



Correspondence Between Staff and Applicant

Approval Letter

Denial Letter

Target Date: Resubmittal to City – August 5, 2020

Item	Response
Zoning Ordinance and Scottsdale Revise Code Significant Issues	
Building Elevations	
<p>1. The roof plan provided with the resubmittal indicates that the maximum 30% coverage for mechanical equipment and screening is being exceeded. The roof plan fails to correctly indicate that parapet walls at the edge of the building, which exceed the maximum height of 48 feet, should be included in the 30% max. calculation. Please revise the roof plan to include all areas exceeding 48 feet in the coverage calculation. NOTE: This may require an amendment to the building height development standard. If so, please also provide a revised legislative draft of the amended standards. Refer to Section 5.005.1 of the Zoning Ordinance.</p>	<p>The roof plan has been revised to include the parapet walls as areas exceeding 48 feet in the coverage calculations. 30% is not exceeded.</p>
<p>2. In the 1st submittal, tall walls were indicated along the 70th Street frontage that actually appeared to be architectural features. The 2nd submittal relabels the walls as architectural features; however, the proposed amended development standards do not reflect the location of the wall(s) as an encroachment into the required minimum setback along 70th Street. Please revise the proposed amended development standards to acknowledge the location of the architectural feature. Refer to Section 1.305 of the Zoning Ordinance.</p>	<p>Sec. 5.5005.G.1.b. in the proposed amended development standards has been updated to include the architectural features and now reads:</p> <p>G. <i>Encroachment beyond the building envelope.</i></p> <p>1. A maximum encroachment of fifteen (15) feet may be allowed for:</p> <p>a. Architectural ornaments and similar features, and</p> <p>b. Trellis, canopies, balconies, patios and partial or full patio enclosures, covered walks, ARCHITECTURAL FEATURE WALLS, and screen walls.</p> <p>Revised Amended Development Standards included with resubmittal. Added to PUD section of Narrative as well.</p>
Significant Policy Related Issues	
Traffic Impact Mitigation Analysis (TIMA)	
<p>3. From 1st review, Trip Generation – prior existing scenario – please remove this comparison as the most recent existing land uses are a church and landscape business. FYI, the ITE definition of LUC 841 may include a service center. Additionally, consider LUC 942 or 943 for an</p>	<p>TIMA has been approved.</p>

Item	Response
independent service center and LUC 949 for a car wash.	
4. From 1 st review, Trip Distribution – The trip distribution on arterial routes varies 8%-19% depending on the direction and time of day, suggesting that the generated trips are heavily influenced by pass- by or diverted trips. Trips to and from residential land uses often are not pass-by or diverted. Please revise distribution.	TIMA has been approved.
5. From 1 st review, the 70 th Street driveway was shifted towards the alley, or is replacing the alley depending on the site plan provided with the first submittal. If the proposal is to modify the alley, which may require purchasing right-of-way and creating a shared access easement with the adjacent property owner and the City, please include volumes from the adjacent parcel and evaluate changes in circulation. If an alley modification is not proposed, please shift driveway further south as previously indicated. Consider aligning with parking garage access on property to the west.	TIMA has been approved.
Engineering	
6. It does not appear the new location for refuse collection, specifically the angle, can meet the required turning radii. It also appears the new location does not provide the required 60 feet of clearance in front of the compactors, and it is unclear if the 14-foot clearance along the refuse truck path of service is being provided. Please revise the site plan accordingly to address these issues. Refer to Section 2-1.309 of the DSPM:	The Refuse location has been revised to accommodate the clearances required for vehicles to access and service the compactors. The site plan indicates a 20' clear vertical clearance at the main drive. All other areas of the refuse truck path of service will be open to sky.

SOUTHDALE - RESPONSE ASSIGNMENTS – 1st Review Letter dated May 22, 2020**5-ZN-2020***Resubmittal Date: July 1, 2020*

