



Correspondence Between Staff and Applicant

Approval Letter

Denial Letter



May 29, 2020

Bryan Cluff
Senior Planner
City of Scottsdale
7447 E. Indian School Rd
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

**RE: 4-GP-2019 & 14-ZN-2019
Seventh Day Adventist Rezoning**

Dear Mr. Cluff:

The following are our responses to staff's comments dated January 3, 2020 regarding Seventh-day Adventists Rezoning (Case # 4-GP-2019 & 14-ZN-2019).

2001 General Plan and Greater Airpark Character Area Analysis:

Sensitive Design Concept Plan:

1. In accordance with zoning ordinance section 7.820. and Table 7.820.A., zoning applications requesting the Planned Airpark Core (PCP) district require a Sensitive Design Concept Plan and Proposed Design Guidelines. In this case, with the site plan generalized to the level of a conceptual bubble diagram, these guidelines will be integral to ensuring future development that is compatible and complimentary to the adjacent community.

The Sensitive Design Guidelines are expected to be applied throughout the community and are structured to respond to the varying conditions and constraints inherent to individual site and contextual settings. To this end, the second submittal included a Sensitive Design Concept Plan and Proposed Guidelines. However, in that document, it suggests in its preface "The proposed development plan will *attempt* to meet the City of Scottsdale's Sensitive Design Concept Plan and proposed guidelines mentioned in the Zoning Ordinance", and concludes with, "The City's design principles are as follows with *minor amendments*".

For purposes of transparency with the public, please communicate in a resubmittal what unique constraint inherent to this site would support a future amendment to the Sensitive Design Guidelines (as amended March 2001). Please also revise the language to state "*will*" meet, rather than "*attempt to*" meet the guidelines.

Response: Revised to address this comment. The proposal *will* meet the City's Sensitive Design Guidelines.

2. Please add to the design guidelines that were submitted with the 2nd review to include additional and more specific information for the edge treatments adjacent to the single- family neighborhoods and N. Scottsdale Road. Additional detail may include but should not be limited to: Landscape palettes, typical street sections showing sidewalks, trails, & landscaping, pedestrian shading details & concepts, and lighting (reference COS lighting design guidelines).

Response: Additional design guidelines depicting staff's comments are a part of this resubmittal.

Citizen Involvement:

3. As a response to Goal 1 of the Community Involvement Element, with a resubmittal, please provide an updated Citizen Involvement Report that describes the key issues that have been identified through the public involvement process.

Response: Included in the resubmittal.

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:

3. Comment #8 in the 1st review comment letter is regarding conversion of existing residential uses on the property (dormitories) to future density on the property. Per subsequent conversations, it may be acceptable based on ratios provided in the zoning ordinance (R4-R Section 5.904) that the existing 338 dormitories may be equivalent to approximately 240 residential dwelling units ($338 \times 0.71 = 240$). Please revise the application to include a maximum of 240 future dwelling units on the property. Please note – if approved under the current application, these units would be subject to discontinuation of the use of the existing dormitory facilities on the property and subject to future City Council approval of the site plan for any units that are within the Phase III area of the property.

Response: So noted. The Land Use Budget has been updated.

4. The exhibits submitted with the development plan as well as the engineering plans identify a future parcel line that appears to divide Phases I and II from Phase III. Please provide site data information for each parcel to confirm conformance with the development standard requirements for each parcel. If each parcel cannot stand alone a Planned Shared Development (PSD) Overlay may be necessary.

Response: No parcel lines are intended with this project. The Property owners intend to long term lease the non-school and religious campus property. Any current or future property lines will conform to the required development standard requirements.

5. The conceptual site plan includes a proposed 60' wide landscape buffer along the south and east property lines in accordance with the requirements of zoning ordinance section 5.4007. Please note – installation of the perimeter landscape buffer for the whole property will likely be required to be completed with Phase I of development and include landscape improvements up to back of the planned curb.

