

**Correspondence Between
Staff and Applicant
Approval Letter**



6750 E. Camelback Rd., Suite 100
Scottsdale, AZ 85251
480.385.2727
berryriddell.com

mh@berryriddell.com
Direct: 480-385-2753

October 26, 2018

Via Email: bcluff@scottsdaleaz.gov

Bryan Cluff
Senior Planner
City of Scottsdale – Planning Department

Re: JDM Partners – La Via (Case: 20-ZN-2017)

Dear Mr. Cluff:

After much consideration, our client JDM Partners has decided to withdraw the rezoning request for the property located at 16001 N. Scottsdale Road. Please accept this letter on behalf of our client to formally withdraw case 20-ZN-2017. Feel free to contact me if you have any questions regarding this request.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Michele Hammond". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Michele" and last name "Hammond" clearly distinguishable.

Michele Hammond
Principal Planner

cc: John V. Berry, Esq.
Tom O'Malley

B | R

September 14, 2018

To: Bryan Cluff with zoning resubmittal

Re: 20-ZN-2017 - La Via

Dear Bryan :

Following are the applicant responses to the 1st review letter for the La Via zoning 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:

Please note: The submitted application did not contain all information necessary to perform a complete review of the Zoning District Map Amendment proposal to utilize the Planned Airpark Core (PCP) District (with bonuses) and the Planned Shared Development (PSD) Overlay district. Receipt and review of a complete application may result in substantial new comments.

Zoning:

1. It appears the proposed project will be developed in multiple phases. If so, please provide a Development Master Plan in accordance with the requirements of Zoning Ordinance Section 7.830. as required by Section 5.4003.C.

RESPONSE: A Development Master Plan with conceptual phasing (subject to change) is included with the revised Development Plan.

2. Please revise the development plan to demonstrate compliance with the Development Standard requirements of Zoning Ordinance Section 5.4007. In addition, if bonus standards will be utilized, please revise the Development Plan to demonstrate compliance with the Bonus Development Standards of Zoning Ordinance Section 5.4008., including Bonus Development Standards, Bonus Formulas, Allocation of Bonuses, and Special Improvements Proposed.

B | R

RESPONSE: The Bonus Development Standards have been revised and are provided as a separate document with the submittal.

3. In accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 5.4008.H., a development agreement is required if Special Improvements are proposed with the use of the bonus provisions. Please provide a development agreement which meets the requirements of this section.

RESPONSE: A draft Development Agreement is underway with City Staff and the development team.

4. The proposed application includes a request to include the Planned Shared Development (PSD) overlay district on the subject parcel. Please revise the project narrative to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the PSD overlay (Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1400., including any proposal for transfer of development rights. Please provide an accompanying development agreement in accordance with the requirements of Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1406.C.1.

RESPONSE: The application meets the Development Plan requirements set forth in Sec. 6.1400. The draft Development Agreement is underway with City Staff and the development team.

Circulation:

5. In accordance with the requirements of Zoning Ordinance Section 7.820, Table 7.820.A., please provide a revised Traffic Impact Mitigation Analysis addressing the comments identified in Attachment 1 "Report Review".

RESPONSE: TIMA has been revised.

6. In accordance with the requirements of Zoning Ordinance Section 7.820, Table 7.820.A., please revise the pedestrian circulation plan to identify pedestrian connections from the external streets to the on-site buildings.

RESPONSE: The Pedestrian Circulation Plan has been revised to show the requested connections.

Fire:

7. Please revise the site plan to clearly demonstrate a minimum 24' width for all drive aisles in accordance with Fire Ord. 4045, Section 503.2.1.

RESPONSE: The Site Plan has been revised to show this minimum dimension.

8. Please demonstrate compliance with Fire Ord. 4283, 503.2.1 with regard to unobstructed vertical clearance, minimum 13'6".

RESPONSE: Notes have been added to the Site Plan to address the Fire Ord. clearance.

Airport:

9. In Accordance with Chapter 5 -Aviation - of the Scottsdale Revised Code, this project is a "noise sensitive" use and the proposal will be required it to go before the Airport Advisory Commission.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

10. In Accordance with Section 5-354 General Requirements - of the Scottsdale Revised Code, the owner of a new development to be constructed in the areas of AC-1 shall complete forms required by the City and the Scottsdale Airport to comply with a height analysis, FAA Form 7460-1. Before final plan approval, the owner shall comply with the requirements of these forms and submit the FAA response to the 7460-1.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

11. In Accordance with Section 5-355 of the Scottsdale Revised Code, each owner of property shall make disclosure to each purchaser of the nearby airport, and if subject to Covenants Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs), the owner shall include the disclosure in the CC&Rs.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

12. In Accordance with Section 5-357 of the Scottsdale Revised Code, before final plans approval the owner shall grant the city and record an aviation easement satisfactory to the city attorney's office.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.Significant Policy Related Issues

The following policy related issues have been identified in the first review of this application. While 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 & Greater Airpark Area Plan:

13. Page 41 of the narrative incorrectly states that the property is designated as Commercial per the 2001 General Plan land use map. The subject site is designated as Mixed-Use Neighborhoods, Regional Use Overlay. Please update the narrative to reflect this land use category and how the proposal meets the definition of such, as well as provide a graphic that displays this designation.

RESPONSE: Page 41 has been revised to show the Mixed Use Neighborhoods and Regional Overlay designation.

14. The General Plan Land Use (Goal 8), Growth Areas (Goal 3, bullet 2) and Community Mobility (Goal 1, bullet 7; Goal 8, bullet 3; Goal 9, bullet 4; Goal 11, bullets 2, 3, 9, and 10; and Goal 12, bullet 1) Elements, as well as the GACAP Land Use (Goal LU 8), Neighborhoods & Housing (Policy NH2.3), Community Mobility (Goal CM 6), and Character & Design (Policy CD 1.1) Chapters speak to enhancing and strengthening the design and character of the Greater Airpark through appropriate site plan design that promotes safe, comfortable, and aesthetically pleasing pedestrian environments. The graphic on page 126 notes a plaza space that varies from 170' to 75' in width along a 560' corridor. This corridor is inclusive of an

internal roadway system that bisects the plaza. The submittal compares the noted "Central Plaza" to "timeless" plazas found in Europe - some of which have limited frontage to roadways, but few that are bisected by such. With a resubmittal please consider revising the site plan so that the vehicular circulation patterns do not disrupt the Central Plaza, ensuring the importance of the pedestrian within this space.