Item	Response
General Plan and Character Area Plan Analysis	
<p>1. The purpose of the PUD district is to promote the goals and policies of the General Plan, Character Area Plans and design guidelines in areas of the City that are designated by the General Plan to be in a development pattern of mixed-use horizontal or vertical design. As submitted, the proposal includes 267 dwelling units on 4.7 acres (56.8 du/ac) and 10,800 square feet of non-residential use within 285,240 square feet of total building area (1.5% of the site devoted to non-residential use), and 36,227 square feet of open space (77% more than required by ordinance). The following is a comparison of approved PUD developments located within the Scottsdale Road/McDowell Road Growth Area:</p> <p>a. The McDowell (12-ZN-2018)</p> <p>b. Alexan (21-ZN-2018)</p> <p>c. South Scottsdale Mixed-Use (6-ZN-2016)</p> <p>d. Scottsdale Entrada (5-ZN-2016)</p> <p>e. Tom/Scot (2-ZN-2012)</p> <p>f. Las Aguas (8-ZN-2012)</p> <p>The following projects with zoning other than PUD provide additional density comparison within the context area:</p> <p>g. Skye On McDowell (18-ZN-2015 and 16-ZN-2016)</p> <p>h. Aire on McDowell (15-ZN-2015)</p> <p>i. Papago Plaza (6-ZN-2018)</p>	<p>The projects listed by the City each have different attributes to consider. Southdale has the following attributes that set it apart from other PUD developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 5,500 s.f. of non-residential space including Hawkins corporate headquarters, URBO Market and Motor Mile Community room. This equates to 1.9% of the total building area as non-residential, which is greater than The McDowell and Tom Scot. Both Tom Scot and South Scottsdale Mixed Use included (with City Staff agreement) leasing, fitness and residential amenities in their “non-residential” calculations so it’s not apples to apples.• 33% open space is proposed for Southdale, which is greater than all other PUD projects listed plus Southdale includes a 4,300 s.f. public plaza along 70th Street adjoining the URBO Market and Motor Mile Community Room.• Southdale is proposing a wrap concept with structured parking (with less impact on urban heat island) vs. the surface parked residential concepts approved for The McDowell and Alexan developments <p>Papago Plaza is zoned PCD and is approved up to 65 feet in height. The residential component is bifurcated from the non-residential uses and does not include physically intergraded commercial uses with the residential product. Based on the residential parcel only the density is more accurately 47.8 du/ac with 18.7% open space.</p>
<p>1. The General Plan (Land Use Element Goal 3, bullet 2; Goal 4, bullets 1 thru 5 and Goal 9, bullets 1,2 and 4) and the Southern Scottsdale Character Area Plan (SSCAP) (Land Use Chapter Policy LU 5.2.1, and Character & Design Chapter Goal CD2) emphasize the importance of providing a balance of uses, both residential and non-residential, in this location of the City as part of the Mixed-Use Neighborhoods Land Use Designation. Furthermore, the General Plan (Land Use Element, Goal 5,</p>	<p>Goals and policies addressed in revised project narrative.</p> <p>Note that LU Policy 5.2.2. more accurately describes the site (SkySong Regional Center).</p>

Item	Response
<p>bullet 6 and Goal 7, bullet 5; Open Space & Recreation Element Goal 1, bullet 9; Growth Areas Element Goal 3 and Community Mobility Element Goal 9, bullet 8) and SSCAP (Character & Design Chapter Goals CD2, CD5 and CD7; Open Space & Recreation Chapter Goal OSR2) both note the importance of open space areas and how they are a community amenity that provide ideal buffering between new and existing developments. With the next submittal, please respond to the above goals and policies as well as staff's comments below:</p>	
<p>a. The proposal includes a request for 56.8 du/ac, which would be the highest density PUD development within the Scottsdale/McDowell Roads Growth Area; an area with a current average density of 37 du/ac for PUD districts. Comparatively within the Old Town area, development proposals for densities in excess of 50 du/ac must abide by Bonus Provisions that require demonstration of a public benefit to the community. With the next submittal, please consider reducing the maximum density to one that is closer to the 37 du/ac average that is found within the Scottsdale/McDowell Roads Growth Area. Furthermore, please identify the public amenities that would be provided by the proposed development to mitigate the proposed density and amended development standards.</p>	<p>See response under first comment above. Additionally, the density of a 56.8 du/ac development is 32 units above what would be permitted as a base density in Downtown at 50 du/ac.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.7 gross acres * 50 du/ac = 235 • 4.7 gross acres * 56.8 du/ac = 267 units • 32 units in excess of 50 du/ac would equate to \$422k if the Special Improvement Bonus formula applied. <p>In this circumstance, the public amenities proposed with this project exceed the value of the “buy-up” fee that would be applied if the property were in Downtown.</p> <p>Estimates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Room: \$287,349 • Public Plaza: \$456,307 • Total: 743,656
<p>b. Although the landscape plan provides plantings that conform to the McDowell Road Streetscape Design Guidelines, it appears to be lacking an enhanced appearance at the northeast corner of 70th Street & McDowell. Newer development along this stretch of McDowell Road have incorporated enhanced corner treatments to their landscape design (Skye and Aire on McDowell to the west of this site). With the next submittal, please consider providing an enhanced landscape treatment and open space area to enhance contextual continuity.</p>	<p>Southdale's 4,300+/- s.f. public plaza along 70th provides more meaningful, usable open space available for public use and serves in connection with the URBO market and community room to benefit the neighboring residents. The 70th Street location was selected to provide a separation from McDowell Road. The K. Hov -Skye corner open space area does not interface with pedestrians in the same manner; it's difficult to even see the open space area because it duals as a recessed retention basin, which therefore requires guardrails.</p> <p>Furthermore, enhanced landscaping has been incorporated at the northeast corner of 70th Street and McDowell Road which includes an accent plant palette that is differentiated from the other site plantings and</p>