Response: We respectfully request to improve the perimeter landscaping with each phase. If Phase One consists of development primarily west of the existing religious and educational campus, then we would propose stipulations for perimeter landscaping in that area of the site per the approved plans. If the more industrial/hangar/office flex development north of the campus develops as Phase One, then we'd install the perimeter landscaping along that phase of development. For consideration of the landscape buffer along the campus portion of the Property, we respectfully ask that the existing wall and landscaping on Sutton be a part of the required buffer. For buffer along Miller Rd., we request that the existing oleander hedge be a

part of the landscape buffer. Also, we request that any ballfield or playfield area, including future expansion of these play areas to the east (west side of oleander hedge) be considered a part of the 60 foot buffer.

Circulation:

6. With the resubmittal, please include an update as to the status of the driveway connection through the City-owned park-n-ride facility. This access location is integral to the vehicular circulation plan as currently proposed and requires coordination between multiple government agencies, and the property owner, to allow access rights through the facility. Preliminary approval of this access point, including the key points of the agreement must be resolved prior to the zoning application moving forward to hearing.

Response: A driveway connection design is a part of this resubmittal.

Engineering:

7. Comment #14 from the 1st review comment letter was regarding Scottsdale Revised Code (SRC) 47-80, requiring undergrounding of existing and proposed overhead wire facilities within the project boundaries. There are existing overhead wire facilities within all three Phases of the proposed development. Overhead facilities within Phase I of the development shall be undergrounded with any permit issuance for new construction in Phase I. The overhead facilities within Phase II and III shall be undergrounded with any permit issuance for new construction in Phase II.

Response: So noted.

Drainage:

8. The conceptual drainage report submitted with application has been accepted with stipulations. Please Note: More detailed analysis of pre- vs post-project discharges will be required at the Development Review stage. This analysis must include actual stage-storage routing of inflow hydrographs to verify that outflow hydrographs for the post-project condition do not exceed pre-project discharges. The report will also need to address how the project will meet drainage requirements at the various stages development.

Response: So noted.

Water and Waste Water:

9. Please submit revised Water and Waste Water Design Report(s) addressing the comments identified in the redlined reports.

Response: We (Wood Patel and Tiffany & Bosco) have been in contact with Richard Sacks at the Water Dept. with regards to the BOD review. We have worked through phone calls and emails to address the City's second review comments. Revised BOD's are a part of this resubmittal.

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:

Site Design:

10. The first review comment letter included several comments related to typical site design standards based on the site plan that was provided with the 1st submittal. The 2nd submittal revised the site plan to a more conceptual “bubble” diagram generalizing locations of future uses and building locations. Please note that the comments previously provided are still likely applicable to the site design and will be verified during the Development Review Board submittal with each phase of development. Many of the comments from the first review letter will be included as stipulations to the zoning approval.

Response: So noted. We look forward to discussing all stipulations with City staff at that time.

11. With the next submittal, please provide a long-term disposition plan of the existing water tank structure on site, and its attached communication facilities, for Phase 2. It seems that the existing tank structure will become obsolete during the redevelopment of Phase 2, and the property may be more marketable with the removal of the tank structure. Consider installing alternative concealment options for the existing AT&T wireless facility, which is currently attached to the tank structure, such as artificial palm tree(s) and/or attaching them to the roofs of new buildings. Also, with the next submittal, please provide a plan for the removal of any equipment attached the tank structure that is no longer operable, such as equipment originally installed for Metricom with Conditional Use Permit case 13-UP-2000 (which has long since expired).

Response: Our assumption is that this comment is referring to the next submittal for Phase 2, which would be a Development Review Board submittal. At that time, we will provide the City with an update to status of the water tower and the communications facilities.

Circulation:

12. Please address the following comments related to the submitted TIMA:

a. Signalization is proposed at Scottsdale Road and the existing, northerly site driveway, approximately 665 feet south of Thunderbird Road. Based on the following information, the proposed signal is not acceptable:

(1) DSPM 5-3.123 G2b states “Traffic signals should be spaced no less than 1/2 mile on major arterials and minor arterials, with 1 mile spacing desirable.”