RESPONSE: The Site Plan and plaza space have been revised from the original submittal and as such the roadway that connects through the site has been repositioned.

15. The General Plan Land Use (Goal 7, bullet 5 and Goal 8, bullet 2), Growth Areas (Goal 3, bullet 2), Open Space and Recreation (Goal 1, bullets 9, 10, and 11) Elements as well as the GACAP Land Use Chapter (Goal LU 8, policies LU 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, and 8.4) all encourage the provision of meaningful open space. Furthermore, and as noted with the previous comment regarding the proposed "Central Plaza", both plans promote safe and comfortable pedestrian environments. The applicant proposes a Sculpture Park as an entry feature to the project - which is constrained by being adjacent to Scottsdale Road as well as the space being bisected by multiple access drives to the site. Notably, a similar plaza exists within the context area - The Frank Lloyd Wright Spire Plaza at the Promenade - located at the southeast corner of Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd and Scottsdale Rd. While the spire itself serves as an excellent model in place making, the plaza itself is largely unused as it is adjacent to two major arterials. With a resubmittal, please consider amending the site plan to allow for an alternate location for this sculpture garden - some suggested locations include: northwest of the "Central Plaza" (in the space created between the proposed Hotel and Condominium buildings); adjacent to the proposed Performance Space at the southwest corner of the site (internal to the site and not at the hard-corner); or, at the current location of the proposed Business Plaza (#4 on the Conceptual Illustrative Master Plan, Page 75) - enlarged to allow for such a space. Any of these suggested locations may ensure a more meaningful, utilized space is created - ultimately producing a secondary plaza space similar to the proposed "Central Plaza" programmed at the center of the existing site plan.

RESPONSE: The Site Plan and plaza space have been revised from the original submittal - several of these concerns are resolved. The entrance gardens along Scottsdale Road are intended to provide a different experience than the central piazza space, paseos and art streets; each with their own character and experience. Notably, the site provides over 50% open space.

16. The General Plan Character & Design (Goal 5) and Growth Areas (Goal 6) Elements as well as the GACAP Aviation (Policy A 4.2), Economic Vitality (Policy EV 3.7), and Character & Design (Policies CD 1.1 and 2.2) Chapters remark on the importance of public art as a cultural and place-making amenity. The first submittal states several times that the implementation of arts and culture throughout the intended development is important. Furthermore, the first submittal remarks on Page 67 that Lobby Art will be an important aspect of the

development - complementing that which is provided outdoors in the public realm. As such, with a resubmittal, please provide a Cultural Amenities Plan, noting locations and scale of the features that will be provided throughout the development; upon resubmittal, please note all locations that are to be publicly-accessible. Finally, the first submittal states that some public art pieces may be "temporary or permanent". As such, please provide a more in-depth discussion concerning these differences in public art provision in the Development Plan narrative, Bonus Development Standard worksheet, and Cultural Amenities Plan.

RESPONSE: A Cultural Amenities Concept Plan is provided as part of the Development Plan.

17. Both the 2001 General Plan (Land Use Element Goal 5, bullet 2 and Goal 9, bullet 4; Economic Vitality Element Goal 5, bullet 6; and, Community Mobility Element Goal 8, bullet 3 and Goal 12, bullet 4) and GACAP (Airpark Mixed Use-Residential definition, Type C Development Type definition, Community Mobility Chapter Goal CM 6 and Policy CD 2.3) discuss the importance of pedestrian connections to and within development - particularly mixed-use developments similar to that being proposed. Consequently, with a resubmittal, please respond to the following:

RESPONSE: The 2001 GP and GACAP discussion has been revised.

18. The applicant states throughout the Development Plan that the proposal will include a "highly integrated pedestrian experience". The site plan appears to have several internal, connected pedestrian linkages; however, the conceptual site plan depicts long building masses without pedestrian corridors. This may make it more difficult for the pedestrian to traverse the site and arrive at Central Plaza, Sculpture Garden, and other pedestrian-oriented spaces provided. With a resubmittal, please respond to the noted policies from both documents. Furthermore, please consider breaking up some of the larger building footprints to allow for a more meaningful pedestrian system within the site. Alternatively, please consider open-air pedestrian connection points through the larger building masses - noting such on the Pedestrian Circulation Plan.

RESPONSE: See updated Pedestrian Circulation Plan and Art Plan.

19. The Conceptual Hardscape Palette on pages 88 and 89 of the first submittal notes various pavement types being utilized throughout the development - including uneven pavers. With a resubmittal, please confirm that paved paths will be ADA compliant.

RESPONSE: A note regarding ADA compliance has been added to the Hardscape Plan.

20. The GACAP (Policy LU 6.4) discusses enhancing the compatibility of residential uses with existing industrial uses to ensure that residential areas adjacent to industrial uses are not in conflict. With a resubmittal, please respond to this policy, noting the techniques that will be utilized as a means to promote compatibility between the proposed residential on the eastern portion of the subject site with the existing industrial uses east of the subject site, across North Dial Boulevard.

RESPONSE: The Development Plan has been revised.

21. The General Plan Community Mobility Element and the GACAP Community Mobility Chapter both speak to the importance of supporting mobility choices that serve the local community. Valley Metro Bus Route 72 traverses Scottsdale Road northbound and subsequently has a bus stop that fronts the subject site. This existing bus stop is a signed stop, without shelter. To convey that this location is indeed neighborhood-serving, with a resubmittal, please add a sheltered bus stop that responds to both the Scottsdale Road Streetscape Design Guideline standards and the architectural context of the proposed development.

RESPONSE: Developer agrees to provide bus stop per the City's requirements.