Item	Response
	<p>site furnishings. In addition to an enhanced landscape treatment, the proposed building design includes architectural features that provide visual interest and enhance the intersection/entrance to the site. The public amenities and public open space for this project are intended to be a shared benefit for the existing adjacent residents, not to draw additional traffic from McDowell Road. These spaces are intentionally located off of 70th Street so that it's a safer and more functional space, protected from the busy traffic and noise of McDowell Road. Additional enhancements will be provided to the public amenities and public open spaces because pedestrians are more likely to occupy these areas, rather than the busy intersection corner. The enhanced landscaping, site furnishings and architectural features will provide an increased presence to the corner of 70th Street and McDowell Road.</p>
<p>c. Page 19 of the narrative states that the development plan "incorporated mature landscaping that acts as a buffer". However, the north and west edges of the subject site that would be most affected by the proposed amended development standards lack a landscape buffer. As made apparent by the #5 Transitions Section on the Transitions Plan, the proposed amended development standards will have a large impact on the adjacent multi-family development to the west and north. It appears the majority of the area adjacent to the proposed building face is calculated as "Open Space", consisting of only a fire lane and hardscape. Furthermore, it appears the only visual buffering provided is a wall that extends 332 feet on the west side (north/south) and 230 feet on the north side (east/west). With the next submittal, please provide a minimum five-foot wide landscape buffer along the north and west edges of the subject site, as proposed in the graphic below (Refer to Section 10.501.H.1 of the Zoning Ordinance). This would match what is provided on the Dwell Apartments site; thus creating a more meaningful buffer and softening the transition between new and existing development.</p>	<p>Site plan changes have been made in response to several planning comments regarding circulation, setbacks, fire access, landscaping and outdoor living area. The parking garage and attached residential building have been shifted 15'-0" to the east. This shift allows better circulation and maneuverability for fire trucks, creates an exterior pedestrian circulation path, exterior living area for units and accommodates a 5'-0" landscape planter along the west wall/property line. The trash and recycling compactor facility has been moved indoors and will not have a visual impact on the public way or internal drives. Most importantly, making this shift increases the building setback from 20'-0" to 38'-6" for a length of 157 linear feet along the west property line adjacent to the Dwell property. The setback not only mitigates visual impact on the neighboring residential parcel but it also creates a shift in the façade plane, resulting in a better elevation and façade design. Please refer to sheet A-102 for the revised site plan.</p> <p>Overall, landscaping has been incorporated where feasible. After reviewing alternative shared fire lane access with the Fire Department, unfortunately, it has been determined that the 24' wide fire lane shall be maintained on-site.</p> <p>The fire lane will be grass-crete or similar with pedestrian connectivity.</p>

Item	Response
	(Enclave and Raintree Mixed Use examples).
<p>d. The proposal is to devote 1.5% of the total floor area as non-residential uses. By comparison, PUD developments within the Scottsdale/McDowell Roads Growth Area have devoted an average of nearly 3% of the overall floor area to non-residential uses. In reviewing the floor area allocated for residential and non-residential uses as compared to recent PUD development noted previously, Southdale appears to be at the lower end of the mix of uses within the project. Please consider increasing the non-residential floor area, to further align with some of the previous PUD approvals in this Growth Area, and to create a more vibrant mixed-use environment. Although a market study was provided that suggests the proposed use mix is appropriate to the context market and its associated demand, the market study contemplates 8,000 square feet of non-residential use (retail/office) as opposed to that proposed by the site plan and Parking Master Plan (4,400 square feet of retail/office). Please note that the 8,000 square feet of non-residential use discussed in the market study, if provided by this proposal, would equate to 2.8% of the total floor area of this development; which is a comparable amount of non-residential floor area within the PUD that is consistent to previously approved projects within the context area.</p>	<p>Southdale is at 1.9% but we also have public plaza space. 5,500 s.f. is the correct number (3,300 commercial office, 1,100 URBO, 1,100 Motor Mile Community Room).</p> <p>Comparison: As noted in first comment above.</p>
<p>2. The project site is within a 2001 General Plan-designated Growth Area. As such, please respond to General Plan Growth Area Element Goal 1, bullet 3 as well as SSCAP Public Services & Facilities Policy PSF 3.3.</p>	<p>Growth Area Goal 1, bullet 3 was previously addressed. SSCAP PSF 3.3 regarding the undergrounding of 69kV or lower voltage powerlines (where feasible) is being reviewed further by the City and Development Team.</p>
<p>3. Both the General Plan (Land Use element Goals 5 and 9, Growth Areas Element Goal 2 and Community Mobility Element Goal 8) and SSCAP (Character & Design Goal CD2, Neighborhood Revitalization Goal NR3 and Community Mobility Goals CM2 and CM4) discuss the importance of the pedestrian experience within the development and</p>	<p>Goals and policies addressed in revised project narrative (several of which were previously stated but expanded on with the revision).</p>