Response: After considerable analysis and cooperation with the City on access through the City’s park & ride facility, we will remove our request for the traffic signal at this driveway. The TIA has been updated to address this staff comment.

(2) The projected 50 percentile queue in 2024 for the northbound through movement approaching Thunderbird Road is projected to extend beyond this driveway during the AM and PM peak hours according to HCM analyses reports in Appendix G.

Response: So noted. The traffic signal request and analysis has been removed from the updated TIA. This is based on the City’s continued efforts to allow cross access through the adjacent park & ride facility.

(3) Preliminary analysis for signalization at this location was suggested when cross- access through the transit center was not considered an option. Since cross- access through the transit center is now being pursued, it is not necessary to make an exception to

the above standards.

Response: So noted. The traffic signal request and analysis has been removed from the updated TIA. This is based on the City's continued efforts to allow cross access through the adjacent park & ride facility.

- b. The TIMA recommends changing the existing, southerly site driveway, approximately 330 feet south of the northerly driveway and 325 feet north of Sutton Drive, from a right-in/right-out access driveway to add left-in access. An exhibit within the application (and not in the TIMA) further depicts the driveway with full access. DSPM 5-3.123 F1a states "Full median openings should occur at not less than 1/4 mile intervals (1320 feet) on major arterial streets. Partial median openings, which allow only left turns off the major street, are acceptable at 1/8 mile spacing (660 feet)". Please revise the TIMA and associated documents to remove the proposed median modification at this driveway.

Response: The revised TIA provides for the current full access at the northern driveway and right-in/right-out access for the southern driveway on Scottsdale Rd. This is based on the City's continued efforts to allow cross access through the adjacent park & ride facility.

- c. Other modifications depicted in the development plan exhibits include a possible median on Thunderbird Road at Access A and addition of median and modifications to Sutton Drive at Driveway D. For Thunderbird Road at Access A, it may be possible and it is recommended to consider restriping to provide a full lane width left-turn refuge should a median be installed. For Sutton Drive at Access D, an acceleration lane/merge condition is not acceptable, and 16 feet of pavement is required adjacent to a median for fire department access.

Response: So noted. We look forward to the final design of these driveways to occur at each phase of development. The initial driveway design on Redfield Rd/Thunderbird Rd. for driveway Access A will be striping. As for Access D on Sutton, the TIA will remove any reference to an acceleration lane for vehicles exiting the site westbound.

- d. If signalization of Driveway B or access change at Driveway C is proposed, a separate analysis should be provided that models conditions without proposed improvements and include justification for proposed exception(s) to Scottsdale's standards.

Response: So noted. The traffic signal request and analysis has been removed from the updated TIA.

- e. With the proposed cross access through the transit center driveway at 73rd Street, a right turn deceleration lane appears to be warranted on the eastbound approach. Please verify traffic volumes and confirm.

Response: So noted. The updated TIA has looked at this condition and does not recommend a deceleration lane.

- f. Trip distribution percentages in Table 4 changed, but do not add to 100% and does not match Figure 5. Volumes in Figure 6 appear to correlate to the percentages in Figure 5. Distribution will likely be influenced on whether or not the proposed signal is allowed.

Response: So noted. The traffic signal request and analysis has been removed from the updated TIA.

g. Analysis:

- (4) Signal progression – Please address the following comments regarding progression analysis results:
 - (a) The analysis appears to only be Scottsdale Road between Thunderbird Road and Access B. If signalization is proposed for Access B, the progression analysis extents should include signals beyond Access B.
 - (b) The time-space diagrams were not found in the Appendix as the TIMA states.
 - (c) If offsets are modified that affect other coordinated corridors (Cactus Road), a grid progression analysis should be provided. Review of the provided TIMA could not determine if such changes were analyzed due to the above.
 - (d) Please provide better labeling for the 2 sections of Table 7 (i.e. existing offsets and timing signalization, with signalization, etc.). It would be helpful to note changes to offsets, if any.
- (5) Projected Site Traffic, Total Traffic, Intersection Capacity Analyses, etc. – The projected total traffic volumes do not appear to match the volumes used in the analyses provided in the appendices. The traffic volumes in the analyses appear to heavily utilize Driveway B and avoid the cross access to the existing 73rd Street signal. Verify traffic volumes in figures and in analyses. Verify levels-of- service tables with provided analysis results.
- (6) Signal Warrant Analysis – A right turn reduction factor is expected for the provided signal warrant assessment. Also, please modify wording to indicate expected conditions were evaluated. Warrant(s) need to be met with counted volumes prior to signalization.