22. The GACAP Neighborhoods & Housing Chapter (Goal NH 2) discusses the importance of creating neighborhoods where residents and community services are within comfortable walking distance. The conceptual site plan, Page 75 of the first submittal, notes the potential of a future grocer at the southwest corner of the subject site - essentially the furthest point on the site plan from future residents and hotel users. With a resubmittal, please consider revising the site so as to depict the potential for a grocer closer to the residents and visitors that are likely to use such. Such a use may be more appropriate at the northeast corner of Parcel A as per the submitted Parcel/Subdivision Plan. Furthermore, please provide information as to how this future grocer will operate within this dense, mixed-use environment (i.e. management of shopping carts, delivery circulation).

RESPONSE: An alternative grocery store location was considered by the team, however, it has been determined that the grocer location (if provided) will need to remain along Scottsdale Road.

23. Please revise the development plan so that it also includes an explanation on how the proposed zoning map amendment will be consistent with the Scottsdale General Plan Character and Design Element: Goal 2 - Bullet 5; Goal 5 - Bullets 11 and 12; Goal 6 - Bullet 6; Goal 7 - Bullets 2 and 4.

RESPONSE: The Development Plan has been revised.

24. Please revise the development plan so that it also includes an explanation on how the proposed zoning district map amendment will be consistent with the Greater Airpark Character Area Plan, Character and Design Element: Goal CD1 - Policies 1.3 and 1.4; Goal CO2 - Policies 2.4, 2.6 and 2.7.

RESPONSE: The Development Plan has been revised.

Site Design:

25. Please revise the development plan so that the cross sections on pp. 92-93 will include diagrammatic lines that depict the required setbacks, stepbacks, and maximum heights.

RESPONSE: The Development Plan has been revised.

26. Please revise the project narrative so that the response to the Scottsdale Sensitive

B | R

Design Principles is more descriptive and has explanative information in the responses. Instead of rephrasing the principles, please provide brief directive responses that clarify how the principles will be implemented. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.

RESPONSE: The Development Plan has been revised.

Fire:

Notes added to Development Plan.

27. Please revise the site plan to clearly demonstrate commercial turning radii requirements for all driveways (25' inner, 49' outside, 55' bucket swing), in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual, Section 2-1.802.B.5.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

28. Driveway entrances and drive thru by pass lanes shall be a minimum of 20' wide, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 2-1.802.B.2.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

29. Please revise the site plan so that divided entrances and drive thru by pass lanes are 20' wide minimum, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 2- 1.802.B.2.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

30. Please provide turn-around for emergency vehicles at end of dead-end driveways over 300', in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 2-1.802(8).

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

Landscape Design:

31. Please revise the development plan so that it also includes a description of the conceptual landscape plan, similar to the descriptions that have been included for the conceptual hardscape plan and conceptual signage plan, in accordance with the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications.

RESPONSE: The Development Plan has been revised.

Circulation:

32. Please revise the site plan so that driveway access on Scottsdale Road aligns with what has been allowed along the west side of the street; minimum driveway spacing is 330 feet; left in access is not allowed at the 660 foot site midpoint and driveways shall be perpendicular to Scottsdale Road, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 5- 3.201.

RESPONSE: Driveway access has been realigned.

33. Please revise the site plan so the minimum driveway spacing along Dial Boulevard and Paradise Lane is 165 feet, including the proposed U-shaped driveways. Driveways must align with existing driveways on the other side of the street or be offset a minimum distance of 250 feet, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 5-3.201.

RESPONSE: Driveways spacing has been revised.

34. In accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 5-3.119G, the minimum spacing for traffic signals along arterials is a half-mile. The traffic study is proposing a traffic signal at Tierra Buena and Scottsdale Road (one-quarter-mile). Please propose an alternative for traffic control if the existing median opening is not adequate.

RESPONSE: The TIMA addresses this comment.

35. Please revise the site plan to provide right turn deceleration lanes at all allowed driveways on Scottsdale Road, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 5- 3.206.

RESPONSE: Right-turn deceleration lanes have been added to Site Plan.

36. Please revise the site plan to provide a minimum 6-foot-wide sidewalk separated from the back of curb along the Paradise Lane, Dial Boulevard, and Tierra Buena site frontage, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section Sec. 5-3.100; Scottsdale Revised Code 47-36 - Street Improvements; 2008 Transportation Master Plan: Ch. 7, Sec. 8.

RESPONSE: Site Plan has been revised to provide a 6' sidewalk separated from the back of curb as noted above.

Considerations

The following considerations have been identified in the first review of this application. While these considerations are not critical to scheduling the application for public hearing, they may improve the quality and may reduce the delays in obtaining a decision regarding the proposed development. Please consider addressing the following:

Special Improvements:

37. The height exhibit within the Development Plan proposes building heights up to 134', which will require the use of the PCP Bonus Provisions to achieve. As part of the required special improvements for the proposed height please consider burying the existing above ground powerlines which run along Scottsdale Road from Thunderbird to Frank Lloyd Wright.

RESPONSE: This request is being evaluated by the development team.

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:

Site:

38. Please provide a site plan that complies with the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications, in accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303. If the proposed site plan does not specifically address the driveway, sidewalk, and building separation dimensions, please provide 'typical' cross sections of the internal streets and pedestrian access ways that identify these dimensions in each anticipated condition.

RESPONSE: The site plan has been revised to comply with the City's requirements.

39. Please identify the location of existing driveways along the streets bordering the site to show how the proposed site driveway locations align with them, in accordance with the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications.

RESPONSE: Existing driveways that border the site are shown to provide context in relation to the proposed site driveways.

Development Plan:

40. On page 16 of the Development Plan, AMU-R is called out as the site's current zoning. Please revise this to identify AMU-R as the Greater Airpark Character Area Plan land use designation.

RESPONSE: Development Plan has been updated.

41. Page 61 of the Development Plan describes the "Purpose of Request". Please relocate this section of the narrative to the beginning of the development plan.

RESPONSE: Development Plan has been updated.

42. Page 90 of the Development Plan calls out a "Building Sign" type, which appears to be ground mounted signage throughout the development. In the Zoning Ordinance building signs are defined as signs located on a building wall. Please provide clarification as to the purpose of this sign type and/or consider a name that is consistent with the zoning ordinance classifications.