Item	Response
between developments. With the next submittal, please respond to the following:	
a. Pedestrian connectivity appears to be lacking on the east side of the property. Provide a six-foot wide pedestrian connection, including pedestrian scale lighting, as indicated in the graphic below.	<i>Pedestrian graphic included with resubmittal.</i> Pedestrian connectivity is addressed through the internal, conditioned corridor which allows direct flow to public frontages.
b. Please consider providing joint access to the property to the east for emergency vehicles, to ensure redundant fire lane access does not occur.	Cross over access is not achievable due to grade change. The developer is open to granting joint access if deemed appropriate.
Zoning Ordinance and Scottsdale Revised Code Significant Issues	
The following code and ordinance related issues have been identified in the first review and shall be addressed with the resubmittal. Addressing these items is critical to scheduling the application for public hearing and may affect the staffs recommendation. Please address the following:	
Zoning/Code	
4. Please acknowledge on site plan that existing overhead wire facilities along and within the project boundary will be relocated underground. Per ALTA, this will be required for the OHE along the alley frontage northwest of the project. Refer to Section 47-80 of the Scottsdale Revised Code.	See response under #2 above.
Project Narrative	
5. Please revise the project narrative to include an explanation of how the proposal meets the PUD approval criteria, and justification for the proposed amended development standards. Refer to Sections 1.303 and 5.5003 of the Zoning Ordinance.	PUD Criteria included with the revised project narrative.
Site Design	
6. Please revise the site plan to indicate a minimum yard depth of 35 feet where parking occurs between the building and the street. This may be reduced subject to DRB approval. Refer to Section 10.402 of the Zoning Ordinance.	We are electing to request DRB approval for the minimum yard depth.
Building Elevations	

Item	Response
<p>7. The building elevations indicate a portion of the building exceeds the maximum allowed height of 48 feet. It is unclear if this is for rooftop mechanical screening. Please note, per Section 5.005.1 of the Zoning Ordinance rooftop appurtenances over 48 feet in height cannot occupy more than 30% of the roof area. Please clarify on the building elevations and provide a roof plan indicating how much roof area is in excess of 48 feet.</p>	<p><i>A roof plan is provided with the resubmittal.</i> The building elevations have been revised to clearly indicate the maximum building height, parapet heights, mechanical heights and rooftop appurtenances. A roof plan sheet with calculations has been provided to indicate the 30% roof area that exceeds 48'-0".</p>
<p>8. From a contextual perspective, this project introduces massing that is not presently represented in the immediate vicinity. Much of the existing residential around this site is either one- or two-story, and the proposed building is four stories all the way around and does not provide a significant transition from the adjacent two-story multi-family to the west and north. The transition is further diminished by the proposed amended development standards. To create a more substantial transition between this project and the adjacent multi-family residential, please revise the applicable plans to reduce the height of the northern most portion of the building to a maximum of three stories. Refer to Section 5.5003.C of the Zoning Ordinance.</p>	<p>Although we believe that 48'-0" is an appropriate building height, in response to concerns as to the visual impact to the adjacent property, we made a significant shift to the site plan which provides an additional 15'-0" of building setback along the 157 linear feet of the west facing elevation. This change increases the building setback to 40'-0", provides space for landscape buffering solutions and allows for a pedestrian walkway along the west property edge. The shift also enhances the quality of the west elevation by incorporating a facade plane change of 15'-0", therefore breaking the massing into two sections. The shift in setback mitigates the visual impact on the adjacent Dwell property and results in a better elevation and façade design. On the contrary, the impact to the Dwell property would be far greater under the current zoning standards which allows 36'-0" of commercial building with up to 20'-0" of mechanical screening. From the public way along 70th Street, the building mass is not perceivable based on the current massing and landscaping on the Dwell property.</p>
<p>Significant Policy and Design Related Issues</p>	
<p>Site Design</p>	
<p>9. There appears to be a missed opportunity along the east end of the building closest to McDowell Road. If there are at-grade patios along this frontage, there is no opportunity for residents to exit the patios and have a designated path to McDowell Road. If there are at-grade patios, please revise the site plan and circulation plan to indicate an additional sidewalk connection on the west side of the drive aisle.</p>	<p>Not achievable due to grade change.</p>
<p>Building Elevations</p>	

