 feet wide between the fence and the perimeter wall. Please revise the site plan to widen the landscape area that is located along the north side of the site so that it will be 30 feet wide, as required by Zoning Ordinance Section 10.602.A.2.  
**Response: The revised Site Plan and notes identify the landscape area as 30 feet wide, as required by Zoning Ordinance 10.602.A.2.**

2. Please revise the conceptual landscape plan so that it includes summary data indicating the landscape area (in square feet) of on-site, right-of-way, and parking lot landscaping, in compliance with Zoning Ordinance Section 10.200.

**Response: The MUMSP conceptual landscaping area is shown generally on the revised Site Plan. The revised site plan will be updated to show landscape area (in square feet) on-site, right-of-way, and parking lot landscaping, in compliance with Zoning Ordinance Section 10.200, with the DRB Submittal.**

**Fire:**

3. On the conceptual site plan, please demonstrate the existing and proposed fire hydrant spacing (Fire Ord. 4045, 507.5.1.2).

**Response: All proposed and existing Fire hydrant spacing will conform to Fire Ord. 4045, 507.5.1.2. as shown on the revised Site Plan.**

4. "Key switch/pre-emption sensor" is required for all commercial/Multi-family/Gated communities. Please revise the conceptual site plan to identify that such equipment will be provided. (Fire Ord. 4045, 503.6.1).

**Response: All sliding security gates will be equipped with Key switch/pre-emption sensors conforming to Fire Ord. 4045, 503.6.1, as depicted on the revised Site Plan.**

**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.

**Site Design:**

5. Please revise the site plan to identify the location where the park refuse enclosure is proposed to be relocated. This is identified with Note 8, but specifics regarding the location are unclear.

**Response: The park refuse enclosure proposed location is shown on the revised Site Plan.**

6. Please revise the site plan to more clearly identify that Tract B of the adjacent Scottsdale Summit subdivision is not included within the boundaries of the MUMSP.

**Response: Correct, Tract B of the adjacent Scottsdale Summit subdivision is not included in the MUMSP and has been removed from the boundaries on the revised Site Plan.**

7. Notes and dimensions on the site plan and the open space plan appear to be 6-point font size, or less. Please revise the notes so that they are 12-point font size (1/6" high of an inch). Please refer to the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.

**Response: The font size is 12-point if plotted at full size. See revised 24" x36" Site Plan.**

8. Please eliminate the landscape symbols from the site plan. Showing the landscape symbols on the site plan results in too much information on the plan, making it difficult to read. Please

refer to the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.

**Response: Landscaping is eliminated from the revised Site Plan to simplify the presentation in conformance with Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.**

9. Note 9 on the Proposed Site Plan Improvements list indicates a 10-foot-tall security wall will be located on the north and east sides of the TGTF building. Please provide additional information and illustration of the proposed wall. Please provide clarification regarding the proposed wall and the existing wall that is on the south and west sides of the existing single-family subdivision that is located to the north of the TGTF building. Please refer to the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.

**Response: Notes are now updated to reflect the current planning and clarify which are existing walls and which are proposed new Security walls on the revised Site Plan, with reference to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.**

10. Please clarify the location of the proposed 10-foot-tall security wall and the existing 8-foot-tall security wall; several wall segments are unidentified. Please refer to the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.

**Response: The location of proposed new security walls and wall height are shown on the revised Site Plan, with reference to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.**

#### **Landscape Design:**

11. Notes on the landscape plan appear to be 6-point font size, or less. Please revise the notes so that they are 12-point (1/6 inch) font size. Please refer to the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.

**Response: The landscape plans were provided within the MUMSP submittal for information only. Updated landscape will be submitted officially with the DRB submittal and comply with the font size and zoning requirements with reference to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.**

12. Please clarify the common name of Hesperaloe parviflora. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 10.200 and the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.