RESPONSE: Development Plan has been updated.

43. Please revise the Development Plan so that the architectural character image on page 111 for the caption 'The facades reflect the surroundings' will be an image that reflects the Sonoran Desert surroundings instead of a building with a glass curtain wall. Please refer to Scottsdale Sensitive Design Principle 9.

RESPONSE: Development Plan has been updated.

Fire:

44. Please revise the site plan to demonstrate the Fire Department Connection meets spacing requirements, and provide remote Fire Department Connections in accordance with Fire Ord. 4045, Section 912.

RESPONSE: Notes added to site plan.

45. Please revise the site plan to demonstrate the fire hydrant location meets spacing requirements, in accordance with Fire Ord. 4045, 507.5.1.2.

RESPONSE: Notes added to site plan.

46. Please demonstrate fire lane surface will support 83,000 lb GVW to include any bridge/culvert crossing, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual, Section 2-1.802.B.3.

RESPONSE: Notes added to site plan.

47. All Codes and Standards used shall be revised, updated, and constructed under the current 2015 I-codes and 2016 Standards.

RESPONSE: Notes added to site plan.

48. Please revise the site plan to clearly identify the location of the fire riser room(s) in each building in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual, Section 6-1.504.1.

RESPONSE: Notes added to site plan.

If you have any comments or questions regarding the above responses, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Michele Hammond
Principal Planner

ATTACHMENT A

Resubmittal Checklist

Case Number: **20-ZN-2017**

Please provide the following documents, in the quantities indicated, with the resubmittal (all plans larger than 8 ½ x 11 shall be folded):

One copy: COVER LETTER - Respond to all the issues identified in the first review comment letter.

Site Plan:

<u>8</u>	24" x 36"	<u>1</u>	11" x 17"	<u>1</u>	8 ½ " x 11"
----------	-----------	----------	-----------	----------	-------------

Pedestrian Circulation Plan:

<u>2</u>	24" x 36"	<u>1</u>	11" x 17"	<u>1</u>	8 ½ " x 11"
----------	-----------	----------	-----------	----------	-------------

Development Plan Booklets

The Development Plan booklets shall be clipped together separately, and not be bounded.

Color	11" x 17"	3	8 ½ x 11"
-------	-----------	---	-----------

Other Supplemental Materials:



10/18/18

Michele Hammond
Berry Riddell
6750 E. Camelback Road Suite 1
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

RE: 20-ZN-2017
La Via

Dear Ms. Hammond:

The Planning & Development Services Division has completed the review of the above referenced development application submitted on 9/14/18. The following **2nd 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 second 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 provide a revised development plan addressing the items identified in the attached redlined development plan, in accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 5.400. and the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications.
2. In accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 5.4008.H., a development agreement is required if Special Improvements are proposed with the use of the bonus provisions. Please provide a development agreement which meets the requirements of this section.
3. The proposed application includes a request to include the Planned Shared Development (PSD) overlay district on the subject parcel. Please revise the project narrative to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the PSD overlay (Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1400., including any proposal for transfer of development rights. Please provide an accompanying development agreement in accordance with the requirements of Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1406.C.1.

Circulation:

4. In accordance with the requirements of Zoning Ordinance Section 7.820, Table 7.820.A., please provide a revised Traffic Impact Mitigation Analysis addressing the comments identified in the submitted TIMA.

Water and Waste Water:

5. Please submit three (3) copies of the revised Water and Waste Water Design Report(s) with the original red-lined copy of the report to me with the rest of the resubmittal material identified in Attachment A.

Significant Policy Related Issues

The following policy related issues have been identified in the second review of this application. While 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 & Greater Airpark Area Plan:

6. The GACAP Neighborhoods & Housing Chapter (Goal NH 2) discusses the importance of creating neighborhoods where residents and community services are within comfortable walking distance. The conceptual site plan, Page 75 of the first submittal, notes the potential of a future grocer at the southwest corner of the subject site – essentially the furthest point on the site plan from future residents and hotel users. With a resubmittal, please consider revising the site so as to depict the potential for a grocer closer to the residents and visitors that are likely to use such. Such a use may be more appropriate at the northeast corner of Parcel A as per the submitted Parcel/Subdivision Plan. Furthermore, please provide information as to how this future grocer will operate within this dense, mixed-use environment (i.e. management of shopping carts, delivery circulation).

Site Design:

7. In accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 2-1.804., please provide a refuse collection plan identifying the location for refuse enclosures or compactors and provide narrative explanation as to how refuse will be managed throughout the development.
8. Please revise the site plan to identify the location of the bus shelter on Scottsdale Road. The shelter shall be located in accordance with the requirements of the Design Standards & Policies Manual and designed in accordance with COS Standard Detail 2264, unless enhanced design considerations are proposed.

Circulation:

9. Please revise the site plan so the driveway spacing along Dial Boulevard aligns with existing driveways on the other side of the street or be offset a minimum distance of 250 feet, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 5-3.201. This requirement includes site driveways on the east side of Dial Boulevard.
10. Please revise the site plan to provide right turn deceleration lanes at all allowed driveways on Scottsdale Road, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 5-3.206.

Please resubmit the revised application requirements and additional/supplemental 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/supplemental 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.

In an effort to get this Zoning District Map Amendment request to a Planning Commission hearing, please submit the revised material identified in Attachment A as soon as possible.

These **2nd 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 480-312-2258 or at bcluff@ScottsdaleAZ.gov.

Sincerely,



Bryan Cluff
Senior Planner

cc:

ATTACHMENT A
Resubmittal Checklist

Case Number: **20-ZN-2017**

Please provide the following documents, in the quantities indicated, with the resubmittal (all plans larger than 8 ½ x11 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 (CD/DVD, PDF format)
- ☒ Three copies of the revised Development Plan
- ☒ Three copies of the Revised Traffic Impact Mitigation Analysis (TIMA)
- ☒ Two copies of the refuse management plan

☒ Site Plan:

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

☒ Other Supplemental Materials:

Other applicable amendments that may not be listed on this checklist _____

Technical Reports:

- ☒ 3 copies of Revised Water Design Report:
- ☒ 3 copies of Revised Waste Water Design Report:

Resubmit the revised Drainage Reports, Water and Waste Water Report and/or Storm Water Waiver application to your Project Coordinator with any prior City mark-up documents.