Item	Response
<p>10. The proposed tall walls along the 70th Street frontage are identified as "site walls", though they appear to be architectural features of the proposed building design. If they are architectural building features, please clarify on the plans. If they are site walls, please note site walls are generally limited to a height of eight feet. Please revise amended development standards accordingly if they are affected by architectural features. Refer to the Plan and Report Requirements for Development Applications (PRRDA) and Section 1.305.A of the Zoning Ordinance.</p>	<p>The site plan has been updated to identify these walls as 'architectural feature walls.'</p>
<p>11. Architecturally integrated balconies are encouraged by both the Sensitive Design Principles and the Commercial Design Guidelines. With the next submittal, please provide more details and information for proposed balconies confirming compliance with this design aesthetic.</p>	<p>Current elevation sheets in the submittal package are conceptual in nature. Details have not been developed for the balconies and patios at this point in the design process. As this project moves forward in design development, a mixture of recessed and projected balconies will be used at the appropriate locations on the building. A variation of balcony expressions will be used to create visual interest and unique expressions along the façade. The design of these balconies will always be integrated specifically into the adjacent design elements and materials of the building façade.</p>
<p>12. Please provide additional details demonstrating how exterior window glazing will be shaded by the building overhangs or by shade devices on the east, south and west elevations. Provide section drawings that describe the shad/shadow that will be accomplished by the proposed shade devices, given the vertical dimension of the wall opening. Devices should have a density of 75% or greater to maximize effectiveness. Refer to Sensitive Principle 9.</p>	<p>Current elevation sheets in the submittal package are conceptual in nature. Details have not been developed for the window systems at this point in the design process. As this project moves forward in design development, our intent is to address the Sensitive Design Principle 9 by placing balcony overhangs over large glazed openings and reducing the size of punched windows that will also be recessed to the back side of the wall. Based on the continued development of these passive solar strategies, we feel like the elevations submitted for later DRB approval will adequately address all concerns of solar sustainability.</p>
<p>13. Please revise the Material & Color Board to include tones more representative of the surrounding desert context. As proposed, the building facade includes large areas of what appears to be bright white. Refer to Sensitive Design Principle 9.</p>	<p>The current color palette for the project is responsive to both its built and historical context. This site is located in an area that has a strong design history rooted in mid-century modern. This is evidenced in the design of the single family and multi-family projects directly adjacent to the site. There is very little visual connection to the context of the Sonoran Desert. We feel that a palette that has some white and gray content that is compliant with required LRV values, mixed in with natural materials and accent colors derived from desert flora, is the appropriate design response</p>

Item	Response
	specific to this site. This design response is based directly off input from neighbors and the south Scottsdale community. It was made clear to us that neighbors desire a design that is uniquely expressive to its specific location and history.
Lighting Design	
14. Please confirm no building mounted fixture will be mounted higher than 16 feet (balcony lighting excluded). Refer to the Exterior Lighting Policy in the DSPM.	Building mounted light fixtures will have a maximum mounting height of 16'-0".
Drainage	
15. The preliminary Drainage Report has not been accepted. Please revise to reflect/address the following:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note that the storm water storage requirement is to provide either a) pre- vs. post-project runoff volume for a 100-year, 2-hour storm or b) the first flush event, whichever is greater. Any area that is considered "true rooftop" (no amenities) can be subtracted from the first flush calculation. 	Pre vs. Post calculation added and results in a required volume of 0 CF. First flush volume is still used. True Rooftop area subtracted from first flush volume.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flows must be calculated using approved methodology, namely the FCDMS's methodology for the modified Rational Method (not TR-55). 	Offsite flows calculated with FCDMC DDMSW HEC-1 Modeling. TR-55 method no longer used.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to verify that the underground storm water storage tanks (USST's) have sufficient storage. Since the proposed USST's consist of long storm drain pipes the pipes may not have sufficient storage when accounting for slope. Please provide calculations to verify. Other comments related specifically to the USST's include the following: 	<p>The provided volume is achieved when the water surface reaches the top of the pipe at the upstream end.</p> <p>The top of the 48" east pipe at the upstream end is 35.80 and the lowest catch basin and/or outfall elevation is 38.23.</p> <p>The top of the 30" west pipe at the upstream end is 39.07 and the lowest catch basin and/or outfall elevation is 41.71.</p> <p>Therefore, 100% of each pipe volume is provided while accounting for slope.</p>
a. Dedicate a public drainage easement that extends a minimum of five feet from the edge of the pipe (show on G&D plan).	Shown on plan. Will be dedicated with CD submittal.
b. Provide a minimum of two access points for each USST pipe.	Two manholes added to each USST.
c. Discuss why the USST's cannot drain to the existing storm	Upon re-reviewing as-builts there is no evidence of 18" storm drain in McDowell. The only line is the 18" SRP irrigation line. SRP will not allow