Response: So noted. The traffic signal request and analysis has been removed from the updated TIA. This is based on the City’s continued efforts to allow cross access through the adjacent park & ride facility.

Technical Corrections

The following technical ordinance or policy related corrections have been identified in the second 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:

13. Please update the conceptual site plan and any other documents as applicable to more specifically call out “building height” on the notes that are in reference to building height.

Response: The conceptual site plan has been updated, however, the building height is not specifically called out on this plan. There is a specific ‘Building Heights ‘plan as part of the resubmittal as well as other plans that call out the heights.

14. Please update the conceptual site plan to include the proposed/requested density.

Response: We are not proposing to add residential density above and beyond the removal of the old dilapidated homes and the construction of more efficient homes for teachers and administrators. That modification does not affect the density on the property. The Conceptual Site Plan identifies the removal of the old, existing homes and identifies the potential for 18 new homes in a new location. That is all the residential being proposed at this time. The land use budget demonstrates the number of residential units allowed as a result of the overall rezoning proposal.

15. Rather than the submitted open space plan that shows all areas outside of the development bubbles as open space, please update the conceptual site plan to include the minimum amount of square feet/acreage of open space that will be required in each phase of development, and identify specific areas of the site that must be preserved as open space areas.

Response: We added the open space per zoning district required in the legend on the open space plan. Other than the designated buffers along the residential zoned properties to the south and east along Sutton and Miller Roads, we are not designating any specific areas on the open space plan as the conceptual land use plan, per staff's direction, is a conceptual plan and open space locations are not yet determined.

16. Please revise the site plan to identify a sidewalk along N. Scottsdale Road with a minimum width of 8', in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual.

Response: Revised and noted on the plans.

17. The land use budget provided in the second submittal is not consistent with the project narrative or Phasing Plan. Based on prior discussion, the Phasing Plan should be modified to reflect "Residential Phase 2" as "Residential Phase 3", limited to 215 units. In addition, please provide additional notation (asterisk) for "Residential Phase 3" to include language that does not allow construction of these dwelling units until use of the existing dormitories on campus are discontinued, and shall require City Council approval of the site plan.

Response: Land Use budget has been revised to address this comment.

TIMA:

18. Please review the TIMA for clarity in statements. Some statements may infer things that are not intended. Consider the following:
- a. Page 1 (and elsewhere) does the intersection capacity analysis results of projected mitigated conditions also include cycle length changes (if any) and/or offset changes (if any)? Since these items are discussed in various parts, it is difficult to determine what is recommended and if the analysis of mitigated conditions includes all the recommendations.
 - b. Page 2 (and elsewhere) states that "the City of Scottsdale has indicated that this intersection cannot be signalized..." whereas the same statement is not included regarding Access B.
 - c. Page 2 (and elsewhere) states that the interim scenario of the traffic signal warrant analysis considered the offices at half occupancy – does the occupancy of the industrial uses matter?
 - d. Page 2 (and elsewhere) states that the "City of Scottsdale does not require the mitigation

of intersections with LOS E.” This is not a true, stand-alone statement. Please review DSPM 5-1.801.

Response: The TIMA has been updated to address this comment.

19. Please provide segment average daily traffic volumes generated by the site per typical TIMA requirements.

Response: The TIMA has been updated to address this comment.

We separately submitted to Dan Worth the proposed driveway connection designs to the Park and Ride Facility. We respectfully request that you follow up with him on this issue. We are happy to sit back down and complete the necessary agreements to ensure this cross access occurs. If you have any questions regarding this resubmittal and the responses, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kurt Jones", written in a cursive style.

Kurt Jones, AICP