11/28/17

Michele Hammond
Berry Riddell
6750 E. Camelback Road Suite 1
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

RE: 20-ZN-2017
La Via

Dear Ms. Hammond:

The Planning & Development Services Division has completed the review of the above referenced development application submitted on 10/17/17. 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 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:

Please note: The submitted application did not contain all information necessary to perform a complete review of the Zoning District Map Amendment proposal to utilize the Planned Airport Core (PCP) District (with bonuses) and the Planned Shared Development (PSD) Overlay district. Receipt and review of a complete application may result in substantial new comments.

Zoning:

1. It appears the proposed project will be developed in multiple phases. If so, please provide a Development Master Plan in accordance with the requirements of Zoning Ordinance Section 7.830. as required by Section 5.4003.C.
2. Please revise the development plan to demonstrate compliance with the Development Standard requirements of Zoning Ordinance Section 5.4007. In addition, if bonus standards will be utilized, please revise the Development Plan to demonstrate compliance with the Bonus Development Standards of Zoning Ordinance Section 5.4008., including Bonus Development Standards, Bonus Formulas, Allocation of Bonuses, and Special Improvements Proposed.

3. In accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 5.4008.H., a development agreement is required if Special Improvements are proposed with the use of the bonus provisions. Please provide a development agreement which meets the requirements of this section.
4. The proposed application includes a request to include the Planned Shared Development (PSD) overlay district on the subject parcel. Please revise the project narrative to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the PSD overlay (Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1400., including any proposal for transfer of development rights. Please provide an accompanying development agreement in accordance with the requirements of Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1406.C.1.

Circulation:

5. In accordance with the requirements of Zoning Ordinance Section 7.820, Table 7.820.A., please provide a revised Traffic Impact Mitigation Analysis addressing the comments identified in Attachment 1 "Report Review".
6. In accordance with the requirements of Zoning Ordinance Section 7.820, Table 7.820.A., please revise the pedestrian circulation plan to identify pedestrian connections from the external streets to the on-site buildings.

Fire:

7. Please revise the site plan to clearly demonstrate a minimum 24' width for all drive aisles in accordance with Fire Ord. 4045, Section 503.2.1.
8. Please demonstrate compliance with Fire Ord. 4283, 503.2.1 with regard to unobstructed vertical clearance, minimum 13'6".

Airport:

9. In Accordance with Chapter 5 – Aviation - of the Scottsdale Revised Code, this project is a "noise sensitive" use and the proposal will be required to go before the Airport Advisory Commission.
10. In Accordance with Section 5-354 General Requirements – of the Scottsdale Revised Code, the owner of a new development to be constructed in the areas of AC-1 shall complete forms required by the City and the Scottsdale Airport to comply with a height analysis, FAA Form 7460-1. Before final plan approval, the owner shall comply with the requirements of these forms and submit the FAA response to the 7460-1.
11. In Accordance with Section 5-355 of the Scottsdale Revised Code, each owner of property shall make disclosure to each purchaser of the nearby airport, and if subject to Covenants Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs), the owner shall include the disclosure in the CC&Rs.
12. In Accordance with Section 5-357 of the Scottsdale Revised Code, before final plans approval the owner shall grant the city and record an aviation easement satisfactory to the city attorney's office

Significant Policy Related Issues

The following policy related issues have been identified in the first review of this application. While 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 & Greater Airpark Area Plan:

13. Page 41 of the narrative incorrectly states that the property is designated as Commercial per the 2001 General Plan land use map. The subject site is designated as Mixed-Use Neighborhoods, Regional Use Overlay. Please update the narrative to reflect this land use category and how the proposal meets the definition of such, as well as provide a graphic that displays this designation.
14. The General Plan Land Use (Goal 8), Growth Areas (Goal 3, bullet 2) and Community Mobility (Goal 1, bullet 7; Goal 8, bullet 3; Goal 9, bullet 4; Goal 11, bullets 2, 3, 9, and 10; and Goal 12, bullet 1) Elements, as well as the GACAP Land Use (Goal LU 8), Neighborhoods & Housing (Policy NH2.3), Community Mobility (Goal CM 6), and Character & Design (Policy CD 1.1) Chapters speak to enhancing and strengthening the design and character of the Greater Airpark through appropriate site plan design that promotes safe, comfortable, and aesthetically pleasing pedestrian environments. The graphic on page 126 notes a plaza space that varies from 170' to 75' in width along a 560' corridor. This corridor is inclusive of an internal roadway system that bisects the plaza. The submittal compares the noted "Central Plaza" to "timeless" plazas found in Europe – some of which have limited frontage to roadways, but few that are bisected by such. With a resubmittal please consider revising the site plan so that the vehicular circulation patterns do not disrupt the Central Plaza, ensuring the importance of the pedestrian within this space.
15. The General Plan Land Use (Goal 7, bullet 5 and Goal 8, bullet 2), Growth Areas (Goal 3, bullet 2), Open Space and Recreation (Goal 1, bullets 9, 10, and 11) Elements as well as the GACAP Land Use Chapter (Goal LU 8, policies LU 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, and 8.4) all encourage the provision of meaningful open space. Furthermore, and as noted with the previous comment regarding the proposed "Central Plaza", both plans promote safe and comfortable pedestrian environments. The applicant proposes a Sculpture Park as an entry feature to the project – which is constrained by being adjacent to Scottsdale Road as well as the space being bisected by multiple access drives to the site. Notably, a similar plaza exists within the context area – The Frank Lloyd Wright Spire Plaza at the Promenade – located at the southeast corner of Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd and Scottsdale Rd. While the spire itself serves as an excellent model in place making, the plaza itself is largely unused as it is adjacent to two major arterials. With a resubmittal, please consider amending the site plan to allow for an alternate location for this sculpture garden – some suggested locations include: northwest of the "Central Plaza" (in the space created between the proposed Hotel and Condominium buildings); adjacent to the proposed Performance Space at the southwest corner of the site (internal to the site and not at the hard-corner); or, at the current location of the proposed Business Plaza (#4 on the Conceptual Illustrative Master Plan, Page 75) – enlarged to allow for such a space. Any of these suggested locations may ensure a more meaningful, utilized space is created – ultimately producing a secondary plaza space similar to the proposed "Central Plaza" programmed at the center of the existing site plan.
16. The General Plan Character & Design (Goal 5) and Growth Areas (Goal 6) Elements as well as the GACAP Aviation (Policy A 4.2), Economic Vitality (Policy EV 3.7), and Character & Design (Policies CD 1.1 and 2.2) Chapters remark on the importance of public art as a cultural and place-making amenity. The first submittal states several times that the implementation of arts and culture throughout the intended development is important. Furthermore, the first submittal remarks on Page 67 that Lobby Art will be an important aspect of the development – complementing that which is provided outdoors in the public realm. As such,