Item	Response
drain in McDowell Road.	bleed off into their pipe. Additionally, the irrigation line is higher than the underground retention.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please revise the Onsite Drainage Map as follows: 	
a. Show existing and proposed contours	Contours shown.
b. Adjust linework so it is easier to decipher; linework that is not pertinent to drainage should be screened back (comment also applies to Inlet Area Exhibit).	Proposed improvements screened back on both exhibits.
c. Label emergency overflow locations for each USST; provide drainage arrows to show where emergency flows go.	Emergency outfalls labeled.
d. Label 100-yr flows leaving the site.	100-year flows added with the outfall locations.
Engineering	
16. Please adjust the internal drive aisle curb to allow service vehicle movement and confirm minimum, per turning template, and confirm minimum 25-foot vertical clearance over compactor locations. Refer to Section 2-1.309 of the DSPM and graphic below.	The site plan has been updated to illustrate the minimum curb radii for service vehicle movement. A minimum 25'-0" vertical clearance will be provided over compactors.
17. Please revise the site plan to indicate a new transit shelter and associated infrastructure near the intersection of 70th Street and McDowell Road. Also provide Transit Shelter Easement if any portion is on the project site. See graphic below and refer to Sections 5-6.000 and 5-6.100 of the DSPM, and Standard details 2263-1 and 2268 for specifications.	In our discussion with the Transportation Department on 6/2, P. Kercher stated that we are required to provide a pad, bench, trash receptacle and bike rack only. No shelter is required. The site plan has been updated to indicate location of these requirements within the right-of-way.
Circulation	
18. According to the site plan, there appears to be a "new site wall", as well as a portion of the proposed building in the required corner safety triangle at the intersection of 70th Street and McDowell. Additionally, the site wall appears to be within the City right-of-way. Please revise site plan accordingly to eliminate these encroachments. See graphic below and refer to Section 5- 3.122.2 of the DSPM.	The site plan has been revised so that the proposed building and new architectural feature walls are not encroaching on the safety triangle and City right-of-way.
19. Please provide a minimum 75-foot separation between the proposed site driveway on 70th Street	Per 6/5/2020 email from City Transportation following the 6/2/2020 meeting: "We are willing to accept the driveway separation as is..."

Item	Response
and the existing alley intersection (measured to the centerlines of both). If the existing site driveway location is moved north, there needs to be a discussion regarding modification of the existing traffic calming island. Refer to Section 5-3.123 of the DSPM.	
20. Please provide a minimum 75-foot separation between the proposed site driveway on McDowell Road and the existing driveway to the east (measured to centerlines of both). Refer to Section 5-3.123 of the DSPM.	Per 6/5/2020 email from City Transportation following the 6/2/2020 meeting: "We are also willing to accept the driveway spacing on McDowell given that it is basically an existing condition."
21. Please revise the site plan and circulation plan to indicate a minimum 8-foot wide sidewalk detached from street curb along the McDowell Road frontage. Refer to Sections 5-3.110, 2-1.312 and 5-8.300 of the DSPM.	The Southdale development plan has been revised to accommodate 8-ft detached sidewalks.
Traffic Impact Mitigation Analysis (TIMA)	
22. Page 9, 68th Street and McDowell Road -please correct to indicate northbound and southbound approaches have a right-turn lane (shared with bicyclists).	Revised.
23. Page 10, Section 3.3 -Please correct to indicate retail and hotel land uses south of the site.	Revised.
24. The collision history should include the intersection of 70th Street and McDowell Road, as well as the 70th Street segment north of McDowell Road.	Included.
25. Trip Generation, prior existing scenario -Please eliminate this comparison as the most recent existing land uses are a church and a landscape business. FYI, the ITE definition of LUC 841 may include a service center. For further information, consider LUC 942 or 943 for an independent service center and LUC 948 or 949 for a carwash.	This calculation is provided to compare a relatively recent prior use.
26. Trip Generation, existing scenario:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The landscape business trip generation estimate seems oversimplified and overestimated. All persons enter in separate vehicles and have separate work vehicles? No 	Provided clarification and more details on existing landscape business operations.