**Response: The landscape plans were provided within the MUMSP submittal for information only. Updated landscape will be submitted officially with DRB TGTF Site Plan submittal and comply with reference to Zoning Ordinance Section 10.200 and Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.**

#### **Fire:**

13. Please revise the conceptual site plan to demonstrate that the commercial turning radii (25' inner/49' Outside /55' Bucket Swing) are being provided by the site design in accordance with DSPM 2-1.802(5).

**Response: The turning radii are depicted on the revised Site Plan in accordance with DSPM 2-1.802(5).**

14. Please revise the conceptual site plan to show where the turn-around for emergency vehicles is provided at end of dead-end over 300 feet in length, in accordance with DSPM 2-1.802(8).

**Response: The turn-around is depicted on the revised Site Plan in accordance with DSPM 2-1.802(8).**

15. Please revise the conceptual site plan to identify that the all proposed fire lane surfaces will support a minimum of 83,000lb GVW, in accordance with DSPM, 2-1.802(3).

**Response: All proposed fire lane surfaces will support a minimum of 83,000 lbs GVW, in accordance with DSPM, 2-1.802(3) as depicted on revised Site Plan.**

16. Please revise the conceptual site plan to maintain a minimum 16-foot-wide emergency vehicle access route, on west side of the future storm water basin, for secondary emergency access in accordance with DSPM 2-1.802(B).

**Response: A 16-foot wide emergency vehicle access route is depicted on the revised Site Plan on the west side of future storm water basin for secondary emergency access, in accordance with DSPM 2-1.802(B).**

#### **Circulation:**

17. Please identify the use of CL-1 driveway type for the proposed site driveway on Thomas Road, to comply with COS Standard Detail #2256, DSPM 5-3.200, and DSPM Sec. 5-3.205.

**Response: A CL-1 driveway type for the proposed site driveway on Thomas Road, in compliance with COS Standard Detail #2256, DSPM 5-3.200, and DSPM Sec. 5-3.205, is depicted on the revised Site Plan.**

#### **Water/Wastewater:**

18. Is Note 9 on the north tree line of TGTF correct in proposing a new 10-foot-tall acoustic block wall, previous discussions had not included this? If a new 10-foot-tall wall is proposed on the north and east, would there still be a need for the proposed wrought iron fence internal to the wall enclosure? Please verify the proposed plan is accounting for these details.

**Response: See response to Item 9.**

19. The proposed southern TGTF wall is identified to be 10 feet tall, but previous discussions had indicated this would be an 8-foot-tall wall. Please verify the proposed wall heights and their impact on the ability to utilize salvaged gates versus new gates on the site.

**Response: See response to Item 9.**

20. Please clarify on the conceptual site plan where the new wall(s) begin and where the existing wall(s) end.

**Response: New walls and existing walls are clearly delineated on the revised Site Plan.**

21. Please revise the conceptual site plan to label the 40-foot pedestrian refuge shown on N. 86<sup>th</sup> Street.

**Response: Pedestrian refuge shown on 86<sup>th</sup> St. is labeled on the revised Site Plan.**

22. Please revise the conceptual site plan to clarify that Note e10, located *off* of the reservoir, is a slightly above ground overflow vault which will be required to have bollards around it after separate improvements are completed.

**Response: The existing vault located off of the reservoir does not have bollards, but bollards may be considered with development of the Site Plan DRB submittal.**

23. Please clarify if Note 14, regarding existing walls to remain for sound control, was the final decision based on the Water Works analysis.

**Response: Some existing walls that are to remain are shown on the revised Site Plan.**

We have resubmitting any revised application requirements and additional information identified in Attachment A, Resubmittal Checklist, provided by the City, including this written summary response addressing the comments/corrections identified above, for further review. We anticipate that the City will review these revisions to determine if the application can be scheduled for a Commission hearing date, or if additional modifications, corrections, or additional information is necessary.

Please contact us directly if you require additional information.

Elaine Mercado  
City Project Manager  
Direct: 480-312-7985

Victor Khoury, P.E.  
Water Works Engineers  
Direct: 480-719-2333

Ben W. Lee, P.E.  
Water Works Engineers  
Direct: 480-744-1344

(Attachments)