with a resubmittal, please provide a Cultural Amenities Plan, noting locations and scale of the features that will be provided throughout the development; upon resubmittal, please note all locations that are to be publicly-accessible. Finally, the first submittal states that some public art pieces may be “temporary or permanent”. As such, please provide a more in-depth discussion concerning these differences in public art provision in the Development Plan narrative, Bonus Development Standard worksheet, and Cultural Amenities Plan.

17. Both the 2001 General Plan (Land Use Element Goal 5, bullet 2 and Goal 9, bullet 4; Economic Vitality Element Goal 5, bullet 6; and, Community Mobility Element Goal 8, bullet 3 and Goal 12, bullet 4) and GACAP (Airpark Mixed Use-Residential definition, Type C Development Type definition, Community Mobility Chapter Goal CM 6 and Policy CD 2.3) discuss the importance of pedestrian connections to and within development – particularly mixed-use developments similar to that being proposed. Consequently, with a resubmittal, please respond to the following:
18. The applicant states throughout the Development Plan that the proposal will include a “highly integrated pedestrian experience”. The site plan appears to have several internal, connected pedestrian linkages; however, the conceptual site plan depicts long building masses without pedestrian corridors. This may make it more difficult for the pedestrian to traverse the site and arrive at Central Plaza, Sculpture Garden, and other pedestrian-oriented spaces provided. With a resubmittal, please respond to the noted policies from both documents. Furthermore, please consider breaking up some of the larger building footprints to allow for a more meaningful pedestrian system within the site. Alternatively, please consider open-air pedestrian connection points through the larger building masses – noting such on the Pedestrian Circulation Plan.
19. The Conceptual Hardscape Palette on pages 88 and 89 of the first submittal notes various pavement types being utilized throughout the development – including uneven pavers. With a resubmittal, please confirm that paved paths will be ADA compliant.
20. The GACAP (Policy LU 6.4) discusses enhancing the compatibility of residential uses with existing industrial uses to ensure that residential areas adjacent to industrial uses are not in conflict. With a resubmittal, please respond to this policy, noting the techniques that will be utilized as a means to promote compatibility between the proposed residential on the eastern portion of the subject site with the existing industrial uses east of the subject site, across North Dial Boulevard.
21. The General Plan Community Mobility Element and the GACAP Community Mobility Chapter both speak to the importance of supporting mobility choices that serve the local community. Valley Metro Bus Route 72 traverses Scottsdale Road northbound and subsequently has a bus stop that fronts the subject site. This existing bus stop is a signed stop, without shelter. To convey that this location is indeed neighborhood-serving, with a resubmittal, please add a sheltered bus stop that responds to both the Scottsdale Road Streetscape Design Guideline standards and the architectural context of the proposed development.
22. The GACAP Neighborhoods & Housing Chapter (Goal NH 2) discusses the importance of creating neighborhoods where residents and community services are within comfortable walking distance. The conceptual site plan, Page 75 of the first submittal, notes the potential of a future grocer at the southwest corner of the subject site – essentially the furthest point on the site plan from future residents and hotel users. With a resubmittal, please consider

revising the site so as to depict the potential for a grocer closer to the residents and visitors that are likely to use such. Such a use may be more appropriate at the northeast corner of Parcel A as per the submitted Parcel/Subdivision Plan. Furthermore, please provide information as to how this future grocer will operate within this dense, mixed-use environment (i.e. management of shopping carts, delivery circulation).

23. Please revise the development plan so that it also includes an explanation on how the proposed zoning map amendment will be consistent with the Scottsdale General Plan Character and Design Element: Goal 2 - Bullet 5; Goal 5 - Bullets 11 and 12; Goal 6 - Bullet 6; Goal 7 - Bullets 2 and 4.
24. Please revise the development plan so that it also includes an explanation on how the proposed zoning district map amendment will be consistent with the Greater Airpark Character Area Plan, Character and Design Element: Goal CD1 - Policies 1.3 and 1.4; Goal CD2 - Policies 2.4, 2.6 and 2.7.

Site Design:

25. Please revise the development plan so that the cross sections on pp. 92-93 will include diagrammatic lines that depict the required setbacks, stepbacks, and maximum heights.
26. Please revise the project narrative so that the response to the Scottsdale Sensitive Design Principles is more descriptive and has explanative information in the responses. Instead of rephrasing the principles, please provide brief directive responses that clarify how the principles will be implemented. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303.

Fire:

27. Please revise the site plan to clearly demonstrate commercial turning radii requirements for all driveways (25' inner, 49' outside, 55' bucket swing), in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual, Section 2-1.802.B.5.
28. Driveway entrances and drive thru by pass lanes shall be a minimum of 20' wide, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 2-1.802.B.2.
29. Please revise the site plan so that divided entrances and drive thru by pass lanes are 20' wide minimum, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 2-1.802.B.2.
30. Please provide turn-around for emergency vehicles at end of dead-end driveways over 300', in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 2-1.802(8).

Landscape Design:

31. Please revise the development plan so that it also includes a description of the conceptual landscape plan, similar to the descriptions that have been included for the conceptual hardscape plan and conceptual signage plan, in accordance with the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications.