Item	Response
<p>car-pooling? No one staying on-site? All trips occurring within one hour? Two aerial photos reviewed from 2018 show fewer than 60 work vehicles at the site (day/time unknown). If including trip generation of the peak hour of generator, which is not required by City staff, provide counts and documentation where available. Estimates should be evaluated and adjusted where appropriate to be used in the engineering document.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trip generation of existing use is not shown for the required AM and PM peak hours of adjacent street. 	<p>Included.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since traffic counts were collected at two of the three driveways during the street peak hours (AM: 8 in/5 out, PM: 2 in, 15 out), it may be appropriate to use these volumes to estimate trip generation. Was the 3" driveway counted? 	<p>Included counts for all three driveways.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please do not compare peak hour of adjacent street of proposed land use with other land use's peak hour generator as it is not the peak hour of the street. 	<p>Provided text clarifying the difference in peak times.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sign on-site indicates the church, two arms of the landscape company and Papago Crossfit. Should the fitness center be added to the existing trip generation? 	<p>Confirmed that fitness center is no longer operating on site.</p>
<p>27. Trip Distribution:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The trip distribution on arterial routes vary 8-19% depending on the direction and time of day, suggesting that the generated trips are heavily influenced by pass-by or diverted trips. Trips to/from residential land uses are often not pass-by or diverted. Please revise distribution. 	<p>Trip distribution was based on existing traffic patterns from actual traffic counts collected since much of the traffic pattern during peak hours are drivers generally headed to and from work/home.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would trips to/from north via 68th Street be more likely to occur on 70th Street via the full access driveway? 	<p>We reevaluated north distribution.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10% for 68th Street to/from the south? Is this to College Avenue, Curry Road or Mill Avenue? 	<p>We reevaluated south distribution.</p>

Item	Response
28. The TIMA did not evaluate the need for an EB/WB left turn phase at 70th Street and McDowell Road as was directed. The existing ~115-foot EB left turn lane may need to be extended and/or left turn phase added due to increased turning volume.	Included.
29. The 70th Street driveway was shifted toward the existing alley or is replacing the alley depending on the site plan provided. If the proposal is to modify the alley, which may require purchasing right of way and creating a shared access easement with the adjacent property owner and the City, please include volumes from the adjacent parcel and evaluate changes to circulation. If not, shift driveway further south as previously indicated. Consider aligning with parking garage access of property on the west side of 70th Street.	Per 6/5/2020 email from City Transportation following the 6/2/2020 meeting: "We are willing to accept the driveway separation as is..."
Parking Master Plan	
30. This site is fronting McDowell Road and 70th Street, neither of which allow for on-street parking. The study identifies 85 (weekday) and 122 (weekend) parking spaces available for guests, however this is not practical. Any overflow parking will likely shift to the neighborhood streets to the north, resulting in complaints and on-going issues.	Additional parking detailed in the updated Parking Master Plan (20 extra spaces provided).
31. The ULI shared parking and ITE requirements cited are too low. They are likely more appropriate for dense cities with more alternative mode use.	ULI rates are based on a mix of land uses of which urban uses represent a portion of the data. ITE rates used were for general urban/suburban areas.
32. There appears to be some discrepancies in the calculations in "Table 3 -Shared Parking Calculations". See next page and revise as needed.	Table revised.
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:	
Site Design	

Item	Response
<p>33. The proposed Parking Master Plan appears to exacerbate the lack of guest parking for the residential portion of the project. As proposed, the site plan only seems to indicate 8 undesignated parking spaces, which presumably are being provided for the commercial uses. Visitors to the site are going to have a difficult time finding parking onsite and will therefore resort to parking in the adjacent single-family neighborhood, as both side of 70th Street are marked with "No Parking" signs. Please consider increasing on-site parking to accommodate visitor parking for the residential and modify Parking Master Plan accordingly.</p>	<p>Additional parking which detailed in the updated Parking Master Plan.</p>
<p>Technical Corrections</p>	
<p>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:</p>	
<p>Drainage</p>	
<p>34. In the drainage report, please discuss the clogging factors used when sizing the catch basins.</p>	<p>Added to Hydraulic Parameters in section 4.</p>
<p>35. Please note: this project will require a full Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, including both the erosion control plan and the report itself.</p>	<p>Will include with CD submittal.</p>
<p>36. Please note the final design plan must address additional USST requirements as indicated in the DSPM, including but not limited to the following:</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration of a minimum 75-year life for the entire system, including the lining and coating of the USST. 	<p>Will include with CD submittal.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smooth interior floor per Supplement to MAG Detail #2554. 	<p>Will include with CD submittal.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An O&M manual. 	<p>Will include with CD submittal.</p>