Circulation:

32. Please revise the site plan so that driveway access on Scottsdale Road aligns with what has been allowed along the west side of the street; minimum driveway spacing is 330 feet; left in access is not allowed at the 660 foot site midpoint and driveways shall be perpendicular to Scottsdale Road, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 5-3.201.

33. Please revise the site plan so the minimum driveway spacing along Dial Boulevard and Paradise Lane is 165 feet, including the proposed U-shaped driveways. Driveways must align with existing driveways on the other side of the street or be offset a minimum distance of 250 feet, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 5-3.201.
34. In accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 5-3.119G, the minimum spacing for traffic signals along arterials is a half-mile. The traffic study is proposing a traffic signal at Tierra Buena and Scottsdale Road (one-quarter-mile). Please propose an alternative for traffic control if the existing median opening is not adequate.
35. Please revise the site plan to provide right turn deceleration lanes at all allowed driveways on Scottsdale Road, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 5-3.206
36. Please revise the site plan to provide a minimum 6-foot-wide sidewalk separated from the back of curb along the Paradise Lane, Dial Boulevard, and Tierra Buena site frontage, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section Sec. 5-3.100; Scottsdale Revised Code 47-36 - Street Improvements; 2008 Transportation Master Plan: Ch. 7, Sec. 8.

Considerations

The following considerations have been identified in the first review of this application. While these considerations are not critical to scheduling the application for public hearing, they may improve the quality and may reduce the delays in obtaining a decision regarding the proposed development. Please consider addressing the following:

Special Improvements:

37. The height exhibit within the Development Plan proposes building heights up to 134', which will require the use of the PCP Bonus Provisions to achieve. As part of the required special improvements for the proposed height please consider burying the existing above ground powerlines which run along Scottsdale Road from Thunderbird to Frank Lloyd Wright.

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:

Site:

38. Please provide a site plan that complies with the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications, in accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303. If the proposed site plan does not specifically address the driveway, sidewalk, and building separation dimensions, please provide 'typical' cross sections of the internal streets and pedestrian access ways that identify these dimensions in each anticipated condition.
39. Please identify the location of existing driveways along the streets bordering the site to show how the proposed site driveway locations align with them, in accordance with the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications.

Development Plan:

40. On page 16 of the Development Plan, AMU-R is called out as the site's current zoning. Please revise this to identify AMU-R as the Greater Airpark Character Area Plan land use designation.
41. Page 61 of the Development Plan describes the "Purpose of Request". Please relocate this section of the narrative to the beginning of the development plan.
42. Page 90 of the Development Plan calls out a "Building Sign" type, which appears to be ground mounted signage throughout the development. In the Zoning Ordinance building signs are defined as signs located on a building wall. Please provide clarification as to the purpose of this sign type and/or consider a name that is consistent with the zoning ordinance classifications.
43. Please revise the Development Plan so that the architectural character image on page 111 for the caption 'The facades reflect the surroundings' will be an image that reflects the Sonoran Desert surroundings instead of a building with a glass curtain wall. Please refer to Scottsdale Sensitive Design Principle 9.

Fire:

44. Please revise the site plan to demonstrate the Fire Department Connection meets spacing requirements, and provide remote Fire Department Connections in accordance with Fire Ord. 4045, Section 912.
45. Please revise the site plan to demonstrate the fire hydrant location meets spacing requirements, in accordance with Fire Ord. 4045, 507.5.1.2.
46. Please demonstrate fire lane surface will support 83,000 lb GVW to include any bridge/culvert crossing, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual, Section 2-1.802.B.3.
47. All Codes and Standards used shall be revised, updated, and constructed under the current 2015 I-codes and 2016 Standards.
48. Please revise the site plan to clearly identify the location of the fire riser room(s) in each building in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual, Section 6-1.504.1.

Please resubmit the revised application requirements and additional/supplemental 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/supplemental 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.

In an effort to get this Zoning District Map Amendments request to a Planning Commission hearing, please submit the revised material identified in Attachment A as soon as possible.

The Planning & Development Services Division has had this application in review for XX Staff Review Days since the application was determined to have the minimal information to be reviewed.

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 480-312-2258 or at bcluff@ScottsdaleAZ.gov.

Sincerely,



Bryan Cluff
Senior Planner

Attachments:

1. Resubmittal Checklist
1. Report Review (TIMA)

ATTACHMENT A
Resubmittal Checklist

Case Number: **20-ZN-2017**

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

☒ One copy: COVER LETTER – Respond to all the issues identified in the first review comment letter.

☒ Site Plan:

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

☒ Pedestrian Circulation Plan:

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

☒ Development Plan Booklets

The Development Plan booklets shall be clipped together separately, and not be bounded.

Color _____ 11" x 17" _____ 3 _____ 8 ½" x 11"

☒ Other Supplemental Materials:



REPORT REVIEW

REPORT TITLE: La Via Traffic Impact and Mitigation Analysis

REPORT DATE: September 29, 2017

PREPARED BY: J2 Engineering and Environmental Design

CASE #: 20-ZN-2017

REVIEWED BY: Phillip Kercher, Leslie Bubke and Emily Appleton

DATE: November 15, 2017

These comments need to be addressed prior to re-submittal and continuing review of the subject report. Please provide a letter with the re-submittal, succinctly noting how the updated report responds to each comment. Acceptance of the report may be delayed until all comments are resolved.

COMMENTS:

1. At locations where dual right turn lanes are proposed staff is concerned about the conflicts with pedestrian crossings (76th Street & FLW, Greenway-Hayden & FLW, Scottsdale & Paradise, Scottsdale & Tierra Buena). Revise the analysis to include a separate pedestrian phase, or a separate right-turn phase, or propose some other mitigation measure that separates the pedestrian movement from the right-turn movement.
2. Scottsdale & Tierra Buena – The proposed traffic signal does not meet City of Scottsdale spacing requirements along arterial streets (one-half mile). See additional information in Comment No. 17.
3. Existing Use Trip Generation – the report estimates the trip generation of CrackerJax using ITE rates. Because this is an existing use currently in operation, actual driveway counts need to be used for this study.
4. Include a table showing trip generation comparison to the current land use (Crackerjax - using actual counts, not estimated).
5. There is no “proposed mix” land use scenario under the C-4 zoning; nothing has been submitted to create this land use scenario. This trip generation scenario should be labeled as possible or potential in the tables if this comparison is included.
6. Provide additional discussion related to the appropriateness of the internal capture rates proposed. Include in the appendix copies of the actual ITE and NCHRP data tables that were used.

7. Provide a table documenting the internal capture and pass-by trip reductions for daily trips, similar to what was provided for AM and PM peak hours.
8. Provide a figure that shows the percentage for AM, PM, and daily volumes, the splits assumed to enter and exit at each entrance for 2022 and 2027 site volumes.
9. Quick spot checks of ADT volumes for various scenarios do not directly add together. Largest differences occur on Paradise, Dial, and Tierra Buena (2022/27 No Build + 2022/27 Site does not equal 2022/27 Build). Did not spot check AM or PM volumes due to time constraints. Assume this is due to subtracting the estimated "existing" CrackerJax volumes as discussed in narrative. Please verify and update.
10. The LOS analysis do not correctly model Scottsdale's lagging permitted-protected intersection operation, resulting in inaccurate results for existing and future scenarios. This needs to be revised to accurately reflect existing and future levels of service. General notes in 6.a., and b., below, are related to issues that occur throughout the analysis. Other comments are more specific in nature and are provided to support accuracy as the study is revised. **Staff recommends that the engineer meet with our Traffic Management Center staff to discuss how to accurately model the existing signal phasing.**
 - a. HCM does not support the lagging permitted-protected signal phasing; Synchro basic LOS tool supports this configuration when the permitted-protected lagging are marked as "dual entry".
 - b. When the signal timing is "optimized" using HCM, lagging permitted-protected phases are proposed where one phase is significantly longer than the other, creating a "yellow trap" condition.
 - c. Review indicates this error exists in the existing (less impact to analysis as existing timings are used), 2022 and 2027 scenarios at the following intersections.
 - i. Scottsdale & Paradise
 - ii. Scottsdale & Tierra Buena
 - iii. Greenway-Hayden & Paradise
 - iv. Greenway-Hayden & 73rd/Dial
 - d. Additional comments at the following intersections:
 - i. Scottsdale & Tierra Buena – lane assignment is not consistent within analysis. Has alignment with west leg been reviewed?
 - ii. Greenway-Hayden & Paradise – why is max recall used on minor street?
 - iii. Greenway-Hayden & 73rd/Dial – coded as "prot-only" lefts. Revise.
11. 2022 PM Peak Hour Build Data is a different report from other scenarios, but it's not clear why.
12. 2022 and 2027 scenarios do not represent coordinated operation on either Frank Lloyd Wright or Scottsdale Road. The report notes "Actuated-Coordinated" and cycles are of standard lengths; however, nearly all offsets are set to "0". Please correct and revise.
13. Intersection of Scottsdale & Frank Lloyd Wright (FLW) - Compared to the "No Build" conditions, the "Build" condition develops unmanageable queues at the 50th percentile conditions. How will this be mitigated?
14. Intersection of FLW & 76th
 - a. Consider NBR overlap with WBL phase. Shared NBL/R causes additional stops and delay on FLW.

- b. 2022 Build scenario shows WBL 50th percentile queue exceeds storage, blocking WBT lane. How will this be mitigated?
- 15. Intersections of Scottsdale & Kierland, Scottsdale & Butherus: Heavy pedestrian usage that exist on all crossings are not supported by the proposed operation. The analysis is based on conditions that cannot be operated under real-life conditions.
- 16. Intersection of FLW & Greenway-Hayden
 - a. Existing right-of-way at SE corner not sufficient to add second NB right turn lane. Relocation of the existing signal pole would also be required.
 - b. Staff requests model files to verify if overlap was coded correctly and whether the poor NBR LOS is “real” as HCM often under-utilizes RTOR or overlap.
- 17. Intersection of Scottsdale & Tierra Buena
 - a. Proposed signal does not meet Scottsdale’s spacing requirements
 - b. Alternative solutions need to be provided. Staff does not support the proposed signal.
 - c. Any consideration of a traffic signal would need to have support from Time/Space flow diagrams (70th and 90th percentile).
- 18. Table 12 – discuss why the 2022 No Build reported delay is less than the Existing scenario for Dial & Paradise, Dial & Monte Cristo, Dial & Tierra Buena and 76th & Paradise; but greater for Scottsdale & Tierra Buena and Greenway-Hayden & Paradise.
- 19. Table 13 – discuss why the 2022 No Build reported delay is less than existing for Scottsdale & Paradise.
- 20. Table 13 – it is assumed that improvement from Existing scenario at 76th Street & FLW and FLW & Greenway-Hayden is due to proposed intersection revisions (dual right turn lanes). This will need to be updated to address comment 9.
- 21. Section 7.4 Year 2027 Improvements and Considerations – the improvement at 76th Street & FLW is described under this section. It is also included as an improvement in the 2022 No Build scenario. Is this intentional or is it meant to indicate something else.
- 22. Table 16 – discuss why the 2027 scenario delay is less than existing delay at 76th Street & Paradise when no improvements have been proposed.
- 23. Collision History – the City’s database indicates six (not 8) potentially correctable collisions in the most recent three years at Scottsdale Road and Tierra Buena. The City counts only collisions within 100 –ft of the intersection. Please update narrative in the collision section and the traffic signal warrant section.



Planning and Development Services Division

7447 East Indian School Road
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251

Date: 10/17/17
Contact Name: John Berry
Firm Name: Berry Riddell, LLC
Address: 6750 E. Camelback Ste. 100
City, State, Zip: Scottsdale, AZ 85251

RE: Application Accepted for Review.

473 - PA - 2017

Dear Ms. Hammond:

It has been determined that your Development Application for La Via 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: Bryan Cluff
Title: Sr. Planner
Phone Number: (480) 312-2258
Email Address: bcluff @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