Item	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Location signs at each end of the USST. 	Will include with CD submittal.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A signed and notarized ownership responsibility statement acknowledging that the owner is responsible for maintenance, repair and potential replacement of the USST. 	Will include with CD submittal.
Circulation	
37. Please note: A streetlight will be required on 70th Street, approximately midway between the north and south property lines.	Streetlight added and shown on grading plans.
38. Please revise the site plan to indicate a Non-Motorized Public Access Easement over any portion of street sidewalk that extends onto the project site (if applicable).	Easement added and shown on grading plans. Will be dedicated with CD submittal.
Fire	
39. Please revise the site plan to indicate the location of the Fire Department Connection and Fire Riser Room (Fire Ordinance 4283, 912 and Section 6-1.504 of the DSPM). Also refer to the red lined site plan in the internet folder for additional comments.	The FDC and fire riser room locations have been noted on the site plan as requested.
Other	
40. The preliminary water and sewer Basis of Design (BOD) Reports have been conditionally accepted. Please address the following in the final BO D's as part of the DRB submittal (some comments will be stipulated and are so noted:	Noted.
Water	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stipulation: The new proposed 8-inch water loop shall connect to the existing 6-inch line at the northeast corner with an isolation valve. 	Connection added and shown on plans. Valve is located at the tee in the 8" waterline.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise the domestic water demand values to the gpm values listed in Chapter 6 of the DSPM. 	GPM water demand values used. Calculations and models updated.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirm new water meter sizing. If 3-inch or larger call out on utility plan that a meter vault will be provided, per COS Detail 2345. 	Water meter is 4". Callout for vault added to utility plan.

Item	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main connection to 70th Street will require a full 8 X 8 tee. 	Plans updated to include tee at both connections.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connections to existing ACP mains will require a portion of the mainline to be replaced with DIP, per Section 6-1.408 and 6-1.413 of the DSPM (2 connections, 70th and McDowell). 	Plans revised for both connections to replace ACP waterline 6-ft on each side of connection.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Address all comments on the utility plan. 	Only these written comments provided.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The minimum easement width required for water lines is 14 feet (currently called out as 12 feet). 	Easement width updated.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on hydrant flow test provided, there are no capacity concerns; however, water modeling included is invalid and will need to be revised. Set reservoir HGL for each scenario using supply curve point from hydrant flow test at required fire flow (or use pump that changes dynamically to simulate supply curve). Fire flow should only be split to a maximum of two worst-case hydrants for modeling purposes. 	<p>WaterCAD model revised with a pump and curve determined from flow tests.</p> <p>Fire flow split between two worst case hydrants.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider tying proposed 8-inch water loop at northwest corner to existing dead-end 8-inch public line in community to the north (120 feet of water line vs. 300+ feet of new water line). 	Per our conversation, there is not room in alley for connection.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Call out existing water meter sizes on utility plan, and indicate what is proposed for the existing meters and fire line. 	Water meter sizes unknown. One water meter to remain for landscape. Other water meter and fire line will be removed. Callouts added to plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirm fire flow required. Proposed value seems too high. 	Fire flow revised using 75% reduction for automatic sprinklers. The minimum fire flow of 2,500 gpm for high rise buildings per City of Scottsdale was used.
Sewer	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stipulation: All on-site sewer and pool backwash shall be routed to the sewer running north and parallel to and east of 70th Street (no waste flows to McDowell Road sewer). 	Noted. (Stipulation already met with last submittal).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stipulation: Pool backwash flow shall be equalized and limited to 50 GPM peak into the proposed 8-inch public sewer. Use of cartridge filter is not an acceptable solution for reducing/eliminating backwash flows. Refer to the page following the cover page of the BOD for guidance on 	<p>The pool backwash was limited to 5 GPM in the last submittal. This flow rate remains.</p> <p>Equalization tank is used, no mention of Cartridge filter. Sizing of tank will be performed with CD submittal.</p>

Item	Response
information to be provided in the final BOD and/or plans on how to equalize this flow.	Nothing received other than written comments for guidance.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stipulation: Off-site construction required. One new manhole and sewer line segment to be added on Palm Lane, approximately 124 feet east of 71st Street centerline. Refer to Option 1 in BOD. Line segment shall be angled 45 degrees to join manholes. Line segment will be approximately 8 feet in length. Rework receiving manhole base to accept re-routed flow and plug both ends of existing line segment. 	Report updated to reflect stipulation. This was also option 1 in the previous submittal. Segment angle changed to 45 degrees. "Option 2" from previous submittal is removed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All new connections to the public sewer shall be minimum 6 inch per Section 440-3 of MAG. Call out on utility plan. 	Sewer Connection will be 8" into existing manhole. MAG detail does not apply.

From: [Julia English](#)
To: [Hemby, Karen](#)
Subject: Julia English 434-PA-2020 and 435-PA-2020
Date: Friday, May 29, 2020 1:00:54 PM

External Email: Please use caution if opening links or attachments!

Hi Karen,

Thank you again for your support and kindness.

Paint information:

Body-Sherwin Williams Leisure Blue SW 6515
Trim-Sherwin Williams Evening Shadow SW 7662

Windows-Window World

9 total windows-no grid white frame

7-3000 series single slide-no vent lock
2-3000 series 3-Lite Slider (1/4 1/2 1/4)

Window glass

9-SolarZone Sun Shield

I hope this information is helpful.

Have a great weekend!

Julia